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Chapter 1

Introduction

The 2013 Brandywine Battlefield Preservation Plan (2013 Plan) identifies and prioritizes significant battlefield areas and battle elements1, 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 features2, 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 Marshallton Strategic Landscape (Map 1-1), along with plans for Trimble’s Ford and Jefferis’ Ford Strategic Landscape and Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Strategic Landscape, represents phase one battlefield strategic landscapes planning. Together, the four Landscapes form the northern Brandywine Battlefield, where tactical battle staging3 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 Marshallton Landscape:

- Role in the battle as part of the northern battlefield, association with American Reconnaissance, and relationship to the British flank in nearby Trimble’s Ford and Jefferis’ Ford Landscapes.
- Historic context, extant structures, road, and lands that contribute to a still readable battlefield landscape.
- Strategies for resource, land/open space, and heritage interpretation planning, including outlining 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.
Chapter 1 – Introduction

‘Behind the Lines’ - Marshallton Strategic Landscape Plan

Strategic Landscape and Plan Names

Focused examination of the area around Marshallton village made clear that the emphasis of the Landscape is more appropriately broadened from that identified in the 2013 Plan to include the entire Marshallton village and its surrounds. The 2013 Plan anticipated that such shifts may occur when recommending further study and planning for identified strategic landscapes. Originally named for Martin’s Tavern - an early Chester County militia meeting spot - the broadened strategic landscape represents its more expansive context in the battlefield as a behind the combat lines area. Marshallton Landscape is also associated with the colonial landscape, impacts of the battle on the local civilian and Quaker community, and accounts to Gen’l Washington about the northern British flanking maneuver. To reflect this more expansive context the strategic landscape is renamed ‘Marshallton Strategic Landscape’ (Map 1-1) and this plan is named ‘Behind the Lines’ to reflect its role in the battle.

Examination of Marshallton Landscape in concert with that of neighboring landscapes also led to grouping related landscapes for planning and interpretive purposes. Hence, while all four landscapes form the northern battlefield (Map 1-2), Marshallton, Trimble’s Ford, and Jefferis’ Fords2 Landscapes form the ‘American reconnaissance and successful tactical northern British flanking march’ of the battle (Map 1-1).

---

1 Strategic Landscapes represent generalized areas for study and planning purposes and their mapped outlines do not denote firm boundaries.
2 See ‘The British Left Hook - Breaching the Fords and the British Advance’ - Trimble’s & Jefferis’ Fords Strategic Landscapes Plan.
Plan Need

The 2013 Plan provides a foundation and framework for ongoing battlefield planning. This Landscape’s role in the overall battle is touched upon in the 2013 Plan as a crossroads staging area where, in the early morning on the day of the battle, local militia organized their efforts to spy on Crown Force\(^1\) troops and gather information about their whereabouts.

The 2013 Plan indicates there remains a significant historic landscape in this area, describing the Landscape’s modern-day context as an enduring village with surrounding rural lands containing significant historic structures and landscapes that retain 18th century character. The 2013 Plan recommends the role of this Landscape in the battle be further explored and this plan implements that recommendation. This plan analyzes, clarifies, and expands upon prior assumptions from the 2013 Plan, adding to the understanding of the battlefield, and specifically this Landscape, for continued planning, education, interpretation, and preservation. This plan 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 Sconnelltown 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.

---

\(^1\) During the Philadelphia Campaign of 1777, British troops along with Hessian soldiers and local loyalists can together be referred to as ‘Crown Forces’.
Chapter 2

‘Statement of Significance’ to the Battlefield

This plan looks to National Park Service guidelines for historic American battlefields and 2013 Plan methodology to describe the specific significance (termed ‘Statement of Significance’) of Marshallton Landscape in relationship to the battlefield and battle. Outlining significance provides a context by which to examine and evaluate battle elements and defining features for their role in Marshallton Landscape and battlefield overall.

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 Landscape in the northern battlefield and in particular American reconnaissance about the British flank. Gen’l Sullivan’s message (reprinted here) informs Gen’l Washington of the latest report of no British activity in the northern battlefield. This is one of three known reports Washington received the day of the battle.

With the fateful words relayed by Gen’l Sullivan from Maj. Spear (who had ridden south from Martin’s Tavern), the Marshallton area became a strategic battlefield landscape. The significance of the Marshallton Landscape as critical to the battlefield as a whole is threefold. First, it is part of the larger northern Brandywine 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. Second, Marshallton village was a location where conflicting accounts (one of which is included above) of British activity originated, leading Gen’l Washington to be uncertain about his military strategy and ultimately to fail to understand, until it was too late, that he was being outflanked to the north by half the Crown Forces. Third, it still displays the Brandywine Valley colonial landscape including structures and lands that American Forces and Crown Forces witnessed, and retains cultural roots and identity including the local Quaker community and continuously used 18th century meetinghouses and properties.

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. Marshallton Landscape is not included in the NHL boundary as its significance to the battle was not understood when the boundary was established.

originally delineated. The 2013 Plan and 2010 Battle of Brandywine Historic Resources Survey and Animated Map Study (2010 Study) were the first planning documents that brought forth the area’s importance for local planning. Marshallton Landscape is located northwest of core battle combat areas, which the NHL generally captures in its bounds. Marshallton Landscape contributes to the intent of the NHL for its largely intact Brandywine Valley colonial landscape that still reflects the story of the battle (military events and local community impacts) and the battle’s contribution to American independence. The Landscape today retains 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 Overview

Marshallton Landscape is located in (historic and modern-day) West Bradford Township, and contains Marshallton village and its surrounding rural lands. It is a part of the northern battlefield encompassing staging events leading up to core battle combat, which occurred in the eastern battlefield later that day. Marshallton Landscape lies just north of Trimble’s Ford, the first unguarded crossing of the Brandywine Creek by the Crown Forces on the ‘Road to the Great Valley’ or abbreviated in the era as ‘Great Valley Road’. Marshallton village was an important colonial crossroads settlement located at the intersection of a spur of the Road to the Great Valley and the Strasburg Road. There were multiple roads to the Great Valley that generally ran north-south, connecting fertile fields of the Brandywine Valley with the industrial corridor to the north in Chester County’s ‘Great Valley’. The Strasburg Road, running east-west through the village, was a primary drover’s east/west road between Lancaster County and Philadelphia.

Marshallton Landscape and the nearby strategic landscapes of Trimble’s Ford and Jefferis’ Ford still contain expanses of rural lands that surround Marshallton village. At the time of the battle, Marshallton village held at least two blacksmith shops, a tavern (Martin’s Tavern, a gathering place for Chester County militiamen), and a regional Quaker meetinghouse (still active today as the Bradford Meeting). Col. John Hannum, a Chester County militia military leader and patron of Martin’s Tavern during the American Revolution, held property in the Marshallton Landscape as did fellow prominent Quaker families of Clayton, Arnold, Marshall, and Woodward, whose lands and buildings remain today as significant intact battlefield resources and defining features that continue to characterize the landscape.

Existing Conditions and Integrity

Marshallton village has roots in the 18th century as a small crossroads. Nearby to the south was another 18th century village, the former Trimbleville, located at the convergence of two Roads to the Great Valley and a ford. Marshallton village with its locale on a main drover’s road - the Strasburg Road – further evolved in the 19th century, while Trimbleville vanished. Marshallton village retains a high degree of historic integrity, and its roots are evident by the many existing 18th and 19th century buildings still in use today and the village’s designation as a National Register Historic District. The Strasburg Road (modern day PA 162) is still the main road through the village and remains a well-used means of travel in the area. Though it is located only a short distance from West Chester Borough, Marshallton has retained a historic village character that is enhanced and protected due to largely intact rural and farmland surroundings. The village contains the stabilized and preserved ruins of the

1 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’.

2 Chapter 4 provides more discussion on historic context.
Marshallton village retains an enduring historic landscape. Revolutionary War era Martin’s Tavern is on the left. Its well-preserved ruins are used as a small community park and Brandywine Battle interpretation area. Not far from the Tavern site stands one of the blacksmith shops present at the time of the battle, and the Bradford Quaker Meetinghouse, both well-preserved buildings. Numerous colonial era structures remain in the Landscape.

Property owners generally value the historic resources and open lands in the Landscape and actively work to keep both viable. Active local groups promote continued viability and preservation of Marshallton. Friends of Martin’s Tavern restored and maintain the remains of the original tavern structure, help maintain the blacksmith shop, and promote continuation and enhancement of village life. Marshallton Conservation Trust advocates for the village being a safe, walkable community, while preserving its rich history, historic integrity, and quality of life. West Bradford Township is committed to enhancing the quality of life and recently completed an extensive streetscape project in the village that improved walkability in a context sensitive manner.

**Historic Contextual Themes**

The significance and analysis of the Marshallton Landscape 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:

- Chester County militia
- American reconnaissance
- Relevance of the nearby British flank

- Brandywine Valley in the 18th century
- Still readable battlefield landscape;
- Quaker roots and Peace Testimony.

Landscape history also mirrors major themes in the overall history of Chester County: Brandywine Valley Quaker settlement, lasting historic villages, prosperous industry/commerce foundations, and role in the American Revolution. Landscape themes are found throughout this plan and are the basis for heritage interpretation (Chapter 6)

Themes for the comprehensive battlefield, and this plan as relevant, relate to and are being coordinated with Museum of the American Revolution’s (MAR) Revolutionary War interpretative themes. MAR’s major themes can be summarized as: ‘Citizens turned Revolutionaries’, ‘Surviving the Darkest Hours’, ‘Radical Nature of Revolution’, and ‘Lasting Meanings’. As Marshallton Landscape is just one part of the much larger Revolutionary War, and has a unique cultural affiliation as part of the Brandywine Valley’s largely Quaker roots, not all MAR themes speak directly to this Landscape. For this Landscape, themes of Chester County militia and American reconnaissance could fall under ‘Citizens turned Revolutionaries’; the nearby British flank 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.

---

1. MAR is the national Museum of the American Revolution in Philadelphia, which is coordinating their efforts to interpret the battle with Brandywine Battlefield Task Force.
Geophysical Landscape and Battlefield Analysis

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 Landscape. This includes reviewing the 1) Landscape’s role as part of the northern battlefield, 2) American military (Lt. Col. Ross and Major Spear) and civilian involvement (Col. John Hannum and Squire Cheyney), and 3) nearby northern British flanking march (Maj. Gen’l. Cornwallis) in Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes. This chapter takes a holistic historical view of the battle in and near this Landscape and provides related recommendations, while Chapter 4 focuses on distinct built features. For local planning purposes, this analysis seeks to clarify the Landscape’s role 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 Marshallton Landscape - where American reconnaissance and staging emanated and/or occurred - and the nearby Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes - where American reconnaissance emanating from Marshallton village and the middle stage of the British flank took place. As a ‘behind the combat lines’ location – hence the name of this plan - Marshallton Landscape itself contains fewer military defining features than other battlefield landscapes. However, battle events are not isolated activities, and so to understand how this Landscape fits into the overall

---

1 Appendix A gray 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 stretches in nearby related landscapes. Figure 3-1 provides updated defining features related to military activity within and related to the Landscape.

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 historic 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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING FEATURE</th>
<th>KOCOA CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marshallton village</td>
<td>Key Terrain (CC Militia Staging)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin’s Tavern</td>
<td>Key Terrain (CC Militia Staging)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Clayton House</td>
<td>Observation</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/from 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>1725 Road segment in Marshallton village (modern Strasburg Rd)</td>
<td>Key Terrain</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>1728/1771 Spur and Trace of Road to the Great Valley to/from Welch’s Tavern (modern Doe Run Rd and archeological battle-era road sites from modern Street Rd to Rt 1 areas of visible road beds on Longwood Gardens property)</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>Brandywine Creek, west branch</td>
<td>Obstacle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: use of ‘Road’ indicates the approximate battle-era roadbed and road alignment still exists. ‘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. Refer to Breaching the Fords/British Advance Plan for more information.

Marshallton Landscape Battlefield Analysis

The analysis discusses the Landscape 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 (Chester County militia, American reconnaissance, and relevance of the nearby British flank) and settlement patterns (Brandywine Valley in the colonial era through 1800 and a still readable battlefield landscape). This analysis explores battle-related events that took place within and/or are related to this Landscape. The analysis was completed by project consultant, JMA so prose may read differently than other plan sections. Refer to Map 3-1 for analysis.

---

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.
parenthetical references, Figure 3-1 for battle-era road’s approximate correlation to modern roads, and the Breaching the Fords/British Advance Strategic Landscape Plan for additional information.
In the northern battlefield during the morning of September 11, 1777, American Forces arrayed on the west side of the Brandywine Creek and in the vicinity of Martin’s Tavern (B) consisted of detachments from Maxwell’s Light Infantry Corps comprising Continental soldiers and Pennsylvania militia, as well as patrols of Continental light dragoons under the command of Col. Bland.

In the northern battlefield during the morning of September 11, 1777, American Forces arrayed on the west side of the Brandywine Creek and in the vicinity of Martin’s Tavern (B) consisted of detachments from Maxwell’s Light Infantry Corps comprising Continental soldiers and Pennsylvania militia, as well as patrols of Continental light dragoons under the command of Col. Bland.

