

Cape Lookout National Seashore
LEWIS - DAVIS HOUSE

HISTORIC STRUCTURE REPORT

**Historical Architecture, Cultural Resources Division
Southeast Regional Office
National Park Service**

2004



**Cultural Resources
Southeast Region
National Park Service
100 Alabama St. SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 562-3117**

2004
Historic Structure Report
Lewis- Davis House
Cape Lookout National Seashore
Cape Lookout Village
LCS#: 09t828


Cover page, Lewis- Davis House, c. 1945
(CALO Coll.)

The historic structure report presented here exists in two formats. A traditional, printed version is available for study at the park, the Southeastern Regional Office of the NPS (SERO), and at a variety of other repositories. For more widespread access, the historic structure report also exists in a web-based format through ParkNet, the website of the National Park Service. Please visit www.nps.gov for more information.

Lewis-Davis House

Historic Structure Report

Approved by:



Superintendent

8-28-03

Date

Cape Lookout National Seashore

Recommended by:



Chief, Cultural Resources

8-28-03

Date

Southeast Regional Office

Recommended by:



Associate Regional Director

8-29-03

Date

Cultural Resource Stewardship & Partnership

Southeast Regional Office

Concurred by:


FOR Regional Director

8-29-03

Date

Southeast Regional Office

Contents

List of Figures	vii
Foreword	xiii
MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	
Executive Summary	1
Historical Summary	1
Architectural Summary	2
Recommendations	2
Administrative Data	5
Location Data	5
Related Studies	6
Cultural Resource Data:	6
PART I DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY	
Historical Background & Context	7
Diamond City	9
Cape Lookout Village	13
Lewis-Davis House	19
Chronology of Development & Use	23
Original Construction	23
Historic Changes	25
Modern Changes	26
Physical Description	29
Associated Site Features	30
Foundation	31
Structural System	31
Roofing	32
Exterior Finishes	33
Doors and Windows	33

Front Porch	35
Room 100	35
Room 101	36
Room 102	37
Room 103	38
Room 104	39
Room 105	

PART II TREATMENT AND USE

Treatment and Use	43
Ultimate Treatment and Use	44
Requirements for Treatment and Use	46
Alternatives for Treatment and Use	48
Recommendations for Treatment & Use	53
Site	53
Foundation	54
Structure	54
Exterior Finishes	55
Doors	56
Windows	56
Interior	57
Additional Research	58

REFERENCE

Sources of Information	61
------------------------	----

List of Figures

- 1** Proposed plan for treatment and use. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2003) 4
- 2** View to east of Cape Lookout Lighthouse, May 1899. First Keeper's Dwelling is at right. (CALO Coll. D-01) 8
- 3** Two of the mullet camps on Shackleford Banks, c. 1908. (reprinted in *North Carolina Historical Review*, Vol. LXX, #1, p. 5) 9
- 4** View north of the life-saving station, c. 1893, with the lighthouse barely visible on the horizon at extreme right. (CALO Coll. G-09) 10
- 5** Map of Cape Lookout, c. 1890. (Coast Guard Collection) 11
- 6** View of Shackleford Banks after 1899 hurricane. Note the partially-submerged structures at upper right. (CALO Coll., F-184) 12
- 7** Plat of proposed development of Cape Lookout in 1915. Arrows have been added to indicate Coast Guard Station, at left, and Lighthouse at right. 13
- 8** View of Cape Lookout Coast Guard Station, 1917. In the background, are some of the small houses of "Cape Lookout Village." (CALO Coll. D-52) 14
- 9** Map of Cape Lookout, August 1934. O'Boyle-Bryant House would be built just north-northeast of the Ogilvie House shown here. (U. S. Coast Guard Collection) 16
- 10** View of Cape Lookout Village, 1942. The Lewis-Davis House is out of view at left. (CALO Coll., Royer #4) 17
- 11** View to northeast from near Coast Guard Station, April 1941. (CALO Coll., O'Boyle #21) 18
- 12** View of porch of Carrie Davis' store, October 1942. The dance hall is at left rear and her shingled house at center rear. (CALO Coll., Royer photographs) 20
- 13** View of Lewis-Davis House during World War II. (CALO Coll., Royer photographs) 21

14	Reconstructed floor plan of house as it was constructed in the 1920s. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	24
15	“Bull” Hunter’s store “near the Coast Guard Station” at Cape Lookout, c. 1925.	24
16	View of Lewis-Davis House in 1942. (CALO Coll., Royer photographs)	25
17	Side elevation of Lewis-Davis House illustrating changes to roof line after WWII. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	26
18	View to east of Lewis-Davis House in August 1958. (CALO Coll.)	27
19	View to northwest of Lewis-Davis house from lookout at Coast Guard Station (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	27
20	View to north of Carrie Davis House. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	30
21	View to northwest, showing metal storage building in rear yard. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	30
22	View of water tanks at rear of house. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	30
23	View of crawl space and piers. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	31
24	View of typical joist sill connection. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	31
25	View of collapsing floor under Room 104. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	31
26	View of junction of roofs of two original structures; note severe termite damage in rafters and decking at left. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	32
27	View of wood shingle roof on original structure encompassing Rooms 100 and 101 . (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	32
28	View of heavily-damaged roof and ceiling structure over Room 104. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	32
29	View of window W-2 on southeast (front) side of house, with exterior siding and trim typical of the original building. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	33
30	View of front door D-1. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	34
31	View to north on front porch. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	34
32	View to northeast in Room 100. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	35
33	View to northwest in Room 100. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	35

34	View to west in Room 101. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	36
35	View to southeast in Room 101. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	36
36	View to south in Room 102. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	37
37	View to northeast in Room 102. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	37
38	View to northwest in Room 103. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	38
39	View to southeast in Room 103. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	38
40	View to west in Room 104. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	39
41	View to east of ceiling in Room 104. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	39
42	View northwest in Room 105. Arrow marks header at outside of historic porch. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	40
43	View to southeast in Room 105. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	40
44	Floor plan of existing building. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)	41
45	Proposed plan for treatment and use. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2003)	59

Project Team

Project Manager

Danny Scheidt, Historical Architect
National Park Service
Southeast Regional Office
Atlanta, GA

*Building Investigation, Research,
Report Author*

Tommy H. Jones, Architectural Historian
National Park Service
Southeast Regional Office
Atlanta, GA

Program Reviews

Danny Scheidt, Historical Architecture
Bob Blythe, History
Allen Bohnert, Curatorial & Museum
Services
Jon Buono, Historical Architect
Tracy Stakely, Cultural Landscapes
National Park Service
Southeast Regional Office
Atlanta, GA

Foreword

We are pleased to make available this historic structure report, part of our ongoing effort to provide comprehensive documentation for the historic structures and landscapes of National Park Service units in the Southeast Field Area. Many individuals and institutions contributed to the successful completion of this work. We would particularly like to thank Superintendent Bob Vogel and the staff at Cape Lookout National Seashore for their assistance with this project. Especially helpful have been Mike McGee, Facility Manager; Michael Rikard, Resource Management Specialist; and Karen Duggan, Park Ranger (Interpretation). In addition, Clark Davis, caretaker for the building's owner, was generous in providing access to the house and discussing its history.