The Martin’s Tavern intersection was a major regional crossroads point and key strategic military feature. Control of the crossroads meant control of the north-south Road to the Great Valley (approximate route shown in pink from C to A) as it came up from Trimble’s Ford, and control of the east-west Strasburg Road (a section of which is shown from B to 2) leading to Marshallton village and Martin’s Tavern and connecting to Turk’s Head Tavern (E, in the former Turk’s Head village and today’s West Chester Borough).

At about 6am, Maxwell’s main body engaged the Crown Forces column commanded by Lt. Gen’l. Knyphausen as it advanced toward the American position at Chads (now Chadds) Ford. Maxwell’s light troops were intended to serve as a reconnaissance force to slow enemy movements and provide information about enemy formations and maneuvers. (Their first recorded engagement took place at C). Troops in Maxwell’s Light Corps were drawn from a number of regiments and battalions (a term used interchangeably during the War) within the army, including Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Virginia, and North Carolina.

Continental American Light Infantry Corps included a large proportion of riflemen, many of whom were volunteers from militias for the counties of Lancaster, York, North Hampton, and Cumberland in Pennsylvania. These Pennsylvania militia company volunteers were attached to the Light Corps specifically because they were armed with rifles (Cummings 1832). To further supplement the Light Corps, Gen’l. Washington also ordered a volunteer battalion of Chester County militia to join Maxwell on September 1st (Catts 2004). This unit, the 8th Battalion Chester County Militia commanded by Patterson Bell, was ordered to join with Maxwell’s light troops on September 1st, but it is possible that Bell’s men did not actually organize until September 6th (Smith 1976:9).

About a week earlier (September 2nd) Washington had provided guidance to Maxwell regarding the role of his light corps, and this advice can be applied to the method of patrolling used by the light troops. Washington advised Maxwell to “keep small parties upon every Road that you may be sure of the one they take.” A similar pattern of patrolling and reconnaissance can be seen in Maxwell’s deployment of his corps after the Battle of Brandywine and in the days leading up to the Battle of the Clouds (that took place between the Americans and British in the Great Valley of Chester County on September 18th). American formations were attempting to cover the various avenues of approach to the battle.

It is likely that small groups of light troops were deployed along the principal west-to-east roads leading from the general Kennett Square vicinity (C) towards the Brandywine Creek, such as the modern US Route 1 corridor and the roughly parallel Street Road (PA Route 926). Patrols were also stationed along the Road to the Great Valley that crossed at Trimble’s Ford (1) and led to Martin’s Tavern (B). Militia formations, and possibly some of the light infantry, were located in the vicinity of Martin’s Tavern on the morning of September 11th. This is certainly the case with Col. John Hannum of the 1st Battalion of Chester County Militia, Maj. Joseph Spear of the 8th Battalion (the unit commanded by Patterson Bell), as well as ‘Squire’ Thomas Cheyney (a county ‘sub-lieutenant’ responsible for organizing militia).

Spear left Martin’s Tavern before dawn and traveled south towards Welch’s Tavern (C) about five miles away. Skirmishing and several sharp but short engagements between Knyphausen’s column and Maxwell’s light infantry
started at around 6am near the intersection of modern US Route 1 and Lenape Road/PA Route 52, well south of Martin’s Tavern. The sound of firing throughout the morning, while not heavy and indicating a major engagement, may have been audible in the region, so American militia, dragoons, and light troops not engaged in fighting would have been on alert.

Sometime before 10am, Hannum and Cheyney worked their way south along the Road to the Great Valley from Martin’s Tavern (B) about one mile to a vantage point where they could see Trimble’s Ford (I). While at this location they observed the crossing of the ford by Maj. Gen’l. Cornwallis’ division. At the time, they watched the column as it was in mid-crossing, with formations queuing to cross extending along today’s Bragg Hill Road, already across the ford and halted on the Camp Linden Road extending east towards Jefferis’ Ford (3), as well as waiting in the fields surrounding Trimble’s Ford (Harris 2014:252; McGuire 2006:188). Historic resource review and landscape analysis suggests Hannum and Cheyney’s location was at or near the Joshua Clayton House on today’s Northbrook Road ((B in blue house map icon). Chapter 4 will detail this further, but Cheyney was related to the Clayton family by marriage and the house commands a good view of Trimble’s Ford. While not substantiated in any historical account, the local legend of Cheyney’s ride to warn Washington has its roots here (Harris 2014:262-265; McGuire 2006:188). Many of the nearby fields where Cheyney may have possibly made his legendary ride (Crown Forces were located on all passable roads south) to reach Jefferis’ Ford prior to the British advance are still farmed open space with evidence of a possible farm lane visible.

Whether Ross’ detachment of light infantry began the morning at Martin’s Tavern is not known. Perhaps more likely is that this 70-man detachment was positioned south of the Creek’s west branch, patrolling roads as were other light detachments. It is known however, that at 11am, Ross – identifying his position as 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, reprinted to the right.

Ross’ message can be read as a warning to Washington that the road he has found the Crown Forces on – identified as the Great Valley Road (also known as the Road to the Great Valley based on Chester County Archives research) – presented multiple avenues of approach to the American position. Ross 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). Ross’ message suggests that his detachment was patrolling the area south of the Creek’s west branch and encountered Cornwallis’ column as it moved towards Trimble’s Ford. Ross’ detachment is on the south side of the Creek, along today’s Red Lion Road, probably near its intersection with today’s Corinne Road (the 1742 Road) in historic Locust Grove, when the rear of the Crown Forces column came under fire from a portion of Ross’ command, but was not seriously impeded (red star on Map 3-1 shows approximate location). Ross’ patrol’s position was previously identified and incorporated into the 2010 Study and 2013 Plan as being north of Trimble’s Ford. However, his patrol’s proximity to Jone’s/Painter’s Ford (6) and the Continental Army from south of the Creek and near the 1742 Road supports the fairly timely delivery of Ross’ message to Washington. Ross’ detachment is reported in East Bradford Township at night fall (McGuire 2006:264).
Historic Military Archeological Potential

Based on the battle and landscape analysis by JMA, while the Marshallton Landscape clearly contributes to the overall understanding of the battlefield, no documented battle or skirmish took place within the Landscape. As a result, the Marshallton Landscape has a low potential to yield archaeological remains associated with possible military-related activities. Marshallton village was a gathering place for local militia units at the time of the battle, so potential exists for archaeological evidence of temporary short-term encampments, but such remains are likely to be sparse and difficult to discern.

Recommendations

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

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

3-2. Further verify the location of Cheyney and Hannum’s observation of the British advance. Investigate the probable route Cheyney may have taken to warn 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 Washington; location of Cheyney and Hannum’s observation of the British advance; updated 1777 road network approximation; and other information depicted on Map 3-1. (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 and items listed in Recommendation 3-3. (CCPC)

3-5. Provide updated information to battlefield communities, particularly West Bradford Township where Marshallton Landscape is located. Information can be used in municipal histories, for historical commission resources identification and documentation, and for educational and outreach efforts (e.g. Marshallton Walking Tour, Marshallton Triathlon, or 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 fostering land conservation and open space preservation to enhance quality of life, and possible public access and interpretation of historic landscapes, and public access as appropriate. (CCPC, municipalities, BBTF)
Cummings, Andrew Pension (1832) Pension Number #W.911. Record Group M804. National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C.
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 battle-era 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 Landscape. To do this, features are considered as to whether and how they support Landscape significance\(^1\) 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 photograph), primary sources (firsthand accounts, road petitions, deeds), 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’.

---

\(^1\) See ‘Statement of Significance’ in Chapter 2.
This plan uses KOCOA to review, update, and/or interpret previously identified built features in or near Marshallton Landscape. These may include: farmsteads, homesteads, houses, blacksmith shops, meetinghouses, taverns, roads, and the village. As an early place in colonial (and modern) West Bradford Township and a ‘behind the combat line’ location in the battle, Marshallton village and its surrounds contain battle-era civilian defining features of structures, residences, and properties. As battlefield features are inherently interrelated, together creating an understanding of the battle story, features in nearby and related landscapes are also considered though to a lesser extent than the more holistic military battle analysis in Chapter 3. Figure 4-1 provides updated cultural topography defining features within and/or related to Marshallton Landscape.

Historic Context

Historic context is an element of Landscape significance. This section goes into further discussion about the 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 Landscape. For this evaluation, the geography is the approximate Marshallton Landscape boundary and time period is 1777. Relevant broad themes are ‘18th century landscape’, ‘local community’, and ‘military activity’, with specific themes of: 18th century Brandywine Valley, a still readable colonial landscape, enduring Quaker community roots, Chester County militia, American reconnaissance, and relevance of the nearby British flank.

Understanding historic context is necessary to more definitively identify built features as battle-era contributing historic resources. Features can be examined for how they correspond with Landscape 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 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 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 actions. Due to their nature, depredations generally include more detailed information than plunders or sufferings. Sufferings and claims 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.

West Bradford Township

Marshallton Landscape is located in West Bradford Township. 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 in 1707 established their home along Brandywine Creek’s west branch at today’s Northbrook village. Abraham and Mary raised nine children and helped to establish the Bradford Friends Meeting, which first convened on their farm in the 1720s, later moving to its permanent location in Marshallton village around 1730. Their descendants erected additional homes, built a grist mill and saw mill, and ran prosperous farms. Because of the family’s prominence, Northbrook originally was known as Marshall’s Mill. Their son, Humphry, became an esteemed botanist, establishing a botanical garden and arboretum at his brick home, which 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

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.
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.

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’, the Strasburg Road 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. Trimbleville village, to the south of Marshallton village, sat in a broad valley formed by the Brandywine Creek and its Broad Run tributary just west of the bustling Trimble’s Ford (where the Crown Forces crossed the morning of September 11, 1777).

**Marshallton Landscape**

In 1724, Richard Woodward bought 1,000 acres in West Bradford Township. In 1735, he sold/left part of the property to his sons James, Richard, and William. At the time of the battle, these men and their heirs owned the farmland east of the Road to the Great Valley spur to the eastern border of West Bradford on the Strasburg Road. John Hannum held the only other property in that area not held by the Woodward family. In 1771, William England purchased a blacksmith shop and adjoining land from Robert Woodward who was a blacksmith. From early on, the Clayton and Arnold families held the land south of the Strasburg Road along the Road to the Great Valley spur, having obtained patents in 1713. Humphrey Marshall purchased property north the Strasburg Road in 1773. (Map 4-1 displays properties and owners in 1777).

Marshallton village was settled in the mid 1700’s when a few houses, Bradford Meetinghouse, Martin’s Tavern, and a blacksmith shop were grouped near the intersection of the Strasburg Road and Road to the Great Valley spur. During the Colonial era, original log structures gave way to stone and brick structures as wealth grew and styles changed, hence few log structures remain. Martin’s Tavern was an important public gathering place, particularly for the Chester County militia during the Revolutionary War. The Landscape played a critical role in the battle due to its associated conflicting accounts about the British flank relayed to Gen’l. Washington that directly impacted battle strategy. Chapter 3 details this role.

**Historic Structures, Properties, Sites**

This section reviews, refines, and updates 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 Landscape in the battlefield as contributing resources (Figure 4-2a). It also notes those resources that relate to battle events as KOCOA built defining features. 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 and 4-2b) and other extant battle-era historic resources inventoried in the 2013 Plan (Figure 4-2b) 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 development patterns, building types, and architectural design choices characterize the Landscape and embody the pattern of colonial life. Development and buildings were largely main residences, tenant houses, and outbuildings on homesteads that dotted the landscape near roads for access to farm products and markets. This is why today many historic buildings are found abutting the edge of roads, as roads were widen and improved over the centuries since the battle. Regional development patterns also included early crossroads settlements with tradesmen (blacksmith or wheelwright shops), homes, and taverns. Some buildings in the Brandywine Valley also 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 changes in 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 4-12) 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 Landscape. 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 relatives properties in association/distance to one another), and ascertain today’s locations of historic accounts and battle-era structures/properties. In addition, though more relevant in other strategic landscapes, property location/owner mapping is used to trace the Crown Forces advance through the battlefield using Quaker sufferings and civilian recordings of plundering claims.3

Historic Resources Contributing to the Landscape

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 the Landscape and contribute to Landscape significance or plan themes, and may also inform about battle events. Figure 4-2a updates the 2013 Plan historic resource and defining features inventories4 for this Landscape, and are categorized as ‘contributing’ resources to the Landscape. (These resources are shown on Map 4-2.) Structures and sites listed stood at the time of and played a role in the battle, and as such are listed by their c.1777 property owner or tenant names unless otherwise indicated. ‘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 suggested future designation based on this plan analysis. Designations include resources that are currently: National Historic Landmarks (NHL), individually listed on or eligible for 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 (Interp5).

---

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
3 See Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Strategic Landscapes Plan for more explanation.
4 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.
5 See heritage tour in Chapter 6 and Appendix C.
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.

<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>49.01</td>
<td>49-5-267</td>
<td>1066 Unionville-Wawaset Rd/940 Marlboro Spring Rd</td>
<td>Richard Barnard Farm, c.1755: Founding Family</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>49-2-85</td>
<td>275 or 299 Brandywine Dr</td>
<td>Indian Deep Farm, c.1759. Thomas Buffington lived in house at time of battle. (Depredation Claim)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.03</td>
<td>49-5-53</td>
<td>2075 Marlboro Spring Rd</td>
<td>Richard Barnard Farm, c.1726: Founding Family</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.03</td>
<td>50-6-101.1</td>
<td>479 Cann Rd</td>
<td>Joseph Woodward Farm, c.1735 son of James, Sr. Founding Family</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.04</td>
<td>50-6-93.1A</td>
<td>1185 W. Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>William Woodward Farm: Carpenter, Son of James Sr.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.08</td>
<td>50-6P-71</td>
<td>1258 W. Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>Joseph Woodward Weaver Shop</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.11</td>
<td>50-6P-1</td>
<td>1371 S. Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>William England Property, c.1735</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>50-8-22.1</td>
<td>685 Broad Run Rd</td>
<td>Temple-Webster-Stoner House, c.1730</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.14N</td>
<td>50-9-20.3</td>
<td>538 Northbrook Rd</td>
<td>William Clayton House; c.1713: Founding Family</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.15N</td>
<td>50-9-29</td>
<td>475 Northbrook Rd</td>
<td>William Clayton Springhouse</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.16N</td>
<td>50-9B-1</td>
<td>502 Northbrook Rd</td>
<td>William Clayton Blacksmith Shop</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.17N</td>
<td>50-9B-25</td>
<td>1404 Carriage Ln</td>
<td>William Clayton Dwelling/Tenant House</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.18N</td>
<td>50-6P-35</td>
<td>1422 W. Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>Built after 1777 but closely associated with Humphrey Marshall</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.19N</td>
<td>50-6-95</td>
<td>1265 W. Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>James Woodward Farm: Wheelwright, Son of James, Sr.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.21N</td>
<td>50-6-91.1</td>
<td>1165 W. Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>John Woodward Property: Son of William, house where he died</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.22N</td>
<td>50-6-85</td>
<td>1117 W. Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>William Woodward, Jr. Property, Son of William</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.23N</td>
<td>50-6-59</td>
<td>1121 Telegraph Rd</td>
<td>John Hannum Property: County Militia Leader</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.09N</td>
<td>61-2-67</td>
<td>361 Marlboro Rd</td>
<td>Marlborough village &amp; Historic District multiple dwellings</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.10</td>
<td>63-3-5</td>
<td>1855 Unionville-Wawaset Rd</td>
<td>James Allen 1777 Property and possible farmhouse. Requires additional research as potential interpretive site.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Marshallton Landscape (especially Martin’s Tavern, Marshallton village, and roads between the village and the Great Valley to the north). This also involves verifying the battle-era Strasburg Road route from Marshallton village heading east toward the former Turk’s Head Tavern in today’s West Chester Borough. 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 4-3) and 1883 (Map 4-1) 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 the extent and level of 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.

---
when named in other reference materials. To speak to the latter, both 1847 and 1883 County maps show farm lanes some of which plan researchers conjecture were 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.

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 4-4 summarizes historic roads.

<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>1725 Road segment in Marshallton village (modern Strasburg Rd)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Roads</td>
<td>1746 Spur to/from Marshallton village of 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley (modern Northbrook Rd)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Roads</td>
<td>1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley aka Great Valley Road (modern Red Lion Rd, Broad Run Rd)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The battle-era road 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, for example the location of Marshallton village in relation to Trimble’s Ford, and understanding the battle.

Knowledge about the British flanking march is based largely on historic accounts that cite a ‘Great Valley Road’ (aka an abbreviation for ‘Road to the Great Valley’) as their primary 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). It appears that Welch’s Tavern on the Great Nottingham Road (modern US Route 1) was connected to the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley by a spur. Thus, it is surmised that the 1746 Road leading to Martin’s Tavern may also have been a spur of the Road to the Great Valley. The British flanking advance via the Road to the Great Valley is further discussed in the Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Strategic Landscapes Plan.
Recommendations

Using the analysis undertaken in this chapter, the following recommendations were developed. Parties that may carry out a recommendation are listed 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 defining 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 Commission, PHMC)

4-2. Research the other extant battlefield historic resources from the 2013 Plan listed in Figure 4-2b and update Township historic resource inventories to reflect these contributing battlefield resources. Correspond extant historic buildings, ruins, foundations in the village with those properties listed in Figure 4-2b. (West Bradford Historical Commission)

4-3. Research families living in or related to 18th century Marshallton village. Focus on Humphrey and Moses Marshall, John Hannum, and Thomas Cheyney to understand the dynamics between them and their motivations to support the Revolutionary War effort or live by the Quaker Peace Testimony. (West Bradford Historical Commission)

4-4. Research the Woodward, Arnold and Clayton families to better understand their relationship to Marshallton village during the Revolutionary War, particularly the John and William Woodward Jr. properties, whose landscape is still today largely intact from 1777. (West Bradford Historical Commission)

4-5. Research the development of Marshallton as an 18th century crossroads village. Using that research and documentation and recommendations from this plan, update information for the current Marshallton Village National Register Historic District. Consider revising the District nomination to reflect that research and this plan’s information. (West Bradford Historical Commission)

4-6. Update the Township historic resource inventory to reflect Figure 4-2a recommended future resource designations. (West Bradford Historical Commission)

4-7. Develop a Battle of Brandywine walking tour of Marshallton village. (West Bradford Historical Commission and Friends of Martin’s Tavern)

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. (West Bradford Historical Commission and Friends of Martin’s Tavern)
Planning Strategies

Chapter 5

Marshallton Landscape as an associated battle site is a relative ‘newcomer’ both to formal recognition as a part of the battlefield, and for related planning and directed battlefield protection strategies. While this area prior to the 2010 Study was known to contain Martin’s Tavern where American Reconnaissance emanated and Chester County militia met, the area was 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 land conservation and historic resource 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 land conservation opportunities. Battlefield planning and protection is simultaneously a historic resource protection, nature feature 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. Adjacent to Marshallton village, 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 conserved via the land development process, whereby land is designated to remain undeveloped or 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 typically 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.

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

---

1 See Chapter 2 in the 2013 Plan for more information.
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 as well as 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 Marshallton 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; Greenways, Trails, and Gateways Plan; and an Official Map, as well as a Recreation Commission that addresses open space. The Township is also 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. Figure 5-1 provides an overview if the variety of land conservation open space protection measures the Township has in place.

**Figure 5-1: West Bradford Township Land Conservation-related Policies Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
<th>CURRENT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Zoning**<sup>1</sup> | - Open space generally can be used for: agriculture, horticulture, recreation, woodland/wildlife preserves, floodplain conservation, historic and agricultural structures and uses, and/or preservation of other scenic, natural, or historic features per Twp policy, as well as a limited number of conservation lots.  
- Open area/space overlay district (protects areas of environmentally sensitive and scenic resources, restricted open space, land with previously extinguished/transferred development rights, or limited use conservation lots).  
- Unified development area district (flexible development with mixed-use under a master plan to conserve site features (open lands, historic, natural, and scenic), min. 60% open space protected).  
- Open space design development option with significant land (min. 60% in R-1C, 75% in R-5) preserved.  
- TND-1/Village Overlay District (promotes mixed-use villages with min. 40% open space protected).  
- Open space management plan required.  
- Agricultural/horticultural uses permitted throughout Township.  
- Natural resource protection provisions (steep slopes, woodlands, riparian buffers, floodplains).  
- Net-out of constrained natural resources and infrastructure areas from open space and development calculations. |
| **Subdivision/ Land Development (SLDO)** | - Open space management plan.  
- Park, recreation, and open space needs of additional residents or employees considered for new development.  
- Fee-in-lieu of new development providing parkland.  
- Identification of parkland and greenways based on Township Plans.  
- Environmental impact assessment report identifying, assessing, mitigating the effects of a development proposed on natural, historic, and scenic features. |

<sup>1</sup> Per an editor’s note in §450-11 R-1 Residential District, §401.9, Transfer of development rights, and §401.10, Open space residential design were once part of zoning but have since been repealed. The Township is currently updating and improving natural resource and landscaping standards.
The Township has worked to direct most development to appropriate areas in the Township, thus leaving more pristine rural, natural, and agricultural areas intact. In the case of unavoidable land development in otherwise open areas, the Township has primarily implemented open space design development and permits agricultural and horticultural uses throughout the Township. Zoning includes an open area overlay district, which 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, which allow land to remain open but be viable. Natural resource and other lands are also protected from development. R-1 district zoning comprises most of the Township including Marshallton Landscape (excluding Marshallton village), however provisions do not promote open space land conservation. At one point, zoning including R-1 had broader use of open space design development as well as transferable development rights, but these provisions have since been repealed. The Township might revisit the tools of open space design development for use in R-1 and transferable development rights for use in R-1 and targeted growth areas as possible land and resource conservation options. The Township might also consider rural 10 acre minimum tract agricultural zoning as another tool option to promote retention of remaining farmlands and Township rural character.

Land conservation efforts have been successful resulting in 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.

Open lands coupled with rolling topography characterize the West Bradford landscape, a character the Township is dedicated to maintaining for future generations. While open lands vary in their level of public access, they nonetheless provide considerable environmental and cultural resource protection benefits to the community overall. Appreciable additional development cannot occur or is limited on these lands, and they remain 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 soundly supported. As well, Township open character, viewsheds, and natural resource protection (floodplains, groundwater recharge, and habitat) is strongly fostered.

Marshallton Landscape

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 took the next step to assess strategic landscapes for their overall existing and potential land protection. Map 2.9 from the 2013 Plan is included here to show the broader context of how this Landscape fits into overall battlefield land protection. From a general perspective, it shows that there are unprotected lands in
close proximity to protected lands and developed open grounds\textsuperscript{1} especially in the ‘Marshallton Cluster’, that provides potential for linkages and protection to create a large cluster of conserved lands in the northern battlefield. Projects that have potential for protecting large clusters of land are more competitive for possible funding. As administrative costs are about the same to preserve large or smaller tracts, land preservation programs often require isolated tracts be a minimum of 10 acres, so having ‘land clusters’ (undeveloped lands in proximity to protected lands) enables better funding possibilities. Northern battlefield lands have been well maintained in village, large lot suburban, and rural patterns, which creates a positive setting for additional land conservation. The 2013 Plan indicated Marshallton Cluster is one of the best-suited areas in the battlefield for additional land protection, due to its potential for a large cluster of protected land that also could simultaneously protect historic and natural resources and landscapes, thus making it more likely to receive competitive conservation funding. Northern battlefield land conservation efforts can benefit from this plan’s further look at this mix of unprotected and protected lands in those 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 battle-era historic resources and properties, natural features, and buffering as well as plan themes. Within the Landscape itself, overall potential for land conservation is low, as the Landscape is largely comprised of an established village, though there are a few key parcels that should be considered. Potential is high towards the Landscape fringes, in adjacent battlefield areas, and nearby strategic landscapes as many lands, particularly to the south and west, are farm fields or open lands well-suited for conservation.

\textsuperscript{1} Developed open grounds are mostly institutional uses with significant open lands, e.g. schools, County uses, golf courses, Longwood Gardens, etc.
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‘Behind the Lines’ - Marshallton Strategic Landscape Plan

Map 5-2
Contributing Historic Resources & Possible Land Conservation Tracts in 1777 Landscape Context
Marshallton Strategic Landscape Plan

Map Features:
- Protected Lands
- Possible New Lands for Conservation (2015 Strategic Landscape Plan)
- Contributing Historic Resources to the Landscape
- Contributions Historic Resources to the Battlefield Overall
- Ford Sites
- 1777 Roads (approximation)
- 1777 Property Lines (approximation)
This analysis supplements 2013 Plan mapping and recommendations by identifying additional possible land conservation tracts. Updated\textsuperscript{1} 2013 Plan mapping on the contemporary landscape (Map 5-1) shows current protected lands and lands suited for possible future conservation. Updated mapping is also overlaid on battle-era development pattern mapping\textsuperscript{2} (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. For example, the historic Joshua Clayton farmhouse’s related farm tract is nearly intact. On both maps, lighter pink areas represent lands recommended as well-suited for possible conservation from the 2013 Plan, while darker pink areas are additional recommended tracts from this plan for conservation consideration.

Some of these ‘newly’ identified tracts contain a battle-era historic resource and part of its associated lands (Chapter 4), hence honoring founding village 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, in employing land conservation clustering discussed above, key smaller tracts (<10 acres) that contain battle-era historic resources, green links, or are part of known battle-era individuals/families original properties, are also identified through this plan’s mapping. Tracts outlying the Marshallton Landscape are deliberately included to provide an open land buffer around the Landscape to serve as a transition area between this portion of the battlefield and possible future development and intrusion. Using this mapping, specific recommendations for land conservation and historic resources protection are at the end of this Chapter.