Chief
Cultural Resources Stewardship
Southeast Regional Office
December 2004

Executive Summary

Historical Summary

According to the National Register nomination, the house was built by Carrie Davis around 1930. However, research and building investigation during the course of this report indicates that the house was actually built perhaps ten years earlier by James C. Lewis, a long-time employee of the Coast Guard at Cape Lookout. Lewis retired from the Coast Guard in 1931 and, around that time, sold the house to Carrie Arrendel Davis. It is not clear if Davis actually lived in the house, since by about 1935, she had built a larger house next to the store and dance hall that she owned on the shore of the bight. Located just south of the old Coast Guard dock, the store and dance hall were focal points for life at the Cape in the 1930s and 1940s. The commanding officer at the army base at Cape Lookout occupied the house during World War II. After Davis' death in 1955, her daughter inherited the house and maintained a lease on the property until it expired in 2002.

Architectural Summary

Architecturally, the Lewis- Davis House is of considerable significance in interpretation of the Cape Lookout Historic District. Created by relocation and combination of two earlier “fishing shacks” around 1920, the house contains some of the earliest examples of the cape’s historic architecture and illustrates one of many ways in which the cape’s residents have always adapted and re- used their buildings.

However, the house is in very poor condition, with major damage from termites and rot, much of it due to a leaking roof. Like the other private residences in the district, it has also undergone significant alterations that include major expansion of the porches.

Recommendations

A comprehensive planning process resulting in an amendment to the park’s GMP will be necessary to insure that the park’s and the public’s needs are addressed and that the historic buildings are used appropriately.

In essence, the goal for treatment of the historically- private dwellings in Cape Lookout Village, including the Lewis- Davis House, is restoration of the exteriors to their appearance around 1950 and rehabilitation of the interiors for continued residential use, if that can be accomplished without compromising their historic character. This would include removal of the additions to the front and side porches, complete rehabilitation of the kitchen, design and installation of a new bathroom, replace-

ment of electrical and plumbing systems, and limited structural improvements to improve the building’s capacity to withstand wind and flood.

However, the Lewis- Davis House is in poor condition structurally, which complicates its overall treatment and may make preservation of the entire structure impractical at the present time. This is especially so if continued residential use is necessary, since bringing the building up to code compliance for residential use would necessarily require considerable alterations to the historic building, even if the code’s allowances for historic buildings are applied. However, the two front rooms at the front of the house comprise all of one of the two houses brought together to form the present structure. Its end- gabled, wood- shingled roof remains intact under the modern roof, and the entire structure is in somewhat better condition than the rear half of the house. This small structure is one of the earliest, intact, private houses remaining on the cape, and because of its small scale, it should be possible to repair and preserve it as an aid to interpretation even if it cannot be completely rehabilitated.

Site

- Clear site of rubbish and debris.
- Remove storage building.
- Follow recommendations of Cultural Landscape Report in determining treatment of the surrounding landscape.
- Improve site drainage and eliminate standing water beneath house.

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Foundation

- Raise house and replace all wood piles, replicating the existing size and placement of piles.
- Design and install storm-resistant mechanism to tie the house's wood frame to the foundation piles.

Structure

- Stabilize structure before repairs proceed.
- Remove 1950s roof structure and restore original roofs.
- Repair floor, wall, and ceiling framing as necessary and make improvements in connections of framing members to reduce the possibility of significant damage from high winds.
- Remove porch additions and restore porches to their appearance in the 1940s photographs.
- If entire house cannot be salvaged, repair and preserve original structure encompassing Rooms 100 and 101.

Exterior Finishes

- Remove cement-asbestos siding.
- Repair underlying boards and install new battens to match the original.
- Repair and preserve historic board-and-batten siding and trim on front and side porches.
- Repair and preserve other exterior woodwork.

- Paint siding dark green, matching surviving paint on side porch, and trim in white as seen in 1940s photographs.

Doors

- Repair and preserve existing historic doors.
- Install new doors at Room 104 and at new bathroom.

Windows

- Preserve historic sash (W-1, W-2, W-4).
- Restore altered opening (W-3) in Room 100.
- Replace missing sash (W-8) at rear porch.
- Repair or replace remaining sash as necessary.

Interior

- Rehabilitate interior for continued residential use.
- Repair and maintain historic paneling on walls and ceilings, flooring, and trim; preserve samples of historic floor coverings.
- Remove existing bathroom and install new bathroom in Room 103.
- Construct new kitchen at northeast end of Room 102.
- Install new plumbing supply and waste lines to bathroom and kitchen.

Executive Summary

- Rewire building, restoring historic light fixtures in Rooms 100 and 101.

Additional Research

- Locate and interview Lewis and Davis family members regarding house's history.
- Conduct paint analysis of interior should it ever be opened for public interpretation.



MANAGEMENT SUMMARY




Figure 1 Proposed plan for treatment and use. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2003)

Notes

Remove 1950s roof structure and restore original roofs. Remove cement-asbestos siding, restore underlying board-and-batten siding. Repair and maintain existing historic interior and exterior woodwork.

1. Remove porch additions (hatched areas).
2. Restore front porch, reconstructing partial screened enclosure.
3. Remove existing bathroom installation on side porch, restore screened porch.
4. Install new wood sash, 6/6, to match historic windows.
5. Close opening at this location.
6. Construct new wall to partition this space; remodel for bathroom and utility storage.
7. Install new kitchen sink, counter and cabinets in this area.
8. Repair major water and termite damage to sills, floor and ceiling joists, and rafters in this area.
9. Repair major damage to floor framing in this area.
10. Repair major water damage to structure in this area.


Executive Summary

Administrative Data

Location Data

Building Name: Lewis- Davis House
Building Address: Cape Lookout Village
LCS#: 091828

Cape Lookout Village



Related Studies

Ehrenhard, John E. "Cape Lookout National Seashore: Assessment of Archeological and Historical Resources." SEAC, NPS, 1976.

Holland, F. Ross. A Survey History of Cape Lookout National Seashore. Department of History, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, NPS, 1968.

Van Beck, Sara L. Cape Lookout National Seashore, Archives and Records Manage-

ment Review. NPS, 2000.

Cultural Resource Data:

National Register of Historic Places: Contributing structure in Cape Lookout Village Historic District, listed 2000

Period of Significance: 1870- 1950

Proposed Treatment: Structural stabilization, exterior restoration, interior rehabilitation

Historical Background & Context

Marked by a lighthouse since 1812, Cape Lookout is one of three capes on North Carolina's Outer Banks. Lying at the southern tip of Core Banks, which stretch in a southwesterly direction from near Cedar Island to about four miles south of Harker's Island in eastern Carteret County, North Carolina, the area is part of the Cape Lookout National Seashore. Accessible only by boat, the cape is in constant flux from the harsh action of wind and ocean currents. As a result, since the late nineteenth century, the entire cape has migrated as much as a quarter mile to the west, and partly due to construction of a breakwater in the early twentieth century, the land area in the vicinity of the cape has nearly doubled in size. It is predominantly a sand environment whose native vegetation is limited to low stands of myrtle, live oak, cedar, and marsh grasses, along with non- native stands of slash pine that were planted in the 1960s.

Cape Lookout Bight began to attract some shipping activities in the mid- eighteenth century; but the low, sparsely vegetated land



Figure 2 View to east of Cape Lookout Lighthouse, May 1899. First Keeper's Dwelling is at right. (CALO Coll. D-01)

of Core and Shackleford Banks did not attract any permanent settlement until the late eighteenth century. Even then, settlement was apparently limited to temporary camps erected by fishermen and whalers, who had begun operations along the Cape by 1755. Sighting the whales from the "Cape Hills," a series of sand dunes up to sixty feet high that were located east and south of the present light house, the whalers operated in small open boats, dragging their catch back to the beach where they rendered the whale blubber into oil.¹

Cape Lookout Lighthouse was authorized by Congress in 1804 but was not completed until 1812. Too low to be effective, it was replaced by the present structure in 1857- 1859. With a first-order Fresnel lens, the new lighthouse was "the prototype of all the lighthouses to be erected subsequently on the Outer Banks."

The harsh conditions around the cape discouraged permanent settlement, and when Edmund Ruffin visited the area shortly before the Civil War, he described it as uninhabited except for Portsmouth near Ocracoke and "a similar but

1. David Stick, *The Outer Banks of North Carolina* (University of North Carolina Press, 1958) p. 308.

smaller enlargement of the reef near Cape Lookout (where, about the lighthouse, there are a few inhabitants).”²

After the Civil War, the full economic potential of fishing at Cape Lookout began to be exploited; and by the late 1880s, Carteret County was the center of commercial mullet fishing in the United States. From May to November, when the mullet were running, scores of fisherman set up camps along the shore, especially on the sound side of the banks. Documented as early as the 1880s and featured in *National Geographic* in 1908, these mullet camps were apparently quite similar, featuring distinctive, circular, thatched huts with conical or hemispherical roofs (see Figure 2). Although some of these beach camps lasted several years, and one is even said to have survived the terrible hurricane of 1899, they were crudely-constructed, temporary structures, and none of them survives today.³

The shoals at Cape Lookout, which stretch nearly twenty miles into the Atlantic, remained a major threat to shipping until the development of better navigational aids in the early

2. Edmund Ruffin, *Agricultural, Geological, and Descriptive Sketches of Lower North Carolina, and the Similar Adjacent Lands* (Raleigh, NC: Institution for the Deaf & Dumb & The Blind, 1861), p. 123.
3. David S. Cecelski, “The Hidden World of Mullet Camps: African-American Architecture on the North Carolina Coast,” *The North Carolina Historical Review*, Vol. LXX, #1, January 1993, pp. 1-13.



Figure 3 Two of the mullet camps on Shackleford Banks, c. 1908. (reprinted in *North Carolina Historical Review*, Vol. LXX, #1, p. 5)

twentieth century. As a result, the first life-saving station on Core Banks opened at Cape Lookout in January 1888 a mile and a half southwest of the lighthouse. Under the direction of William Howard Gaskill, who served as station keeper for over twenty years, a crew of “surf men” served at the Cape Lookout station, patrolling the beaches and manning the lookout tower at the station throughout the day and night during the active season which, by 1900, extended from August through May.

Diamond City

By the 1880s, as the fishing industry became more lucrative, settlements developed on the



Figure 4 View north of the life-saving station, c. 1893, with the lighthouse barely visible on the horizon at extreme right. (CALO Coll. G-09)


protected sound side of Shackleford Banks west of the lighthouse. Diamond City, named for the distinctive diamond pattern painted on the lighthouse in 1873, was the most important of these. Lying in the lee of a forty-foot-high dune about a mile and a half northwest of the lighthouse, Diamond City and two smaller settlements further west were home to as many as five hundred people in the 1890s, according to the National Register nomination, giving Shackleford Banks a larger population than Harkers Island.

There are a number of references to “the village” in the journals of the Cape Lookout Life-Saving Station in the 1890s, but these references

should not be confused with the National Register district of Cape Lookout Village, which developed in the early twentieth-century. While the life-saving station journals do not name “the village,” on more than one occasion, they do note the three-mile distance from the life-saving station, which confirms that “the village” at that time was Diamond City on Shackleford Banks.

Prior to World War I, the life-saving service crew was made up almost exclusively of men whose families had lived in Carteret County for generations. The surfmen lived at the station while on duty, but during the inactive season returned to their permanent homes in Morehead City, Harker’s Island, Marshallberg, and elsewhere.⁴ Before 1916, the station keeper was

4. Each station log begins with a list of the crew, their spouses or next-of-kin, and their home address.



Sketch showing site of Life-Saving Station on Cape Lookout, N.C.

H.v.B.
5-25-#10

Figure 5 Map of Cape Lookout, c. 1890. (Coast Guard Collection)



Figure 6 View of Shackleford Banks after 1899 hurricane. Note the partially-submerged structures at upper right. (CALO Coll., F-184)

the only one of the crew who lived year-round at the Cape. He had separate quarters in the life-saving station, but since his family could not be accommodated, he appears to have had a house near the station by 1893. It appears not to have been a full-time residence, however, and in the early twentieth century as motor boats began to make Cape Lookout more accessible, few if any chose to live there year-round.⁵

By the 1890s, some fishermen began constructing more-permanent “fish houses,” as they are referred to locally, or “shanties,” as they were

5. Cape Lookout Life-Saving Station, Journal, December 6, 1890; December 6 & 26, 1891; January 25, 1892; January 22, 1895. The original journals are in Record Group 26 at the National Archives and Records Administration, East Point, Georgia.

designated on the Life-Saving Service’s earliest known map of the cape (see Figure 5). Seven of these structures appear to be indicated on that map, with five in the protective “hook” of Wreck Point and two others across the Bight in near where the 1907 Keeper’s Dwelling or Barden House is now located. Almost certainly, all of these were occupied seasonally and not year-round.

Even with something more than thatched huts for shelter, the cape fishermen often sought shelter in the life-saving station when their camps and fish houses were threatened by high winds and tides. On more than one occasion, as many as fifty fishermen somehow crammed their way into the life-saving station to ride out a storm. The fact that there are only two references in the journals to women or children taking shelter in the station in the 1890s, suggests that the men did not usually expose their families to the harsh living conditions associated with fishing the waters around Cape Lookout.⁶

Cape Lookout has always suffered from storm damage, but the hurricane that struck on August 18-19, 1899, was one of the deadliest ever recorded on the Outer Banks. Believed to be a Category 4 storm, the so-called *San Ciriaco* or “Great Hurricane” decimated the Outer Banks. Winds at Hatteras reached 140 m.p.h. before the anemometer blew away, and the Outer Banks were submerged under as much as ten feet of water. The surge swept completely

6. Cape Lookout Journal, June 16, October 13, 1893; October 9, 1894.



Figure 7 Plat of proposed development of Cape Lookout in 1915. Arrows have been added to indicate Coast Guard Station, at left, and Lighthouse at right.

across Shackleford Bank, heavily damaging Diamond City and the other communities to the west of the Cape. Another hurricane at Halloween, though not as strong as the first, produced a greater storm surge and completed the destruction of the Shackleford Bank communities. So great were the damage and accompanying changes to the landscape that over the next year or two, the entire population abandoned Shackleford Bank, with most of them moving to Harker's Island and the mainland.