Marshallton village itself is well-zoned for preservation as TND-2, traditional neighborhood development-2, which is fosters continuation of the village setting. R-2 residential zoning bookends the village, creating a buffer and transition area into the countryside. R-1 zoning is beyond the village and makes up the remainder of the Landscape area. TND promotes continuation of the traditional character and land use pattern of the village, adaptive reuse of buildings, new development or redevelopment to be consistent with the scale and elements of village character, green areas, and historic and scenic resource preservation, and discourages demolition of existing viable buildings. Green areas preserved under TND-2 could coincide with the possible lands identified for conservation in this plan and could include educational interpretation information.

**Historic Resources Protection Overview**

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 battle-era farmsteads. Within Marshallton village, there remain 18th century structures that ‘witnessed’ behind the lines battle activity and those structures that contribute to the overall period setting.

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. West Bradford is a good example of such historic preservation promotion as evidenced through its solid Township policy and ordinance protection provisions for the village discussed below. The Township is a member of Brandywine Battlefield Task Force (BBTF) and has representatives who participate in BBTF’s historic resources/interpretation subcommittee. It also participates in Chester County Historic Preservation Network, a group who advocates 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 stewardship,

\textsuperscript{1} Updated with current parcels, protected lands, roads, and other relevant information since 2013.

\textsuperscript{2} Refers to battlefield-era development pattern mapping created for battle events and historic resources verification in Chapters 3 and 4.
Historic resource preservation is significant in the battlefield. Land conservation and historic resource preservation on larger parcels in the battlefield have tended to go hand-in-hand in large part to the battlefield literally remaining home to many descendants of the original Quaker colonists, who continue to act as stewards of both their lands and historic structures as part of their 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.

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 the protection of historic resources, allow adaptive reuse to promote their continued economic vitality, and regulate their demolition. Often in Chester County, this takes the form of historic resource zoning overlay, whereby provisions addressing historic resource protection are added to base zoning. For example, this may include permitting modification of area and bulk requirements to account for the unique character of individual resources and help preserve its setting/context; allowing additional uses as incentives for continued historic resource use; or review of proposed building changes. Historic resource overlay zoning is often employed in situations where there is not a sufficient concentration of resources to form a local 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 provisions has tended to be less well used in Chester County, likely due to the less dense development pattern and largely more scattered rural historic resources. However, there are five local historic districts in battlefield communities.

**Historic Resource Protection Policy and Analysis**

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.

Marshallton Landscape has numerous extant battle-era historic resources (Map 4-1). Marshallton village is a well-preserved village that still displays its 18th and 19th century village setting. It continues to be a local community-gathering place just as it was in 1777. Marshallton Village is a National Register District and the Township contains
individual National Register properties as well as has a historic resource survey that identifies locally designated
historic resources. In addition to Marshallton Historic District, the Township contains portion of three other
National Register historic district: Trimbleville (discussed in Breaching the Fords/British Advance Plan for Trimble’s
and Jeffers’ Fords Landscapes), Northbrook, and Worth/Jefferies. Additionally, 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 solid historic resource protection measures for Marshallton village,
but limited protection in parts of the Landscape outside of the village (Figure 5-2a). TND-2, traditional
neighborhood development district, in Marshallton village serves as the primary historic resource protection
measure in the Marshallton Landscape. It provides a unique and successful approach to historic resource
protection in a battlefield village setting. TND-2 promotes continuation of historic land use and development
patterns as well as a mixed-use village setting. The TND allows provisions to be modified to better achieve district
purposes; requires building activities relate to/emulate context, historic character, and fabric of typical Chester
County villages and follow design guidelines; promotes adaptive reuse as a way to extend historic building
lifespan and utility; and requires review of building demolition. Under TND provisions, a Township Design
Review Committee reviews plan proposal and demolitions. Commercial performance standards in TND that
require building activity (materials, design, and use) demonstrate it will not detract from and will be in
furtherance of village character.

Conservation of historic resources under the unified development area district requires preservation of 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.

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 the Strasburg Road through Marshallton village is to be treated
as a scenic road corridor whereby elements should not detract from scenic roadside quality.

<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: existing historic and agricultural structures and uses, and/or preservation of other scenic, natural, or historic features per Twp policy, as well as a limited number of conservation lots that could be used to protect individual historic resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unified development area district (integrated mixed-use flexible development under a master plan. Promotes conserving historic resources. Allows historic or scenic features to remain in protected open lands).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Traditional neighborhood development, TND-1 and 2/Village Overlay Districts (promotes mixed-use villages in Romansville and Marshallton respectively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional use of bed and breakfasts are permitted as principal permitted use in TND district and as accessory uses in R-1 District or in R-4 District if R-4 is in a National Register historic district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision/Land Development (SLDO)</td>
<td>- Environmental impact assessment report identifies historic resources and known archeological resources (e.g. significant structures, areas, routes, trails), and assesses effects of proposed development on natural, historic, and scenic features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While TND-2 promotes strong historic resources protection within its boundaries, there are several battle-era (as
well as other era) historic resources in and near Marshallton Landscape that are outside those boundaries. These
include (Figure 4-2 and Map 4-1) historic resources with Map IDs of 50.20N, 50.15N, 50.16N, 50.17N, 50.03,
50.04, 50.21N, 50.22N, and 50.23N. These resources fall within R-1 district zoning, except for 50.17N that is
zoned as R-2. Historic resources protection provisions in these districts are minimal, and the Township might consider revisiting zoning to implement their protection.

## Specific Historic Resource Protection and Land Conservation Recommendations

Historic properties and resources identified in Chapter 4 and their associated lands have protection recommendations as follows:

### Martin’s Tavern (Clayton Property)

**Map ID:** 50.01  
**Description:** Stabilized remains of the circa 1750 Tavern are an interpretive site.  
**Recommendation:** This highly significant historic structure is recommended for continued preservation and for use as an interpretive site and outdoor community gathering space. The Historical Commission should work with Friends of Martin’s Tavern on interpretation efforts for this property, which can help assist with ongoing public awareness and preservation. It is the focal point in Marshallton village for battle interpretation.

### William Clayton Properties

**Description:** Multiple circa 1713 resources associated with a prominent Marshallton Landscape family.  
**Recommendation:** These resources and properties constitute potential land preservation tracts and significant historic structures recommended for preservation. The Historical Commission should work with Friends of Martin’s Tavern to encourage interpretation and preservation of the related resources, now on multiple properties. The Township should consider land conservation possibilities for these tracts. If these properties come up for development, the Township should work with the property owner to determine how to preserve elements of Marshallton Landscape through protecting lands and built features on this tract.

### Bradford Meetinghouse

**Map ID:** 50.05  
**Description:** Significant circa 1764 Quaker meetinghouse standing at the time of the battle, and still in active use today. This meetinghouse is often featured as a stop on tours of Marshallton due to its colonial architecture and its story of the past and modern Quaker community.  
**Recommendation:** This highly significant historic structure and grounds are recommended for preservation and for continued active use as a Quaker meetinghouse to maintain its vitality. It is a focal point in the village for battle interpretation. Work with Bradford Meetinghouse Property Committee to promote the preservation and use of the meetinghouse and grounds.

### Humphry Marshall House

**Map ID:** 50.06  
**Description:** Significant circa 1773 historic house and grounds. Humphry was the son of a founding Marshallton family and was a famous community leader and botanist. The village is named in honor of the Marshall family.  
**Recommendation:** This highly significant historic structure and grounds are recommended for preservation. The Township should consider land conservation possibilities. If this property comes up for development, the Township should work with the property owner to determine how to preserve the house and grounds. The
Historical Commission should work with Friends of Martin’s Tavern to encourage preservation of this important structure and its landscape.

**House Associated with Humphry Marshall**

Map ID: 50.18N  
Description: Post-1777 historic house closely associated with Humphry Marshall.  
Recommendation: Though this house was built after the battle, it appears to be a historic structure and due to its close association with Humphry Marshall should be considered for preservation. Additional research should be conducted on this resource.

**William England Blacksmith and Wheelwright Shop and Property**  
Map ID: 50.12, Blacksmith and Wheelwright shop, Map ID: 50.11, William England property  
Description: Significant circa 1748 blacksmith and wheelwright shop and circa 1735 house and property.  
Recommendation: These significant historic resources and property are recommended for preservation. The Historical Commission should work with Friends of Martin’s Tavern to encourage preservation and interpretation.

**Joseph Woodward Properties**  
Map ID: 50.03, Joseph Woodward Farm, Map ID: 50.08, Weaver Shop  
Description: Significant circa 1735 historic house and circa 1760 Weaver Shop. Joseph was a son of James Sr. and associated with a founding Marshallton family.  
Recommendation: This property constitutes a land conservation possibility. The significant historic structures are recommended for preservation. The house needs to be further documented and then a preservation action plan determined. In coordination with preserving this property, the Historical Commission should also work with the property owner to raise awareness about and encourage land conservation coordination with other tracts (parcels 50-6-101.2 and 50-6-103.4) that were originally part of this farm. The Historical Commission should work with Friends of Martin’s Tavern to encourage interpretation and preservation of resources. The Township should consider land conservation possibilities for this and associated Woodward family tracts. If this and associated properties come up for development, the Township should work with the property owner to determine how to preserve elements of Marshallton Landscape through protecting lands and built features on this tract.

**William Woodward Property**  
Map ID: 50.04  
Description: Farm containing house and barn. William was a son of James Sr., a carpenter, and part of a founding Marshallton family.  
Recommendation: This property constitutes a land conservation possibility. The Township should work with the property owner to raise awareness about and encourage land conservation. Further research is needed to determine if the extant buildings are from the colonial period and whether they stood at the time of the battle. If this property comes up for development, the Township should work with the property owner to determine how to preserve elements of Marshallton Landscape through protecting lands on this tract and possibly built features, pending further research.

**James Woodward Property**  
Map ID: 50.19N  
Description: Farm containing a significant historic structure. James was a son of James Sr., a wheelwright, and part of a founding Marshallton family.  
Recommendation: This property constitutes a land conservation possibility. The significant historic structures are recommended for preservation. The Township should work with the property owner to raise awareness
about and encourage land conservation. If this property comes up for development, the Township should work with the property owner to determine how to preserve elements of Marshallton Landscape through protecting lands and built features on this tract.

**John Woodward Property**  
**Map ID:** 50.21N  
**Description:** Farm of a son of William Sr.  
**Recommendation:** This property constitutes a land conservation possibility. The Township should work with the property owner to raise awareness about and encourage land conservation. Further research is needed to determine if any historic structures remain and if so whether they stood at the time of the battle. The Historical Commission should also work with the property owner to raise awareness about and encourage land conservation coordination on other tracts (parcels 50-6-91.51 and 50-6-91.6) that were originally part of this farm. If this property comes up for development, the Township should work with the property owner to determine how to preserve elements of Marshallton Landscape through protecting lands on this tract and possibly built features, pending further research.

**William Woodward, Jr. Property**  
**Map ID:** 50.22N  
**Description:** Farm that contains a possible store, stone house, and barn. William Jr. is a son of William Sr.  
**Recommendation:** This property constitutes a land conservation possibility. The Township should work with the property owner to raise awareness about and encourage land conservation. Further research is needed to verify the existence of a shop, stone house, and large stone barn, and if so whether they stood at the time of the battle. If this property comes up for development, the Township should work with the property owner to determine how to preserve elements of Marshallton Landscape through protecting lands on this tract and possibly built features, pending further research.

**Joshua Clayton House**  
**Map ID:** 50.20N  
**Description:** Significant historic structure. Joshua was related to Squire Cheyney by marriage and his property is thought to be the location where Cheyney and Col. Hannum spotted the British northern flanking column after they rode from Martin’s Tavern/Marshallton village.  
**Recommendation:** This property constitutes a land conservation possibility. The significant historic structures are recommended for continued preservation. The Township should work with the property owner to raise awareness about and encourage land conservation. If this property comes up for development, the Township should work with the property owner to determine how to preserve elements of Marshallton Landscape through protecting lands and built features on this tract. The Township Historical Commission should work with Friends of Martin’s Tavern and the property owner to encourage preservation and interpretation.

**John Hannum Property**  
**Map ID:** 50.23N  
**Description:** Property that John Hannum owned but never built on. The current house on the property is not associated with Hannum.  
**Recommendation:** Hannum was a key figure in the battle as it related to the Marshallton Landscape. This, the property could be considered for possible land preservation. The Township Historical Commission should work with Friends of Martin’s Tavern to encourage interpretation of Hannum.
General 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 Township promotes land conservation in their Township policy, and these recommendations build upon this. (Additionally, the Township can find regional/battlefield-wide municipal recommendations in Breaching the Fords/British Advice Plan for Trimble’s and Jeffers’ Fords Landscapes.) Unless otherwise noted, West Bradford Township would be the party to carry out the following recommendations. 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 Landscape. 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 in the northern battlefield to link larger conservation tracts. In the coming years, many larger open lands in northern battlefield 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. 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. Thornbury and Pennsbury Townships, Chester County include a special Battlefield protection zoning overlay, which should be consulted as a starting point.
5-4. Consider expanding fee-in-lieu provisions to include open space. 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 the Township 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.

5-5. Revisit the Official Map/Ordinance 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 to consult that denotes proposed future lands for conservation among other information.

5-6. Continue to participate in and implement greenway master planning in the Township through the Greenways, Trails, and Gateways Plan and the multi-municipal Brandywine Creek Greenway (BCG) Plan, which can serve the dual purpose of protecting battlefield lands. All municipalities participating in the BCG Plan have a ‘to do’ plan implementation list. As well, West Bradford should consider updating their Greenways, Trails, and Gateways Plan to also address coordinated gateways to complement links to regional greenways and trails.

General Historic Resource Protection Recommendations

This plan recommends expanding on the successful historic resource protection that has occurred to date. This can occur by broadening historic resource protection standards and implementing Township Comprehensive Plan recommendations. West Bradford Township promotes historic resources protection in their Township policy, and these recommendations build upon this. (Additionally, the Township can find regional/battlefield-wide municipal recommendations in Breaching the Fords/British Advice Plan for Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes.) Unless otherwise noted, West Bradford Township would be the party to carry out the following recommendations. 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.

5-7. 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)

5-8. 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. During this review, expanding historic resources protection through a historic resource zoning overlay and fostering incentives that encourage care and maintenance of historic properties could be considered. The following items should be considered in an overall review and update to historic resource protection regulations: (West Bradford Planning Commission and Historical Commission)

- 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 alternation 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.

5-9. 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.

5-10. Revise the Environmental Impact Assessment in the SLDO to also identify and assess development impact on the battlefield. Such a requirement would make developers more aware of historic resources, and design their projects with preservation in mind. Likewise, The Township could consider requiring existing features identification and specifically the battlefield on development plan proposals via the SLDO.

5-11. Involve the Township Historical Commission 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.

5-12. 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.

5-13. 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.

5-14. 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
demotion-by-neglect provisions should also be considered, which can minimize deterioration of historic
resources from long-term lack of maintenance.

5-15. 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.

5-16. 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.

5-17. Include West Bradford Historical Commission in the land development, 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.
Due to the size and complexity of the battlefield, the 2013 Plan proposes a series of Gateways, Heritage Centers, Interpretive Sites, and Viewing Corridors as a means to organize public access and interpretation. It places strategic landscapes into one or more of these categories for future interpretation and study. Phase one strategic landscapes planning1 provide further clarification via grouping related landscapes, whereby 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.

The 2013 Plan indicates Marshallton Landscape has high potential for interpretation, due to its numerous extant and well-reserved historic resources and to Marshallton village remaining a community gathering point (as it was in 1777). The 2013 Plan indicates opportunities should be examined for establishing a historic interpretation center in the Landscape, as the village already includes tourism amenities, such as restaurants and shops. 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. In doing this, this chapter recaps key concepts that are detailed in the rest of the plan so prose may be somewhat repetitive herein, however when interpreting this part of the battlefield 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.

Marshallton National Register Historic District anchors Marshallton Landscape and meets the necessary criteria to be a Heritage Center. This Heritage Center will represent the northern battlefield landscape where the 9-hour, 14 mile British flanking march took place, and will explore historic themes related to the colonial landscape and the impact of the American Revolution on it.

---

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.
Initially recommended to be named the British Invasion Heritage Center, further research and coordination with West Bradford Historical Commission indicates that the name does not adequately capture the history of the Landscape or major interpretive themes recommended for this Heritage Center and part of the battlefield. As a result, Behind the Lines Heritage Center was recommended by the West Bradford Historical Commission, and is detailed in this Plan. The concept of a heritage center in Marshallton village is in line with Township policy in their Greenways, Trails, and Gateways Plan, which identifies the village to be a Township ‘gateway’. A ‘gateway’ as defined in that plan shares similar qualities with this plan’s heritage center recommendation, 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.

**Marshallton village:**

**Overview for Interpretive Purposes**

As described in Chapter 4, Marshallton village was settled the mid-1700s when a few houses, the Bradford Meetinghouse, Martin’s Tavern and a blacksmith shop were grouped near the intersection of the Strasburg Road and a 1746 spurs of the 1728/1771 Road to the Great Valley. The Strasburg Road was a drovers’ thoroughfare between the market city of Philadelphia and Strasburg in Lancaster County. The location of Marshallton village and existing 18th century structures and roads make it an ideal location for a proposed Heritage Center. Today, the Strasburg Road connects Marshallton with the county seat in West Chester. Two roads leading from the village, today’s Northbrook and Lucky Hill, provide access to key battlefield viewing corridors and interpretive sites related to the Crown Forces flanking advance.
Four sites related to the battle are located in Marshallton Historic District and still reflect their 18th century origins: Bradford Meetinghouse, Humphry Marshall House, the Blacksmith Shop, and Martin’s Tavern interpretation site. A recent Township streetscape project upgraded sidewalks and parking, while adding traffic calming measures. Public amenities are available in historic buildings, such as Four Dogs Tavern and Marshallton Inn.

One of the most important considerations for the proposed Heritage Center is that three organizations currently work to preserve and promote the history of Marshallton: West Bradford Historical Commission; Friends of Martin’s Tavern; and Marshallton Conservation Trust. West Bradford Historical Commission sponsors biannual walking tours and has a printed walking tour of the village. Friends of Martin’s Tavern hold many fundraising events that promote the history of the village. All these events are well received by residents and visitors to West Bradford. All three organizations were represented at the 2014 stakeholder’s meeting for this plan, where the interpretation recommendations from the 2013 Plan were outlined, and have endorsed the concept of Marshallton village as a heritage area.

As a result of these considerations, Marshallton village was recommended as a model for the establishment of the 2013 Plan’s proposed Heritage Center concept, which form the basis for interpreting the battlefield. Map 5.2 from the 2013 Plan is included here to show the development of the Heritage Centers concept. Since the Humphry Marshall House is privately held and Bradford Meetinghouse is actively used for Quaker meetings, this plan recommends working with the Friends of Martin’s Tavern to establish the Blacksmith Shop and Martin’s Tavern as the central locations for heritage interpretation.
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:
- Relevance of the nearby British flank
- Flanking as a tactical military maneuver
- American military activity and battle skirmishes to the south of Marshallton

Military events and Local community themes:
- Chester County militia and local support of the war effort
- American reconnaissance
- Battle impact on local civilians

18th century landscape theme:
- Still readable Brandywine Valley colonial and battlefield landscape

Local community and 18th century landscape themes:
- Brandywine Valley in the colonial era through 1800, including role of taverns, roads, and villages/population centers in colonial Chester County
- Quaker roots and Peace Testimony

Chester County history related themes: Landscape history also mirrors major themes in the overall history of Chester County, including Brandywine Valley Quaker settlement, lasting historic villages, prosperous industry/commerce foundations, and role in the American Revolution.

Museum of the American Revolution (MAR) related themes: Marshallton Landscape interpretive themes can also be categorized under the broad MAR themes. Landscape themes of Chester County militia and American reconnaissance could fall under ‘Citizens turned Revolutionaries’; the nearby British flank 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.

Marshallton is a well-preserved yet viable modern village surrounded by a still visible battlefield landscape.
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, Jeffers’ Ford, and Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill, as well as from the 2013 Plan as needed. It would need to be determined if this narrative would also include the first leg of the flank from Kennett Square to the base of the Trimble’s Ford Landscape.

Successful British Flanking Tactic and Conflicting American reconnaissance Thematic Narration:
Battle staging1 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 tactic under Gen’l. Howe to avoid, via a 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 of Breaching the Fords/the British Advance Plan for Trimble’s and Jeffers’ Fords Landscapes that discusses terrain and what soldiers (British and American alike) would have experienced in 1777 traversing the rough landscape. Before 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 of northern battlefield strategic landscape plans that discusses 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 of Breaching the Fords/the British Advance Plan for Trimble’s and Jeffers’ Fords Landscapes 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

---

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 Jeffers’ 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.
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. This would rely on information in the Breaching the Fords/the British Advance Plan.

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.

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.” This would rely on information in the Breaching the Fords/the British Advance Plan.

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. This would rely on information in the Breaching the Fords/the British Advance Plan.

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 treatments 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 narrations addressed above.

Interaction and conflict between the invading British army, local militia, and the Quaker community.
The introduction of 30,000 soldiers into the Brandywine Valley impacted the largely Quaker pacifist community. Because of their religious belief of pacifism, they were confronted with two invading armies – British and American – and hostility and mistrust on both compounded by the direct impact of seizure of property in lieu of service in the Chester County Militia. Regardless, following the battle, Quakers provided much of the medical care to the wounded of both armies.
Concepts/Topics to be provided as part of interpretation:
- Troops seizing goods and property, both formally as an army and informally individually.
- The flanking march’s impact to property, business, and the longer lasting effects on agriculture and industry.
- Impact of the battle and flanking march on local families following the battle. (e.g. Marshall, Clayton, Woodward, Barnard and Wickersham families).
- Quaker pacifist situation in the field of battle, form a religion and economic viewpoint, (e.g. due to their pacifist stance and Peace Testimony, Quakers were affected economically before, during, and after the battle).
- While Quakers as a community did not support war and therefore either side, many individual Quakers did take up arms, which resulted in their having to leave the meeting.
- Quakers today still do not want to honor warfare including the battle.

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.
- Blacksmith Shop: Proposed location for Behind the Lines Heritage Center
- Martin’s Tavern: Although owned by the Quaker Clayton family it was leased to a non-Quaker since Quakers did not run taverns.
- Bradford Meetinghouse: Spiritual center example of Brandywine Valley Quakers.
- Marshallton village: Settled almost entirely by Quaker families.
- Heritage Tour into the surrounding countryside: Appendix C proposed themed heritage tours largely features sites related to founding Quaker families in the area, and their story could be summarized via the tour and further told at the Heritage Center.

Outreach and communication:
- Audience: Local and Regional Visitors; Heritage Tourists, Residents, School Children.
- Brochure on the ‘Testimony of Peace’ 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 four 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 signage can be placed at appropriate locations that are further detailed in Appendix D.
- Interpretive signage at Bradford and Marlborough Meetinghouses that explores the lesser-known story of the inherent impact the battle had on the pacifist Quaker community.

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.
Behind the Lines Heritage Center at Marshallton village

Interpretive Sites in Marshallton speak landscape and battlefield themes. Martin’s Tavern was a focus for the Chester County militia and rest stop for farmers driving their livestock to market, while Bradford Meetinghouse provided the spiritual and social center for the area Quakers.

Bradford Friends Meeting Interpretive Site

On October 10, 1729, Abraham Marshall (who had held Quaker meetings in his home at Derbydown), Richard Woodward, Peter Collins and Richard Buffington, trustees for the meeting, purchased land from Edward Clayton in what is now the village of Marshallton. The first building was log and became a stable when the brick meetinghouse was built in 1735. Today’s meetinghouse was built in 1764. This is the recommended site for interpretation of the Quaker Peace Testimony and the Brandywine Valley’s Quaker legacy.

Blacksmith Shop Interpretive Site

The first documented blacksmith was James Millison. Robert Woodward inherited the property in 1748 from his father James as a minor. The Woodward tract was initially 1,000 acres and at the time of the battle the heirs of Richard Woodward owned a large portion of the small community. William England purchased the blacksmith shop in 1771, selling it to his son in 1809. A saddler’s shop was added prior to 1798. This is recommended as a possible Heritage Center location.

Martin’s Tavern Interpretive Site

The date stone on this structure reads ‘WCA 1750’ for William and Abigail Clayton. This is one of Chester County’s earliest taverns, started by Joseph Martin in 1764, the same year Mason and Dixon began their survey. It was a political gathering place, voting center, site of mail service before the post office and one of the Brandywine Valley’s most important places to exchange information about the Revolutionary War.

Records place Chester County militia members ‘Squire’ Cheyney and Colonel John Hannum at Martin’s Tavern on September 10th and they rode out from the Tavern the morning of September 11th. Local lore holds that upon siting the British flanking march, Cheyney rode on to warn General Washington. The documented role played by Martin’s Tavern was the ill-timed reconnaissance ride by Major Joseph Spear of the Chester County militia, who traveled from Martin’s to Welches’ Tavern and reported to General John Sullivan that he had seen no sign of the invading forces. The conflicting information played a critical strategic role in Gen’l. Washington’s defeat. Friends of Martin’s Tavern, a private non-profit organization, completed a remarkable stabilization and interpretation of the historic tavern in 2004. This site is recommended for Chester County militia Interpretation.
In addition to these public Interpretive Sites, the Humphry Marshall House and the historic sites identified in Chapter 4 can be viewed from the sidewalk and many are part of the Marshallton Walking Tour developed by the West Bradford Historical Commission.

‘A Testimony of Peace’: Quaker Heritage Tour Overview

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 ‘Testimony of Peace’ Quaker Heritage Tour, which is the featured tour for this Landscape plan. Appendix C provides the detailed tour and map.