Cape Lookout Village

After the hurricane, a few residents relocated to Core Banks in the vicinity of the Cape Hills, but even before 1899 these sheltering hills were fast disappearing.⁷ Nevertheless, there were, ac-

ording to one writer who visited the cape in the early 1900s, as many as 80 residents at Cape Lookout⁸, enough to warrant establishment of one-room school house. A post office was also established in April 1910, with Amy Clifton, wife of the lighthouse keeper, as post master. Post office records locate the post office “two miles north of the cape, near the light house landing,” most likely in the 1907 Keeper's Dwelling. However, the widespread use of gasoline-powered boats after about 1905 made travel to Harkers Island, Beaufort, and elsewhere far more convenient, and it was soon apparent that the post office was not worth maintaining. It was discontinued in June 1911, barely fourteen months after its inception.⁹

7. Cape Lookout Journal, December 22, 1896.
8. Fred A. Olds, “Cape Lookout, Lonesome Place,” XLVI, #26, *The Orphan's Friend and Masonic Journal* (Oxford, NC, October 14, 1921).
9. U. S. Post Office Record of Appointments of Postmasters, 1832-Sept. 30, 1971; Records of Site Locations, 1837-1950.



Figure 8 View of Cape Lookout Coast Guard Station, 1917. In the background, are some of the small houses of “Cape Lookout Village.” (CALO Coll. D-52)

Cape Lookout was, according to one visitor “a bustling place” in the early 1900s, especially after the Army Corps of Engineers announced in 1912 that a coaling station and “harbor of refuge” would be established at Cape Lookout Bight. Sand fences were installed in 1913 and 1914 to stabilize some of the dunes, and in 1915, work began on a rubble- stone breakwater to enlarge and protect the Bight.

The project’s most- ardent supporter was local Congressman John H. Small, who envisioned a railroad from the mainland that would help make Cape Lookout a significant port. Intending to capitalize on those plans, private developers organized the Cape Lookout Development Company in 1913 and laid out hundred of residential building lots and planned a hotel

and club house to serve what they were sure would be a successful resort community. Unfortunately for all of those plans, there was less demand for a harbor of refuge than supporters had anticipated, and funding for the breakwater was suspended before it was complete. When plans for a railroad from Morehead City also failed to materialize, the development scheme was abandoned as well.¹⁰

In 1915, the Life- Saving Service and the Revenue Cutter Service were combined into the U. S. Coast Guard, and in 1916 construction began on a new Coast Guard Station to replace the old 1887 life- saving station. At the same time, pay scales were improved and a more- rigorous system of testing and training was instituted in an effort to produce a more professional staff. These measures and the availability of power

10.National Register Nomination. Also see plat for Cape Lookout Development Company, Carteret County Superior Court Records, Map Book 8, p. 13.

boats, which lessened the crew's isolation, combined to greatly reduce the rapid turnover in personnel that had plagued the station since the 1890s.

The use of gasoline- powered boats around Cape Lookout was first recorded by the life- saving station keeper in 1905, and this new mode of transportation rapidly transformed life at the cape.¹¹ So many "power boats" were in use by 1911 that the station keeper began recording their appearance in the waters around the cape, with as many as thirty- five of them recorded in a single day. Even before the life- saving service got its first power boat in 1912, many if not most of the crew had their own boats and were using them to commute from homes in Morehead City, Beaufort, Marshallberg, and elsewhere. The convenience of motor boats no doubt contributed to what the National Register calls "a general exodus" of year- round residents from the Cape in 1919 and 1920. The one- room school closed at the end of the 1919 school year, and some thirty or forty houses are reported to have been moved from the Cape to Harkers Island around the same time.

Fred A. Olds had visited Cape Lookout in the early 1900s and was even instrumental in getting a schoolhouse built on the island. When he returned for a visit in 1921, however, he found Cape Lookout to be "one of the 'lonesomest' places in the country." Only two or three families were living there by that time, he wrote, and "most of the houses are mere shacks, innocent of paint." He also found the

11. Cape Lookout Journal, June 30, 1905.

landscape littered with "thousands of rusted tin cans" and "grass or any green thing . . . conspicuous by its rarity." The lighthouse and the Coast Guard station were, he thought, "the only two real places in it all."¹²

Most of the houses left at the Cape were used as "fishing shacks," according to the National Register, and after World War I Cape Lookout became "an isolated haven for seasonal fishermen and hardy vacationers, most of them connected to the place by deep family roots." In addition, a few of the Coast Guardsmen with long- standing family ties to Cape Lookout maintained private residences that their own families occupied for at least part of the year. The Lewis- Davis House, the Gaskill- Guthrie House, and the Guthrie- Ogilvie House were all built as private residences by Coast Guardsmen in the 1910s and 1920s.

The Coast Guard's life- saving stations on Core Banks (one was located half- way up the Banks and another at Portsmouth) remained in service after World War I, but power boats and new navigational aids like the radio compass (or direction finding) station that the Navy began operating at the Cape Lookout Coast Guard Station in 1919 were rapidly rendering the life- saving service obsolete as a separate entity. The Portsmouth Life- Saving Station closed in 1937, and the Core Banks Station in 1940. The Coast Guard Station at Cape Lookout remained active until it was decommissioned in 1982.

12. Olds, "Cape Lookout, Lonesome Place."

Historical Background & Context




Figure 9 Map of Cape Lookout, August 1934. O’Boyle-Bryant House would be built just north-northeast of the Ogilvie House shown here. (U.S. Coast Guard Collection)



Figure 10 View of Cape Lookout Village, 1942. The Lewis-Davis House is out of view at left. (CALO Coll., Royer #4)

During World War II, the government expanded its military presence at Cape Lookout significantly. In April 1942, Cape Lookout Bight became an anchorage for convoys traveling between Charleston and the Chesapeake Bay. The 193rd Field Artillery was sent to the Cape to provide protection for the Bight, replaced that summer by heavier guns that remained in place throughout the war.¹³ Some, if not all, of the residences near the Coast Guard Station were occupied by Army personnel during the war years.

13. Rex Quinn, *The Gun Mounts at Cape Lookout, Historic Resource Study* (National Park Service, 1986).

After World War II, the Army base was conveyed to the Coast Guard, which retained only ninety-five of the original 400+ acres that made up the base. Land speculation also increased, and several of the old residences were acquired by people without family ties to the cape.

The State of North Carolina began efforts to establish a state park on Core Banks in the 1950s, but by the early 1960s, it was apparent that the undertaking was beyond the capacity of the state alone, and efforts were begun to establish a national seashore, similar to the one that had been established at Cape Hatteras in 1953. In

1966, Congressional legislation was passed that authorized establishment of a national seashore at Cape Lookout that would include a fifty-four-mile stretch of the Outer Banks from Ocracoke Inlet at Portsmouth to Beaufort Inlet at the western end of Shackleford Bank. In



Figure 11 View to northeast from near Coast Guard Station, April 1941. (CALO Coll., O'Boyle #21)

September 1976, enough land had been assembled for the Secretary of the Interior to formally declare establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore.

In the enabling legislation for the national seashore, “all the lands or interests in lands” between the lighthouse and the Coast Guard Station at Cape Lookout, which included the houses in what is now the Cape Lookout Village historic district, were specifically excluded from the new park. In 1978, however, the Federal government was able to acquire these lands for inclusion in the national seashore. Rights of occupancy under twenty- five year leases or life estates were granted to those “who on January 1, 1966, owned property which on July 1, 1963,

was developed and used for noncommercial residential purposes.”¹⁴

Cape Lookout National Seashore was authorized “to preserve for public use and enjoyment an area in the State of North Carolina possessing outstanding natural and recreation values.”¹⁵ That same year, however, Congress also passed the National Historic Preservation Act, and by the time the park was actually established in 1976, the area’s historical significance was being recognized. In 1972 the Cape Lookout Light Station was listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the first formal recognition of the value of the park’s cultural resources. In 1978 Portsmouth Village was also

14. National Park Service, *Cape Lookout General Management Plan/Development Concept Plan*, hereinafter designated “GMP,” (Denver Service Center, December 1982), p. 30.