This tour speaks to primary themes of the battle’s impact on local civilians and Quaker community roots and Peace Testimony. The battle occurred on lands settled and owned primarily by a conservative and wealthy Quaker community. In Quaker communities, the Meeting was the center spiritually, intellectually and economically. A key tenant of Quaker faith was testimonies. A Quaker testimony was not a belief but rather a description of committed actions. One basic testimony was that of peace or a testimony against war that described actions taken to promote peace and refrain from and oppose participation in war. Starting in Marshallton village at the Behind the Lines Heritage Center and other interpretative sites, this tour then travels along colonial-era roads to see how Quaker families lived and to learn about how their community was challenged and impacted by the battle and Crown Force troops and local militia. This tour connects the proposed Heritage Center in Marshallton with the proposed British Attack Heritage Center in Strode’s Mill village.

Recommendations

Overarching Recommendation - Brandywine Battlefield Task Force’s Historic Interpretation Subcommittee meets on a regular basis throughout the year and includes members from historical commissions and historic sites within the battlefield. The key to successful implementation of interpretation is for the Task Force to identify a Behind the Lines Heritage Interpretation Subcommittee consisting of the West Bradford Historical Commission, Friends of Martin’s Tavern, Marshallton Conservation Trust, private residents, merchants, the Methodist Church, and Bradford Meetinghouse. The following are ideas for such a Subcommittee to consider 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 northern battlefield 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. Coordinate advancing the Heritage Center with the Township’s policy of Marshallton village to be a Township gateway. A gateway and heritage center are generally compatible whereby they are both available for public viewing access and, in Marshallton village is in line with Township policy in their Greenways, Trails, and Gateways Plan, which identifies the village to be a Township ‘gateway’. A ‘gateway’ as defined in that plan shares similar qualities with this plan’s heritage center recommendation, 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.
6-3. Develop a historic walking tour of Marshallton village that focuses on the battlefield Colonial landscape. This walking tour should highlight interpretive sites of Martin’s Tavern, Bradford Meetinghouse, and the Blacksmith Shop. It should additional highlight well-known 1777 persons with contrasting personalities, such as Col. John Hannum and Humphry Marshall.

6-4. Implement the Heritage Tour in Appendix C and develop a smart phone app for the three proposed northern battlefield Heritage Tours.

6-5. Develop special displays at the Bradford Meetinghouse discussing the Quaker faith and the Testimony of Peace in 1777 through today. Host an annual speaker program that highlights what the Testimony of Peace meant in 1777 and how it remains relevant today.

6-6. 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.

6-7. 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.

6-8. Build the historic themes for the Behind the Lines Heritage Center into public events in the village. For example the Marshallton Triathlon, which begins and ends in the village, could focus on the physical difficulty of the 9-hour march with 60 pound packs that British troops endured on the flanking march.

6-9. 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.

6-10. 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.

6-11. 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.
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 Nottingham 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 Jeffers’ 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.

1 Crown Forces are shown in red, American Forces in blue, 2010 Study battlefield boundaries in white and 1992 NHL planning boundaries in off-white.
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 Landmark\(^1\), 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 Landscapes\(^2\); 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.

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

\(^{1}\) 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.
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 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

\begin{tabular}{|c|p{15cm}|p{8cm}|}
\hline
**BATTLEFIELD ELEMENT** & **DEFINITION** & **DEFINING FEATURE EXAMPLES** \\
\hline
KEY TERRAIN & A portion of the battlefield, possession of which gives an advantage to the possessor. & Road junctions, fords, buildings, bridges, high ground \\
\hline
OBSERVATION AND FIELDS OF FIRE & Any point on the landscape that allows observation of movements, deployments, and activity of the enemy, offers opportunity to see over an area and acquire targets, and allows flat-trajectory weapons to be brought to bear on the enemy. & High ground, sloping approaches to entrenched positions, clearings, roads \\
\hline
COVER AND CONCEALMENT & Landforms or landscape elements that provide protection from fire and hide troop positions from observation. & Walls, structures, woodlands, ravines, stream banks, hills, entrenchments \\
\hline
OBSTACLES & Landscape elements that hinder movement and affect the ultimate course of the battle. & Watercourses, walls, ravines, marshes, dense vegetation \\
\hline
AVENUES OF APPROACH & Corridors used to transfer troops between the core battle area and outer logistical areas. & Roads, paths, steam beds, railroads \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\(^1\) 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.
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.

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.1 Per ABPP standards ‘combat areas’ and ‘associated battle sites’, that together make up a battlefield, were considered in determining the extent of the battlefield.2 Marshallton Landscape is an associated battle site as it involved behind the combat line events, namely American reconnaissance, that played 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).
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 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.
Appendix B

Historic Resources
Documentation

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.

Martin’s Tavern/Clayton Family Property
Map #50.01: Parcel #50-6P-40-E at 550 Northbrook Road, circa 1750.
Description: A tavern likely operated at or near this intersection as early as 1747 when George Martin petitioned for a license. His petition coincided with the 1746 laying out of a road that connected what is now called Strasburg road with the road leading from the Great Valley to Wilmington near Trimble’s Ford (Original Road Papers Vol. 5 pg. 16). Joseph Martin petitioned in 1748, followed by William Pyle who ran the tavern until 1750. This is the last year a petition was recorded until 1759, when Samuel Clark’s petition was rejected. Clark, like William Pyle, also leased the property and mentioned that it had “many years ago served as a tavern.” The earliest deed concerning the property was not recorded until 1776 when Abraham Marshall bought the 2.5 acre lot from Joseph Martin (Deed Book V-1 pg. 325). Joseph Martin started the tavern again in 1764, his petition stating that he “has now Purchased a Lott with a house thereon and is now Erecting a Commodious house at the place” (Tavern Petition Vol. 15 pg. 165). According to the deed, a portion of this property was owned in joint tenancy amongst Abraham Marshall and other unspecified individuals. The recital clause provides the following brief of title: Mary Pennington acquired 1250 acres from William Penn. Mary married Daniel Whorley and sold the property in 1703 to Edward Beeson, who in turn sold 199 acres of land to Edward Clayton, who in turn sold “a small part” of land to Abraham Marshall and “others in joint tenancy” in 1729. Abraham Marshall, having the rights invested in him by surviving the other unnamed joint tenants, sold the property in 1758 to William Clayton, who, with another small adjoining tract of his own land (likely the parcel of land where his mother Ann resided after the death of his father Edward), sold the property in 1759 to Richard Baker, who in turn sold it in 1764 to Joseph Martin. Although Abraham Marshall acquired the property in 1776 he was likely not the tavern keeper in 1777. In 1776, Robert Peoples petitioned for a license, followed in 1778 by James Porter, who was likely the tavern keeper in 1777. The tavern was known as the Center House; the first petition using this name was filed in 1768. For additional information see: http://www.martinstavern.org

William Clayton Properties
Map #50.14N: Parcel #50-91-20.3 at 538 Northbrook Road, probable William Clayton House.
Description: The property was deeded to Mary Pennington in 1681 by William Penn. In 1713 the property was purchased by Edward Clayton but there was no dwelling recorded unit 1776 when William and Mary Clayton bought the messuage and tenements from Joseph and Hannah Martin. They in turn sold the property to Abraham and Alice Marshall in 1787. The small lots to the south of this property were subdivided by Edward Clayton for his children. The earliest indication of his occupation is in a mortgage he took out in 1768 (Deed Book Q pg 139) where he is identified as a blacksmith. So it is quite plausible that his smith’s shop identified in 1789 was there at a much earlier date. He married Abigail Woodward in 1750 (she was most likely dead by 1768 since she did not sign off on the mortgage) which suggested he had to be plying his trade by the early 1750s (see Parcel #50-9B-1). In the Marshallton area there were three blacksmith shops.
Map #50.15N: Parcel #50-9-29 at 475 Northbrook Road, William Clayton Springhouse.
Description: The springhouse is located in the northern corner of the property. An 18th century house was built on the property.

Map #50.16N: Parcel #50-9B-1 at 502 Northbrook Road, William Clayton Blacksmith Shop
Description: Edward Clayton willed this property to his son William Clayton in 1760 (W&A #1874) as part of a 125 acre tract, which William mortgaged in 1768 (Deed Book Q-1 pg 139). On March 20, 1814 William Clayton willed to his grandson Uriah Clayton, this lot, adjoining a garden and the property of his son James Clayton “including the old smith shop” (W&A #6015). In 1783 William Clayton was taxed for one barn and one house. The 1799 tax records list a “midling stone house” and an “old log barn.” These buildings were likely located on another portion of the 125 acres and not on this lot. Considering the adjective “old” was used to describe the smith shop in 1814, it is possible that the shop stood on the property in 1777 and was leased to a blacksmith. However, there is no direct documentary evidence to prove this. Both Edward Clayton and his son William were Quaker farmers and early members of the Bradford Meeting. William Clayton first married Abigail Woodward and, after her death (date unknown), he married Mary whose maiden name is unknown. No record of this marriage can be found in Quaker records, which may suggest that William was disowned or left the meeting some time prior to his second marriage.

Map #50.17N: Parcel #50-9B-25, 1404 Carriage Lane, William Clayton Dwelling/Tenant House
Description: Also part of William Clayton’s property in 1777 and willed outright to his second wife Mary in 1814, this portion of the property was close to a garden and a spring house, which was willed to William’s son James. This may suggest that the original dwelling or tenant house stood in this vicinity. (See parcel #50-9B-1 for additional information)

**Bradford Meetinghouse**

Map #50.05: Parcel #50-9-8 at 521 Northbrook Road, Bradford Meetinghouse, circa 1764
Description: On October 10, 1729, Abraham Marshall (who had held Quaker meetings in his home at Derbydown), Richard Woodward, Peter Collins, and Richard Buffington, (trustees for the meeting), purchased land from Edward Clayton in what is now the village of Marshallton. The first building was log and became a stable when the brick meetinghouse was built in 1735. Today’s meetinghouse was built in 1764 to 1765.

**Humphrey Marshall Properties**

Map #50.06: Parcel #50-6-66.1 at 1407 W. Strasburg Road, Humphrey Marshall House, circa 1773
Description: Humphrey Marshall built his home just north of his parent’s home on Northbrook Road. A colonial “Renaissance Man” Marshall was a farmer, miller and mason. At age 51 he pursued botany and was the first person to categorize and describe the different species of trees and shrubs in America in his 1785 book Arbustrum Americanum: The American Grove

Map #50.18N: Parcel #50-6P-35 at 1422 W. Strasburg Road
Description: Though built after 1777, the historic house is closely associated with Humphrey Marshall. December 6, 1814 Alice Pennock Marshall, cousin and foster daughter of Humphrey Marshall became the owner. Alice married Moses Marshall. Alice was born in 1770. According to Humphrey Marshall’s will (August 28, 1794), he built a dwelling on the property for Alice. It was a tenant house with the tenant Francis Carpenter. In 1798 the dwelling consisted of 2 sections a frame house (22x16) and a log Hatters Shop (15 x14).
**William England Blacksmith Shop & Properties**

**Description:** As part of his will, James Woodward required his son Robert to learn a trade at the age of 17. James Millison, who was referred to in the will, was a blacksmith. When Robert came of age his trade was also that of a blacksmith and he likely operated the smith shop from around 1764 until 1771 when he sold it to fellow Quaker and blacksmith William England. England married Susanna Hall at the Goshen Meeting in January 1771 and they later became active members of the Bradford Meeting. In 1783, William England was taxed for one house and one barn and in 1799 a “good” stone house, frame barn cellared (sic), and two stone shops.

**Map #50.12:** Parcel 50-6P-52.1 at 1340 W. Strasburg Road, Blacksmith and Wheelwright Shop, circa 1748

**Description:** The first record of a village blacksmith was James Millison in 1748, and the last was William Ludwig who worked into the 1950’s. Robert Woodward owned the property but was a minor in 1748. According to his father’s will, the property was in the tenancy of James Millison. The taxes suggest that Robert came of age around 1764 and was identified as a smith. After he sold the Marshallton tracts in 1771, Robert bought a larger tract of land in the western part of the township and thereafter was known as a yeoman.

**Map #50.11:** Parcel #50-6P-1 at 1371 W. Strasburg Road, circa 1735

**Description:** In 1777 it was part of the William England property on the north side of Strasburg Road. A stone house is indicated at the site in the 1883 Brous map. Originally part of James Woodward’s 308 acre tract, this parcel was bequeathed to his son Robert Woodward in 1748 (W&A #1167). In the will, the property was described as “fifty acres of Land forty acres of it to be Surveyed off the westerly end of my Land Joyning the land of Thomas Arnold & George Martin being the place where James Millison Now liveth & the other ten acres to be Surveyed to it on the South Side of the great Road.” The earliest Blacksmith Shop was on this lot.