15. *GMP*, p. 3.

listed on the National Register, followed by the Cape Lookout Coast Guard Station in 1989.

Most recently, in June 2000, the Cape Lookout Village Historic District was listed on the National Register. According to the National Register report, Cape Lookout is one of the last historic settlements on the Outer Banks to survive relatively intact and has statewide significance in social history, maritime history, and architecture. The district's period of significance encompasses all phases of historic development from 1857, when construction of the present lighthouse commenced, until around 1950 when the lighthouse was automated and the State of North Carolina began acquiring land for a proposed state park.

The Cape Lookout Village Historic District contains twenty-one historic resources, including the lighthouse (completed in 1859), two keeper's quarters (1873 and 1907), the old Life-Saving Station (1887), the old Life-Saving Station's boathouse (c. 1894), the Coast Guard Station (1917), and several private residences (c. 1910- c. 1950). Five of the ten historic private dwellings were built by fishermen or Coast Guard employees for their families from about 1910 to around 1950. Two houses were built about 1915 for Army Corps of Engineers workers, and two others were built as vacation cottages in the two decades before World War II. The National Park Service owns all of the property in the district except for the Cape Lookout Lighthouse, which is owned, operated, and maintained by the U. S. Coast Guard.

Lewis-Davis House

According to the National Register nomination, the house was built by Carrie Davis around 1930. However, Clark Davis, the current tenant, stated unequivocally that it was, in fact, built in the 1920s by his uncle James L. "Jimmy" Lewis, who sold the property to Carrie Davis when he retired from the Coast Guard in 1931.¹⁶ There is no recorded deed for the sale, although there is a recorded deed for her purchase of what would be her commercial property on the shore of the Bight in 1932.

James C. Lewis was born around 1892 in North Carolina and probably grew up in Carteret County. He enlisted at the Cape Lookout Coast Guard station in late 1917 or early 1918 and, the following year married "Maggie C.," whose last name has not been documented. When the Federal census was taken in January 1920, Jimmy and Maggie Davis were listed in the enumeration of Harkers Island, where their permanent residence was apparently located. Sharing the household with them was Odell Guthrie, who also worked at the Coast Guard Station at Cape Lookout and bought his own house at Cape Lookout in 1923.

The Lewis' first child, Guy, was born later in 1920, and it appears that Maggie and the baby spent at least part of the time at the Cape while James was on duty. On September 16, 1921, the officer in charge of the Coast Guard Station

16. Interview at the house with Clark Davis by the present author, October 23, 2002. In an interview on October 22, 2002, David Yeomans also stated that Davis bought the house from "somebody else," but he could not identify the seller.



Figure 12 View of porch of Carrie Davis' store, October 1942. The dance hall is at left rear and her shingled house at center rear. (CALO Coll., Royer photographs)

recorded the Lewis' harrowing experience the previous day as James was "on his way home" with Maggie and the baby. The boat was traveling at a high rate of speed when Maggie, holding the baby in her arms, was pitched overboard. Unable to swim, she had begun to sink by the time her husband got back to her, but he was able to grab her hair and pull her back on board, still clutching the baby. His life-saving skills, including resuscitation, saved the day, and mother and son were both revived unhurt.¹⁷ The Lewis' second child, a daughter named Ira, was born in 1923, and by 1925 they had moved to Marshallberg, across the sound

from Harker's Island.¹⁸ There, their son James, Jr., was born in the fall of 1928, around the time that their oldest son was starting school. In the fall of 1931, J. C. Lewis resigned his service with the Coast Guard.¹⁹ It is not clear exactly when Lewis sold the house at Cape Lookout to Carrie Davis, but it probably occurred in 1932.

Carrie Davis was born Carrie F. Arrendale on October 6, 1875, the daughter of Thomas Arrendale and Martha Oglesby, in Newport, N.

17. Cape Lookout Life-Saving Station Journal, September 16, 1921. The original journals are in Record Group 26 at the National Archives and Records Administration, East Point, Georgia.

18. Each volume of the LSS journals begins with a list of the station crew, their spouses or next of kin, and their place of residence.

19. The precise date of his discharge has not been documented.



Figure 13 View of Lewis-Davis House during World War II. (CALO Coll., Royer photograph)

C.²⁰ Very little of her early life has been documented beyond her marriage to Henry G. Pierce on May 17, 1893.²¹ How long they remained married has not been documented, nor is it known if any children were born of that marriage. By 1915, Pierce was either dead or they had divorced, and she had remarried. Her new husband, who had also been previously married, was Frederick S. Davis, a native New Yorker born about 1863. Their only child, a daughter named Edith, was born about 1915, and although the family has not been located in the 1920 census, they are shown in the 1930

20. Carteret Co. Death Certificate, 38-29.

21. Carteret Co. Marriage Records.

census living on Arrendale Street, perhaps in her parents' old house, in Morehead City.

In December 1932, Sterling Davis sold Carrie Davis (no family relationship has been documented) a 50' by 100' lot "fronting the shore" of Cape Lookout Bight.²² It is not clear if the three buildings photographed on the site during World War II were there when Carrie Davis bought the property in 1932 or if she had them built. In one of the buildings, Davis operated a small general store, and next door to it was a large, hipped-roof, screened pavilion that was a popular dance hall. In addition, by World War II, Davis had apparently built a house for herself next to the store and dance hall and rented the smaller Lewis-Davis House near the Coast Guard Station that she had bought from

22. Carteret Co. Deeds and Mortgages, Book

74, p. 1.

Historical Background & Context

Jimmy Lewis. Her husband had apparently died between 1930 and 1932 and she may have moved to Cape Lookout for financial reasons.

Recent research has shown that the cook at the Coast Guard Station lived in the Lewis- Davis house through most of World War II. According to family members, the cook, Willard “Bill” Royer, was posted to Cape Lookout in October 1941, and in February 1942, his wife and two daughters moved from Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin, to join him. Until the war’s end and his re-assignment to another duty station, Royer and his family lived in Carrie Davis’ small house near the Coast Guard Station.²³

23. The Royers’ daughter has written a brief memoir of the family’s time at the Cape and given copies of numerous photographs from the period to the park.

The Army base closed at the end of World War II, and the Cape quickly returned to the somnolent place it had been before the war. Carrie Davis turned 70 in October 1945, and advancing years more than anything else may have caused her to sell her house, store, and dance hall on the Bight to James B. and Gladys Harper in 1947. All three buildings were eventually burned or demolished, and nothing remains on the site today. Although she sold the property on the Bight, Davis retained title to her house near the Coast Guard Station. When she died at Newport, N. C., on March 15, 1955,²⁴ her daughter Edith Davis Darnell inherited the house. Ms. Darnell retained a lease on her mother’s old house when it was incorporated into the National Seashore in 1978.

24. Carteret Co. Death Certificate, 38-29.

Chronology of Development & Use

The present Lewis- Davis House was created by the joining of two older “fish houses,” with current occupant Clark Davis reporting that James Lewis relocated them from elsewhere on the island, “and put them together.”²⁵ Although no historical documentation for that scenario has been found, two structures are clearly evident in the present house, and materials and construction techniques suggest that both houses date to the first quarter of the twentieth century. The National Register suggests a date of c. 1930 for the house, but it was actually created earlier, probably around 1920, the c. 1930 date being the date around which Carrie Davis acquired the property.

Original Construction

The front half of the present house (Rooms 100 and 101) was a wood- framed, two- room structure, measuring about 16’ by 20’ with the roof gabled on the short sides. It appears to have been quite similar to “Bull Hunter’s store,” a photograph of which is in the CALO collection of photographs (see Figure 14).

25. Interview with Clark Davis by the author, 23 October 2002.




Figure 14 Reconstructed floor plan of house as it was constructed in the 1920s. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)




Figure 15 "Bull" Hunter's store "near the Coast Guard Station" at Cape Lookout, c. 1925.

The rear half of the present house (Rooms 102, 103, and 104) was also wood- framed, 16' by 20', but with the roof gabled on the long

side. The original floor plan of this portion of the house is unclear, since this section of the house appears to have undergone significant alterations when the present house was created, including removal of the entire outside wall where it joined the rear of the other house.

The unframed nature of the northwest and southeast walls in Room 103 and the presence of a window opening between Room 103 and 104 suggest the possibility that the structure making up this portion of the present building was originally divided into two rooms (Rooms 102 and 104) and a porch (Room 103) rather than the three that are at first apparent.

Both houses were originally finished with board- and- batten siding and wood- shingled roofs. When the houses were moved and combined, the earlier board- and- batten siding was maintained, and the roofs were shingled in



Figure 16 View of Lewis-Davis House in 1942. (CALO Coll., Royer photographs)

wood. The shed- roofed porch on the side of the house was added when the houses were combined and, in the late twentieth century, was greatly expanded and enclosed to become Room 105.

Until after World War II, most, if not all, of the private residences at the cape had rudimentary indoor plumbing, if any at all. The same is apparently true of the Lewis- Davis House, although a kitchen sink was probably installed when the house was built. There is no physical evidence for an historic bathroom in the house until the present make- shift bath was installed in the last quarter of the twentieth century. However, in one of the 1940s photographs (see Figure 12) there appears to be a plumbing vent stack above where the bathroom is now located

in Room 105. This probably served a toilet that was flushed like the historic toilet at the O'Boyle- Bryant House, by pouring buckets of well water to flush the unit. Wood- or coal- burning stoves provided heat for the house. The location of the cook stove has not been determined, but the T- shaped, terra- cotta flue for what was apparently a free- standing stove in Room 100 is visible in one of the 1940s photograph (see Figure 9).

Historic Changes

Historic changes to the house in the 1920s and 1930s are not readily apparent, but if there were any, they probably occurred in the late 1930s. These might have included the enclosure of part of the front porch with a knee wall and screening of both porches.




Figure 17 Side elevation of Lewis-Davis House illustrating changes to roof line after WWII. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

Like most of the houses at Cape Lookout, the Lewis-Davis House originally had no electrical service. However, the character of the light fixtures in Rooms 100 and 101 suggests that the house was wired for lighting as early as World War II, which must have run off batteries or a generator, unless power was being taken from the Coast Guard Station’s generator, which was only a few hundred feet away from the house.

Modern Changes

The valley at the junction of the two gabled roofs on the house must have been an ongoing maintenance problem, and after World War II the present roof line was created. The rear shed of the roof was removed entirely and a new roof structure was built over both roofs, eliminating the valley between the two sections of the house. At the same time, the front shed of the roof was extended to fully engage the roof of the front porch. Given the time period in which this occurred, it is likely that the covering for the new roof was asphalt shingles, which seemed to have generally replaced wood

shingles on most, if not all, of the structures at the Cape.

Probably at the same time the roof line was being changed, the exterior of the building was covered with cement- asbestos shingles, similar to those used at several other houses in the vicinity. This necessitated removal of all of the battens from the board- and- batten exterior siding.

Excepting the marked neglect and resulting deterioration that has characterized the building in recent years, the most significant change to the historic structure occurred in the late twentieth century when both porches were enlarged, with the rear porch also being completely enclosed. These changes, particularly the rear addition, produced a significant change in the building’s form and historic character.

In addition, the window (W- 3) at the northeast end of Room 100 has been shortened, and modern, two- over- two sash used to replace the historic six- over- six sash. The sash have also been entirely removed from the window (W- 8) on the rear porch, and the sash have been replaced at four other openings (W- 4, 5, 6, & 9)



Figure 18 View to east of Lewis-Davis House in August 1958. (CALO Coll.)

using modern six- over- six sash with aluminum sash channels.

As elsewhere at Cape Lookout, there have been dramatic changes to the landscape in the last quarter of the twentieth century, particularly in the stands of trees and shrubs that now surround the site. A road that historically allowed pedestrian and vehicular traffic to bypass the Coast Guard Station runs on the south side of the house but is now little more than a foot-path.



Figure 19 View to northwest of Lewis-Davis house from lookout at Coast Guard Station (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

Chronology of Development & Use

Time Line for Lewis-Davis House	
1857- 59	Second Cape Lookout Light House constructed
Oct 6, 1875	Carrie Arrendel born in Newport, NC
1887	Cape Lookout Lifesaving Station constructed
c. 1892	James L. Lewis born in Carteret County, NC
May 17, 1893	Carrie Arrendel marries Henry G. Pierce in Carteret Co.
c. 1914	Carrie Arrendel Pierce marries Frederick S. Davis of NY
1915	Carrie Arrendel Davis' only child, Edith, born
1899	<i>San Ciriaco</i> or "Great Hurricane" decimates Shackleford Banks
Apr 6, 1910	Cape Lookout Post Office opens
Jun 10, 1911	Cape Lookout Post Office discontinued
1913	Cape Lookout Land Company begins land acquisition at the Cape
1914	Construction commences on breakwater to create "harbor of refuge" at Cape Lookout Cape Lookout Development Company lays out lots and streets at cape
1915	Life- Saving Service becomes part of new U.S. Coast Guard
1916- 1917	New Coast Guard Station constructed at site of old Life- Saving Station
c. 1918	Jimmy Lewis joins Coast Guard
Fall 1931	Jimmy Lewis retires from Coast Guard
Dec 1932	Carrie Davis buys property on the Bight and probably Lewis' house, too
Oct 1941	Willard "Bill" Royer posted to Cape Lookout
Feb 1942	Royer's family joins him from Wisconsin; rent Carrie Davis' house until end of war
c. 1947	Carrie Davis sells dance hall and store to James and Gladys Harper
Mar 1955	Carrie Arrendel Davis dies at Newport, NC
1966	Cape Lookout National Seashore established
June 1976	Property conveyed to Federal government subject to twenty- five year lease
after 1976	Porches doubled in size
Jun 3, 2000	Cape Lookout Village Historic District established

Physical Description

Located about a hundred yards north of the old Coast Guard Station at Cape Lookout, and facing in a southeasterly direction, the Lewis- Davis House is a one- story, wood- framed, end- gabled structure that includes six main rooms, plus a large, screened, front porch. The main footprint of the building, including the porch, is about 37' by 20' plus a modern addition, approximately 4' by 21', along the southwest side of the house. There are about 800 square feet of interior floor space plus about 220 square feet of space on the porch.