**Joseph Woodward Properties (son of James, Sr.)**

**Map #50.03:** Parcel #50-6-101.1 at 479 Cann Road, Joseph Woodward Farm, circa 1750

**Description:** Writing his will in 1748, James Woodward left his son Joseph “that part of my Land situate on the South Side of the great Road where John Kirgan now liveth” (W&A #1167). Joseph, as with his brothers and sisters, was a minor at the time of his father’s death. Joseph, a birthright Quaker, married Rebecca Martin, a daughter of Joseph Martin, at Old Swedes Church in Delaware in 1760 and was disowned for marrying out. Joseph was a weaver by trade. In 1783 he was taxed for one house, and in 1799 a stone house, log barn, and weaver’s shop. Woodward also owned parcels #50-6-101.2 and #50-6-103.4 and the land is still largely open.

**Map #50.08:** Parcel #50-6P-71 at 1258 W. Strasburg Road, Jospeh Woodward Weaver Shop, circa 1760

**Description:** This site was owned by Richard Woodward who worked at Cope’s Foundry in Copesville in the 19th century. In 1777, the house was located on the Joseph Woodward Farm, possibly a tenant property or Joseph’s Weaver Shop.

**William Woodward Farm (son of James, Sr.)**

**Map #50.04:** Parcel 50-6-93.1A at 1199 W. Strasburg Road

**Description:** William Woodward inherited this tract of land from his father, while still a minor, in 1748. (See Parcel #50-6-95 for more details). In 1776, when of age, William and his brother James partitioned their father’s property, which had been held jointly through their minority. William received the eastern portion of his father’s original tract. William Woodward became a carpenter; a stipulation in his father’s will required that he apprentice to learn a trade at the age of 17. He married Mary Pyle and both were members of the Bradford Meeting. William died intestate in 1793 and the property was given to his eldest son Caleb Woodward. In 1783 William was taxed for one house and one barn. In 1799 his widow Mary was taxed for the property and the record lists an “Old log house Barn & shop.” A house and barn are standing and further research is needed to determine if the extant buildings are from the colonial period.
James Woodward Farm (son of James, Sr.)
Map #50.19N – Parcel #50-6-95 at 1265 W. Strasburg Road
Description: In 1735 Richard Woodward sold to James Woodward Sr. 308 acres, of which this property is a part. Having made out his will in 1748, James Woodward left the remaining parts of his land to his sons William and James, James “to have that part & the Dwelling house & barn where they now stand” (W&A #1167). At the time of their father’s death, both James and William were legally minors, under the age of 21. By 1776, both James and William had reached majority and agreed to partition the land as specified in their father’s will (Deed Book U-4 pg 620). James received 84 acres of land on the western portion of the original tract where his father’s house was located. A birthright Quaker, James married Jane Bullock at Old Swedes Church in Delaware and was read out of the Bradford Meeting in 1771 for being married by a priest and to “one not a member.” The 1783 tax list indicates that James Woodward owned one house and one barn. In 1799 James Woodward was taxed as a wheelwright and he owned a “Good stone house” and a “log Barn & shop.” This property preserves approximately half of the original farm. The extant house is considered the oldest house in Marshallton Village dating to 1748 and was the earlier home of James Woodward, Sr.

Joshua Clayton House
Map #50.20N: Parcel #50-9-23 at 450 Northbrook Road
Description: Joshua Clayton owned this property in 1777. He purchased the 100 acre tract of land from his father Edward Clayton in 1749 and sold it to John Burgess, his son-in-law, in 1793 (Deed Book I-2 pg 384.) As part of the sale, Joshua Clayton made an agreement with John Burgess (also in 1793) whereby he and his wife Martha could remain in the house for the rest of their lives. In the agreement they provide metes and bounds that appear to place the house in the location of the present structure. Like his brother Edward, Joshua Clayton was a Quaker farmer and a member of the Bradford Meeting. The 1783 tax indicates that Joshua Clayton owned one house and one barn. In 1799, John Burgess (owner since 1793) had one “small old stone house” and a “good frame Barn celler’d”. The 1796 tax also indicates that an “old still” was on the property. This property is thought to be where Col. Hannum and Thomas Cheney saw the British approach from. The extant house still commands a view of the valley and Cheney’s wife was first cousin to Abigail Clayton.

John Woodward Property
Map #50.21N: parcel #50-6-91.1 at 1163/65 W. Strasburg Road
Description: John Woodward inherited this property from his father William Woodward in 1769. On this parcel was the house his father resided in at the time of his death (W&A #2509). John Woodward was a farmer and distiller who was reprimanded by the Bradford Meeting for imbibing intoxication spirits. He married Lydia Martin, the daughter of Joseph Martin Sr. who ran the Centre House (Martin’s Tavern) for many years. Both were disowned from the Bradford Meeting in 1773 for relations before their marriage. John died intestate in 1808 and the property was divided amongst his heirs. In 1783 John Woodward owned one house, one barn and one still house with 2 stills. The 1799 tax assessment lists a stone house, frame barn, and a stone still house, research is needed to determine if any historic properties remain. Parcels that preserve the farm are #50-6-93.1A, #50-6-91.51 and #50-6-91.6.
William Woodward, Jr. Property (Son of William)
Map #50.22N: Parcel #50-6-85 at 1117 W. Strasburg Road
Description: William Woodward, Jr., son of William and Hannah Woodward bought 99 acres from his father in 1767. This was a portion of his father’s original 253 acre tract of land (Deed Book B-3 349). William Woodward Jr. was a Quaker farmer and storekeeper who married Lydia Lewis at the Bradford Meeting House in 1765. In 1783 William was taxed for one house and one barn. After selling off several smaller tracts, including an unimproved 30 acre tract of land to David Lewis in 1792, the 1799 tax records list a “Good Stone House” and a “large stone Barn” on the remaining 49 acres of land.

Col. John Hannum Property
Map #50.23N: Parcel #50-6-59 at 1121 Telegraph Road
Description: John Hannum Jr. of East Bradford purchased a 28 acre lot from the estate of John Woodward in 1771 (Deed Book B-2 14). This was likely an unimproved tract with no messuage or out buildings and no direct access to a road. Hannum appears to have continuously resided in East Bradford from 1771 forward. John Hannum Esq., who participated in the events of 1777, is taxed for a house and lot in West Bradford in 1778. This is likely not the 28 tract of land purchased by John Hannum Jr. of East Bradford and there is no evidence that John Hannum Esq. owned the house and lot for which he was taxed. It is likely he leased the house and lot. Since lease agreements are private contracts, public records cannot help us to determine where John Hannum Esq. lived in September 1777.

Richard Barnard Property
Map #49.01 and 49.03: Parcels 49-5-267 and 49-5-53 at 1066 Unionville Wawaset Road and 940 Marlboro Springs Rd.
Description: Both parcels are a part of a 404 acre tract of land which Richard Barnard acquired in two transactions, purchasing a tract from Joshua Pusey in 1755 and another tract from his father Richard in 1759 (Deed Book K-3 pg 309). Richard was a Quaker farmer, the son of Richard and Ann Barnard and a member of the Bradford Meeting. He was married twice, first to Susannah Eckhoff, the daughter of his near neighbor David Eckhoff and second to Lettice Baker, daughter of Joseph Baker. Richard remained on the property until his death in 1813. There is no evidence that his property was directly plundered. His son Richard Barnard Jr., who was only 10 years old at the time, lost a horse as the troops marched through the area. In 1783 Richard Barnard was taxed for one dwelling house and two out buildings.

Abraham Marshall Farm (Derbydown) and Humphry Marshall’s Mill Property
Map #50.02: Parcel #50-9-34 at 206 Northbrook Road c. 1707, Northbrook Historic District
Description: 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. 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. (Also see resource #63.13 in Breaching the Fords/British Advance Plan for Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes)
Marlborough Meetinghouse and Historic District
Map #61.09N: Parcel # 61-2-67 at 361 Marlboro Rd.
Description: This parcel is comprised of two 2 acre tracts of land along “the road to Wilmington” one of which was owned by Isaac Baily and the other by Richard Barnard in 1777. The land appears to be unimproved until it was sold to the trustees of the Marlborough Meeting in 1801 (Deed T-2 pg 669).

James Allen Farm
Map # 63.10: Parcel #63-3-5 at 1857 Unionville-Wawaset Road
Description: 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 what was East Marlborough. 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 this 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. (Also see resource #63.25N in Breaching the Fords/British Advance Plan for Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes)
This appendix provides detailed information about the interpretive themed 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 #1 of three for the northern battlefield. Tours #2 and #3 are in plans for Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords Landscapes (‘Breaching the Fords and the British Advance’ Plan) and Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Landscape (‘Preparing for Battle’ Plan). 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 for example as evidenced by their registered claims against the British Crown for goods stolen by troop 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. For ease of understanding and readability, 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 #3 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.

Tour #1: ‘A Testimony of Peace’

Heritage Tour Overview

Quaker Heritage in the Brandywine Valley

In 1682, William Penn established his new colony to be a ‘holy experiment’ to provide religious freedom for his chosen faith of Quaker and the faith of others. The most important product of the flowering of Quakerism in the New World was the unique Quaker culture, which was a clearly defined way of life with a spiritual basis. The believers broke away from the Church of England to respect what they believed were the practices of the early church. In Quaker communities, the ‘Meeting’ was the center spiritually, intellectually and economically. It included a library and school as well as a place (the meetinghouse) conducive to silence for meeting worship and for separate men’s and women’s business meetings. Disputes of whatever nature were settled in the business sessions of the Meeting.
One aspect of the Battle of Brandywine that has not received adequate attention is the impact of this invasion on the civilian population. At the time of the battle, the majority of property owners in the Brandywine Valley were Quaker. From the Quaker point of view, in the early days of September 1777 two opposing armies (numbering more than 30,000 soldiers and camp followers and comprising far more people than likely had ever set foot at once in the area) invaded an established, affluent agricultural landscape where the dominant population and culture was that of the Quaker Society of Friends. A key tenant of Quaker faith are testimonies. A Quaker testimony was not a belief, but rather a description of committed actions. One basic testimony was the peace testimony or testimony against war, which described committed actions to promote peace and refrain from and actively oppose participation in war. These peace testimonies were documented by individual Quakers as ‘sufferings.’ This tour examines the field of battle through the eyes of the local population. It includes recordings of sufferings during the days surrounding the battle (September 8 to 15, 1777) and the physical effects on Quaker homes, meetinghouses, and businesses from the battle itself and foraging parties from both sides. It also references eyewitness accounts and claims for reparation (called ‘depredation’ claims) sent to King George III by the non-Quaker population.

Colonial-era Settlement Patterns in the Area

More than any other place 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 value of the rich soils in the Brandywine Valley and that the Creek could support numerous mills (over 130 at the height of use). To the north, settlers found more resources including limestone (Chester County’s Great Valley), iron ore, and more powerful creeks to sustain ironworks and mills. Within thirty years of settlement, increased demand and population resulted in the building of grist and corn mills, saw mills, and several fulling mills in Chester County, while the second iron forge was established in Coventry in 1717.

Flour and wheat along with corn, pork, beef, flaxseed, butter, and after 1750 iron, 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 extensive time, and although by the time of the battle the region had been settled for 80 years, most farms still had uncleared lands. Fallow lands, woodlots, and meadows (hay lands, often mown to rid plants took root without deliberate seeding) 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. The 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.

Many of the farms and mill sites owned by the largely cohesive society are still standing and will be visited by this tour. While touring the Brandywine Valley and considering reports of looting by troops it is important to bear in mind how utterly devastating even the loss of one horse or bag of flour could be to a farming family in such a sparsely populated agrarian setting. 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 overtop to provide perspective for the modern day viewer.
#1: Behind the Lines Future 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

Driving south on Northbrook Road, you will pass the former Trimbleville and the James Trimble Farm. This charming drive through rural Chester County looks much as it did in 1777.

Turn right at 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.
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”.

The 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.
#3: Northbrook Historic District and Interpretive Site

Continuing south, you will see a large horse farm on your right. This was the homestead, ‘Derbydown’, of Abraham Marshall, the founding Quaker patriarch of the Marshall family. His descendants built additional homes, a grist mill and saw mill, and ran prosperous farms.

Since historic Trimble’s Ford was never bridged, from early on the closest bridge across the Creek was at Northbrook; though since rebuilt, that bridge has been attributed as the earliest covered bridge in Chester County. Because of the Marshall family’s dominance, the area was originally named for them as Marshallton before changing to being called Northbrook. The historic district’s buildings represent an assortment of historical uses throughout the late 18th and the 19th century.

Standing beside the Creek near one of the canoe/kayak launch sites in Northbrook, one can see the Dr. Moses Marshall house and farmstead. Dr. Marshall cared for the wounded during the battle and was the nephew of the renown botanist Humphrey Marshall. Today, Texas long-horn cattle and miniature horses are raised at this carefully restored historic homestead.

Probably the single most critical geographic element of the Battle of Brandywine was the Creek itself. This natural barrier was selected by General Washington to make a military stand in his attempt to protect Philadelphia. General Howe’s ability to successfully ford at two sites where General Washington had not posted guards was critical to the British’s success on the battlefield. A fair-season ‘Water Trail’ of the battle is proposed to begin at Northbrook Canoe Company, where canoes and kayaks can be rented to see firsthand the now hidden crossing at Trimble’s Ford and to enjoy the beauty of the Creek and battlefield landscape. One can also travel by canoe to Brinton’s Ford and Chadd’s (historically spelled Chad’s) Ford where fierce battle combat took place.

#4: Richard Barnard Sr. Farm Viewing Site

Traveling south on Northbrook Road, turn right on Unionville-Wawaset Road and you will pass the Barnard Farm on your left. The owner at the time of battle, Richard Barnard, captured the impact of the invading armies on residents in his diary in 1777. A Quaker farmer, his diary reflects the sufferings that he experienced as a result of his faith, as follows:

9/5/1777, the English army came near me – took my mare from son Richard;
9/7/1777, a company of the Americans at my house. Capt. Lee took my little Wagon;
9/18/1777, Captain lee at my house again;
2/29/1778, Joshua Lawrence came here with some armed men and took from me two wagons loads of hay, one wagonload of corn. I demanded them to show on what orders. Lawrence said he had none, but my name and Isaac Baily’s; and 1779, John Ingram and John Findley, wagon masters, brought 72 horses here and fed them 7 days with my good hay.
#5: Marlborough Village Historic District & Interpretive Site

A left hand turn on Marlboro Spring Road will take you past the Richard Barnard Jr Farm (Richard Barnard Sr son’s property in 1777.) The eastern part of the current stone house is believed to have been built around 1726 and the four-bay section added by the Barnard family in 1771. The original part of the existing stone barn on the property was built by the Barnard family around 1769 and is one of the finest examples of an English Lake District style barn in Chester County.

Although the village largely represents a mid-19th century crossroads hamlet with a history spanning from 1771-1944, the Farm existed at the time of the battle. The rapid growth of the village following the end of the American Revolution is a good example of the new-found prosperity Americans enjoyed as a result of independence from Great Britain. The village was founded and existed as a rural agrarian Quaker community reflecting social characteristics of the sect: education, social justice, simplicity, and action based on one’s beliefs to bring about social change. The village grew around the Marlborough Meetinghouse, built in 1801. Standing in the yard of the meetinghouse, you can look out at the Barnard Farm. The meetinghouse is still actively used so please be quiet and respectful.

#6: The 1728 Road to the Great Valley Viewing Corridor

From Marlboro Spring Road, turn left on Marlboro Road, and make another left onto Red Lion Road. Perhaps one of the most relaxing scenic drives in the battlefield, little has changed on Red Lion Road since 1777 when 9,000 British regulars marched two abreast up a one lane width of this road, then a highway of its day as part of the 1728 Road to the Great Valley. A tenant house on James Allen’s property is to your left, and the fields on the right owned by Abner Cloud (who filed a property loss claim against the British Crown) preserve the still visible 1777 landscape.

#7: Brandywine Red Clay Alliance/Baker Farm Interpretive Site

Traveling north on Red Lion Road, you will pass the home of Richard Baker, Sr. who filed a claim report against the Crown from property loss that occurred the morning of the battle. The barn associated with the property is the interpretive center for Brandywine Red Clay Alliance (BRCA). Continuing north, you approach Red Lion Road’s intersection with Unionville-Wawaset Road. Directly ahead within the tree line is the roadbed where British forces continued uphill towards Trimble’s Ford.

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 at the time of the battle. His tax assessment immediately following the battle indicates his property was plundered and he submitted a property loss claim against the British Crown in 1783.
In 1945, thirty people from West Chester and Wilmington came together to discuss the alarming status of the Brandywine Creek which was in many spots little more than an open sewer. The group founded the Brandywine Valley Association (BVA), now Brandywine Red Clay Alliance (BRCA), which was the first and oldest small watershed protection organization in the nation. Their focus is water conservation and environmental education. One can stop to stretch your legs and visit BRCA to walk the trails for recreation. BRCA is a proposed site for interpreting the British flanking march via a proposed trail approximating the location of the march north to meet with Pocopson Township’s trail on Bragg Hill Road.

In 1981 much of the farm that had been owned by Richard Baker was donated to the group and the Myrick Conservation Center was founded as the home of then BVA and now BRCA. The center is the site of many public education programs and has been identified in this plan as an ideal setting for public interpretation programs of the role that the Creek played in the battle. Thanks to their efforts, today the Creek is enjoyed for recreational opportunities and drinking water and hundreds of acres have been preserved in the battlefield.

#8: Bragg Hill Road and Trimble’s Ford Viewing Area
Continuing traveling along Unionville-Wawaset Road, and turn left on Bragg Hill Road. A portion of Bragg Hill Road has been dedicated as a trail in Pocopson Township. In the future, it will hopefully connect to a British march trail on BRCA lands. One of the so called “great and strange people of Chester County”, made his home on Bragg Hill Road in 1777 and witnessed the British flank firsthand. Joel Baily was a well-to-do Quaker who defied the testimony of peace and was an outspoken loyalist during the Revolutionary War. A self-taught mathematician and craftsman, Baily made clocks, built furniture, and occasionally did gunsmithing. He was a surveyor and astronomer and assisted Mason and Dixon in their famous survey 10 years prior, building levels for them and carefully recording important weather data. Bailey was part of a scientific team sent to observe the Transit of Venus at Cape Henlopen in 1769 and was elected to the American Philosophical Society.

From Bragg Hill Road, an amazing view of Trimble’s Ford and Trimbleville National Register Historic District reveals the incredibly well-preserved 1777 landscape of the British flanking march within the battlefield. Trimble’s mill and residence is across Brandywine Creek in the photo near Trimble’s Ford, where the British crossed the Creek. Looking carefully, you can see and trace the route of the Creek by following the tree line. Marshallton village is located directly north over the ridgeline. The flanking march continued east toward Jefferis’ Ford.

#9: Trimble’s Forths Future Interpretive Site and Trail
The importance of Trimble’s Ford as a key component of the colonial road infrastructure 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 that formed the ford. In addition, the 1742 road that merged with the 1728 Road to the Great Valley utilized by the British troops brought goods and people from the fords in East Bradford and Birmingham Townships. At the time of the battle, it is surmised that a blacksmith shop was located within close proximity on the James Marshall property. Slag from a nearby business was utilized to fill holes that formed in the ford, probably due to the constant flooding of the Creek.
Appendix C-Heritage Tour 'Behind the Lines' - Marshallton Strategic Landscape Plan

The ford fell into disuse after the Creek was bridged at Northbrook in the early 1800’s. By the early 1900’s, the section of the Road to the Great Valley that led to the ford and that had been marched upon by the British was closed and today is barely visible except for a small section of the unpaved road that is designated as a trail in Pocopson Township. The geomorphic ground study that was an intrinsic part of this plan located the archaeological sites under three feet of mud for a primary Trimble’s Ford and a secondary Trimble’s Ford. It also identified the Road to the Great Valley road trace which the troops utilized during the successful crossing at Trimble’s Ford. This site is currently for sale and it is recommended that it be preserved as open space with an interpretive trail and parking area developed. See Chapter 3 for a detailed description of the Ford and Tour #2 ‘Ford to Ford’, the Military Strategy at Trimble’s and Jefferis’ Fords.

#10: Jefferis’ Ford Interpretive Site
Return to Unionville-Wawaset Road, and turn left. Continue over the Bridge Street bridge (across the Creek’s west branch), bear right and then turn left onto Allerton Road. Emmor Jefferis was the owner of the stone farm at the intersection of Allerton and Lucky Hill Roads. Built in 1714, the four-bay, two-story stone residence has an added 1760 addition and a stone and frame barn. Nearby is where 9,000 troops across the ford of Creek that bore Jefferis’ name. It is attributed that Jefferis was pressed into service at gunpoint by the British to serve as a guide. The farmhouse became a tavern, Sign of the Eel’s Foot Tavern, after the war.

Continue on Allerton Road toward the bridge, which stands near the approximate location of the former Jefferis’ Ford. As General Howe crossed to the other side of the creek, he was dumbfounded that he was not met by Washington’s troops since he had encountered American Forces earlier in the day. This is a question that still confounds historians today. Continue straight on Allerton Road and make a left on PA 842 with care. Then take your first right on Birmingham Road and continuing following in the British troops’ steps.

#11: British Attack Future Heritage Center at Strode’s Mill village
On Birmingham Road just north of Strode’s Mill National Register Historic District is the location of the John Dilworth house ruin and the barn that housed Richard Strode’s blacksmith shop. The day of the battle, the Birmingham Friends meeting was held here as the Birmingham Meetinghouse was being used as a field hospital for troops of both armies. Strode’s Mill area is also where James Townsend witnessed General Howe and the British troops whom he described in his eyewitness account the day of the battle.

Located at the intersection of Birmingham Road and PA 52/Lenape Road, this barn/grounds was acquired by East Bradford Township in 2015 and is proposed to be developed as an interpretive center about the British flanking advance (‘British Left Hook’), preparation for battle, and the battle itself. From Strode’s Mill village, British troops marched south on Birmingham Road and made their last uphill climb to Osborne Hill, where they rested (after marching many grueling miles over difficult terrain, in humid conditions, and while carrying heavy packs) and prepared for battle. While in Strode’s Mill village, visit Strode’s Mill Gallery to be introduced to the Brandywine Valley through some of its most famous artists, including the Wyeth Family, who depicted some of the most well-known artistic renderings of the battle, battle-era landscape, and Brandywine Valley landscape.
Heritage Interpretive Signage

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

Battlefield Boundary Signage

‘Entering Brandywine Battlefield’ Signage
Boundary signage for the Landscape marks key entry points into the battlefield near the Landscape. 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 and Eastern Sides of Marshallton Landscape
➢ PA 162/Strasburg Road (east side specifically coordinated with Jefferis’ Ford Landscape)

Northern Side of Marshallton Landscape
➢ Sugars Bridge Road
➢ Marshallton-Thorndale Road

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, and 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 drover’s road to include:
➢ Marshallton 1777 Walking Tour & Map
➢ ‘You Are Here’ battlefield mapping
➢ Historic Marshallton village information
➢ ‘Quaker Heritage’, ‘Ford to Ford’, and ‘Mills, Taverns & the Militia’ Tours and Maps

Bradford Meetinghouse Interpretive Site
Interpretive Panel emphasizing the Quaker experience and religion, the area’s Quaker roots, Quakers in relation to the battle and village to include:
➢ Founding Quaker Families information
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- 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 & Signage**
Trimbleville Interpretive Site and Turn-Out Area – field across from Blacksmith Shop
Interpretive Panel emphasizing the battlefield in the Trimble’s Fords landscape, former colonial-era Trimbleville and significance of its location at a colonial 5-point intersection and ford, fords and crossing creeks in the colonial-era, 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

**#3: Northbrook Interpretive Site & Signage**
Quaker Heritage Viewing Corridor and Parking Area at Northbrook Bridge
Interpretive Panel emphasizing the Quaker experience, the area’s Quaker roots, Quakers in relation to the battle and rural life to include:
- Battle Impact on Local Civilians information and reported Quaker Sufferings
- Founding Quaker Families information
- ‘You are Here’ battlefield mapping
- ‘Quaker Heritage’ Tour and Map

**#5: Marlborough Village Interpretive Site & Signage**
Quaker Heritage Viewing Corridor and Parking Area at Marlborough Meetinghouse
Interpretive Panel emphasizing the Quaker experience, the area’s Quaker roots, Quakers in relation to the battle and the village to include:
- Battle Impact on Local Civilians information & reported Quaker Sufferings
- Founding Quaker Families information
- ‘You are Here’ battlefield mapping
- ‘Quaker Heritage’ Tour and Map

**#7: Brandywine Red Clay Alliance Interpretive Site & Signage**
Recommend trail development along the trace of the 1728 Road to the Great Valley that remains on BRCA lands to Bragg Hill Road Scenic overlook and interpretive signage.
- Eyewitness account of British troops approaching the ford
- Joel Baily and Richard Baker family histories, on whose battle-era lands BRCA is located.
- Colonial Landscape and impact of the military impact on civilians on the flanking advance march along the 1728 Road to the Great Valley.
- Impact of the Brandywine Creek as an obstacle during the battle.
- 'You Are Here' battlefield mapping
- ‘Quaker Heritage’, ‘Ford to Ford’, and ‘Mills, Taverns & the Militia’ Tours and Maps

#9: **Trimble’s Fords Interpretive Site & Signage**
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

#10: **Jefferis’ Ford Interpretive Signage**
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

#11: **British Attack Future Heritage Center**
Strode’s Barn Proposed Interpretive Site Interpretive Panel emphasizing the battlefield in Sconnelltown and Strode’s Mill villages and Landscape with both village histories stressing Joseph Townsend’s first person narrative. Discussion of the colonial-era settlement patterns and the growth of one village versus the decline of the other based upon the rise of West Chester at the county seat will be included:

- Sconnelltown/Strode’s Mill Village Driving Tour and Map
- A heritage tour of the core battle action areas in Birmingham and neighboring Townships
- Interpretation of the battle that took place starting at Osborne Hill
- ‘You Are Here’ battlefield mapping
- ‘Quaker Heritage’, ‘Ford to Ford’, and ‘Mills, Taverns & the Militia’ Tours and Maps