Vernacular design and construction broadly define the character of the Carrie Davis House. Like most of the other buildings in the village, the house is a simple, utilitarian structure that was built in response to specific needs and circumstances, with little consideration of architectural style or refinement of detail. The house is distinctive, however, for the fact that it was created by the combination of two, smaller, older structures in the 1920s. As a result, it

A plan of the existing building can be found at the end of this section

Physical Description



Figure 20 View to north of Carrie Davis House. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 21 View to northwest, showing metal storage building in rear yard. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 22 View of water tanks at rear of house. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

might be considered one of the oldest private residences at Cape Lookout.

The structure has suffered major damage from termites and a leaking roof. Floors are collapsing in Rooms 101, 104 and 105, and there appears to have been major damage to the sills throughout the house. The roof, too, is in extremely poor condition, with large areas of rotten and termite-ridden rafters and decking. Although most of the historic finishes remain in place, the house as a whole is in very poor condition.

Associated Site Features

Like the Gaskill- Guthrie House, the house was built on a lot 50' by 220' that combined two of the original lots laid out by the Cape Lookout Development Company in 1915. In the rear yard is a modern metal storage building, 12'-3" by 15'-3". Partially-burned piles of refuse litter the grounds.

At the rear of the house is a wooden frame rising about ten feet that holds three, metal, 55-gallon drums. Water is pumped into these

tanks from a well, with gravity creating the necessary pressure for kitchen and bath fixtures.

Foundation

The wood frame of the main body of the house is set on a series of wooden piers, 8" - 12" in diameter, sunk to some indeterminate depth into the ground. Piers are so low that the house's frame is only a few inches above grade. Most are, at best, in fair condition, and concrete block have been inserted at some locations to provide additional support. Water is standing under large areas of the house, contributing to its ongoing deterioration.

Structural System

Both parts of the house were simple, wood-framed buildings, constructed using circular-sawn lumber and wire-nailed connections throughout. Building finishes and the house's close proximity to the ground prohibited investigation of much of the building's structure, but it is evident that the two structures that comprise the present building were constructed with the minimal wood frame necessary for a board- and- batten wall.

Floor: Floor joists appear to be a mix of 2" by 4" and 2" by 6" (actual dimensions could not be ascertained), set on 30" - 36" centers. Deterioration is widespread. Sills appear to be mostly single 2" by 8". Along the northwest side of Room 104, floor joists and sill have collapsed and there is major structural damage in Room



Figure 23 View of crawl space and piers. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 24 View of typical joist sill connection. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 25 View of collapsing floor under Room 104. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

Physical Description



Figure 26 View of junction of roofs of two original structures; note severe termite damage in rafters and decking at left. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 27 View of wood shingle roof on original structure encompassing Rooms 100 and 101. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 28 View of heavily-damaged roof and ceiling structure over Room 104. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

105, along the wall between Rooms 100 and 102, and all along the southwest side of Room 101.

Walls: Wall framing could not be examined but studs are minimal and widely spaced, constructed as a bare framework for vertically-installed board- and- batten siding on the exterior.

Ceilings: Like the walls, the ceilings appear to be very loosely framed, using widely-spaced 2” by 4” joists or, in some cases, 2” by 6” laid flat. The ceiling above Room 104 has been heavily damaged by water penetration and termites.

Rafters: There are three main rafter systems in the present structure: one over Rooms 100 and 101, which could not be examined, and another separate system over the rear rooms. When the two halves of the house were joined, a new roof structure was built to cover both of the earlier roofs (see Figure 10). Rafters of this third roof are around 1- 3/4” by 3- 3/4”, on 30” centers, and woefully undersized for their span and pitch. Rafters at the rear of the house have been severely damaged by termites.

Roofing

The roofs of the original houses had solid decks of random-width boards, covered with “tar paper,” and shingled with sawn wooden shingles. The use of solid roof decking and tar paper under a wood-shingle roof is an unusual feature, since wood shingles were typically laid over open lath that helped prolong the life of the shingle by allowing them to dry more quickly. In the stormy coastal environment of Cape Lookout, however, shingles nailed to a

solid deck helped reduce the possibility of wind damage, and wood shingles are routinely installed in that manner.

The present roof also has a solid deck, mostly 1" by 6", except on the modern additions where plywood is used. The present roof covering is modern, asphalt, "hurricane" shingles that have been heavily patched with tar or other coatings. The roof covering is leaking badly, especially at the rear of Room 104 and near the center of the house.

Exterior Finishes

The front half of the house was originally finished with board- and- batten siding, the originals of which remain exposed on the front porch and on the southeast (front) wall of Room 102. The boards vary from 8" to 12" wide and have battens 4- 1/2" to 5- 1/2" wide. The rear half of the house appears to have been finished in a mixture of board- and- batten siding, some of which remains exposed on the northeast wall of Room 105, and 6"- wide, vertical, tongue- and- groove boards, which are exposed on the exterior of part of the northwest (rear) wall of Room 105. Shiplap siding appears as a finish material on the upper part of the front wall of the house where it was raised to meet the new roof line when the two original structures were joined. Shiplap siding is also present in the exposed decking of the original front porch.

After World War II, the exterior walls were covered with cement- asbestos shingles, except on the porches, where the original board- and-



Figure 29 View of window W-2 on southeast (front) side of house, with exterior siding and trim typical of the original building. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

batten siding was left exposed. There are numerous broken shingles, and all of the siding, which is now painted pink, is stained and mildewed.

Doors and Windows

Window openings are typically 2'- 4" by 3'- 9" with six- over- six sash, but half of the sash have been replaced with modern windows. Exterior casing is typically plain 1" by 6" with 2" by 6" sills and no drip cap. (For locations of doors and windows, see plan at end of this section.)

D- 1: Wooden, five- panel door with molded stiles and rails, 2'- 6" by 6'- 5", 1- 3/8" thick, plain metal mortise lock, knob, and escutcheon. Door is historic if not original.

Physical Description

D- 2: Modern, aluminum, storm door, opening 2'- 6" by 6'- 8".

W- 1: Wooden frame and sash; opening 2'- 4" by 3'- 9"; six- over- six, single- hung sash, in



Figure 30 View of front door D-1. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 31 View to north on front porch. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

good condition.

W- 2: Wooden frame and sash; opening 2'- 4" by 3'- 9"; six- over- six, single- hung sash, in good condition. *W- 3:* Wooden frame and sash; original opening was 2'- 4" by 3'- 9" like *W- 1*; shortened to 3'- 1" and six- over- six sash replaced with modern two- over- two sash. The frame and sash are in poor condition.

W- 4: Wooden frame and sash; opening 2'- 4" by 3'- 10"; six- over- six, single- hung sash, in poor condition.

W- 5: Wooden frame and sash; opening 2'- 4" by 3'- 9"; modern, six- over- six, double- hung sash, aluminum tracks; in poor condition; sill-mounted air- conditioning unit installed in opening.

W- 6: Wooden frame and sash; opening 2'- 4" by 3'- 10"; modern, six- over- six, double- hung sash, aluminum tracks; in fair condition.

W- 7: Wooden frame and sash; opening 2'- 4" by 3'- 9"; modern, six- over- six, single- hung sash, aluminum tracks; in fair condition.

w- 8: Wooden frame, opening 2'- 4" by 3'- 9", sash missing.

w- 9: Wooden frame and sash; opening 2'- 4" by 3'- 9"; modern, six- over- six, single- hung sash, aluminum tracks; in fair condition.

W- 10: This opening is now around 2'- 4" by 3'- 9", there is no sash and joints in the paneling below suggest that the existing opening may be

part of a door that predated the joining of the two original houses.

Front Porch

The extent of the house's original front porch, which was about six feet deep and ran the full width of the house, is readily apparent in the ceiling of the front porch. When the porch was extended after 1976, the posts were removed and the existing angled braces installed. The porch is surrounded by a plywood-covered knee wall about two feet high.

Floor: The entire floor framing system appears to have been rebuilt when the porch was expanded. Flooring is plywood.

Ceiling: The original portion of the porch ceiling is the exposed underside of the roof deck, which is 6"- wide shiplap siding. Exposed rafters and plywood decking form the ceiling of the modern extension of the porch.

Walls: The outside walls of the porch date to the porch's expansion after 1976 and are framed with 2" by 4" studs covered with plywood to about 2' and screened above.

Door: The screen door is modern, wood, 2'- 9" by 6'- 8".

Room 100

The front door opens into this room, which is about 11' by 15'- 3". Most of its historic features remain intact and in good condition.



Figure 32 View to northeast in Room 100. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 33 View to northwest in Room 100. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

Floor: Flooring is typical 3- 1/4" tongue- and-groove. The flooring was historically painted, but now is covered with a modern vinyl floor covering.

Ceiling: Ceiling is set at about 7' and is finished with typical, double- V- joint boards, 3- 1/4" wide.

Physical Description



Figure 34 View to west in Room 101. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 35 View to southeast in Room 101. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

Walls: Walls are finished with typical double-V-joint boards, 3-1/4" wide.

Door: In addition to the front door (see above), the door to Room 102 opens into this room. It is a simple cross-braced door 2'-2" by 6', made up with 5-1/4"-wide boards. The door has no hardware besides the hinges.

Trim: One-inch quarter-round molding is used as a shoe mold. A 2" bed mold finishes the joint between walls and ceiling.

Doors are cased with plain boards, 3/4" thick and 4-3/4" wide. The front window (W-2) is cased with similar material and has a plain 4"-wide stool and 5-1/4" apron. All trim has been removed from the other window (W-3).

Room 101

This bedroom measures about 7'-10" by 15'-3". In the north corner of the room, there is a small closet about 2' by 5'. It has the house's only closet, which appears to have been the only significant alteration to the original structure when the present house was created in the 1920s.

The floor is in dangerous condition and appears to be collapsing due to major deterioration of floor joists and/or piers under this part of the house.

Floor: Flooring is typical 3-1/4" tongue-and-groove. The flooring was historically painted, but now is covered with a modern carpet.

There are major issues with the floor, which is collapsing on the north side.

Ceiling: Ceiling is set at about 7' and is finished with typical, double-V-joint boards, 3-1/4" wide.

Walls: Walls are finished with typical double-V-joint boards, 3-1/4" wide.

Doors: The door opening from Room 100 is 2'-6" by 6'-5". The door itself has four vertical panels and is 1-3/8" thick, but about 3" of the bottom rail have been cut off so that it will clear the collapsing floor. This door appears to never have had a lock, knobs, or other hardware besides the 3" hinges with which it is hung. The door opening to the closet is 1'-8" by 6'-0". There is no evidence that a door was ever installed at this opening.

Trim: The windows are cased with plain boards, 4-3/4" wide, a 3-3/4" stool, and a 5" apron. A 2" bed molding is used at the ceiling, with about 6' on the south wall finished with a molding with a slightly different profile from the remainder.

Room 102

This room measures 8'-2" by about 15'. All of the rooms in the house except Room 101 open to this room. Major damage is ongoing where the roof is leaking along the wall adjoining Room 100.

Floor: Flooring appears to be tongue- and-groove but is completely covered by two layers of modern carpeting over an indeterminate number of layers of linoleum.

Ceiling: The ceiling is set at about 7' and covered by sheets of wafer board. Original tongue- and-groove boards, 3-1/2" wide, probably V-joint, remain in place beneath the wafer board, but many are probably damaged or deteriorating due to water penetration. The ceiling has been braced along the middle of the



Figure 36 View to south in Room 102. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 37 View to northeast in Room 102. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

the east wall because water-damaged joists are collapsing in that area.

Walls: The southeast (front) wall of this room was originally the exterior wall of the structure that comprises the front half of the house. The wall is finished with 8" boards and 2-3/4" battens. The northwest (rear wall) is also board-and-batten, but the boards there are 12" wide

Physical Description



Figure 38 View to northwest in Room 103. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 39 View to southeast in Room 103. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

with 2-3/4" battens. The wall between this room and Room 104 is framed; the wall between this room and Room 103 is unframed.

The southwest wall is finished with 4-1/2"-wide, double-V-joint, tongue-and-groove boards, with the eastern half covered with fiber board.

The north wall is finished with a mixture of 3", 3-1/2", and 4-1/2" double-beaded, tongue-and-groove boards and 4-1/2" double-V-joint tongue-and-groove boards.

Doors: The door opening to the kitchen (Room 103) is 2'-2" by 6'-2", but there is no evidence that a door was ever installed at this opening. The door opening to Room 104 is 2'-3" by 6'-1" with a makeshift door constructed of 3/8"-thick plywood.

The door opening to Room 105 2'-6" by 6'-2". The door in the opening is constructed of 10"-wide boards with ledgers and cross brace. The door has a mortise lock with a white porcelain knob.

Miscellaneous: On the southeast (front) wall behind Room 101 is evidence of a small window opening about 21" high. This opening was apparently closed when the two original structures were combined and the closet built in Room 101.

Room 103

This room measures about 6'-7" by 11'-10". The light framing of the outside walls suggest that this could have been a porch when this part of the house was originally constructed.

Floor: The nature of the flooring in this space was not determined due to multiple layers of linoleum and vinyl floor coverings.

Ceiling: Ceiling is set at about 7' and, like the ceiling in Room 102, is finished with modern

wafer or chip board. What underlies this material has not been determined.

Walls: The northwest and southwest walls are finished with panels of fiber board, 3/8" thick and 9" wide, laid over 3- 1/2" tongue- and-groove boards. The southeast wall is composed of tongue- and- grooveboards 5- 1/2" wide, while the east wall is composed of 12"- wide boards without battens.

Miscellaneous: On the southwest wall is a modern porcelain sink and drain board resting on a wooden frame. In the northeast corner of the room are built- in wooden shelves and a wooden counter. A variety of other modern cabinets and a stove line the remainder of the walls.

Room 104

Measuring 8'- 4" by 11'- 6", this room is in extremely poor condition.

Floors: The floor is carpeted over plywood, although there appears to be an underlying layer of historic tongue- and- groove material. Water penetration and termites have destroyed the connection between the joists and the rear sill, allowing the entire floor to collapse at that end of the room.

Ceiling: The ceiling, like the floor, is on the verge of total collapse due to severe termite and water damage. It was originally finished with double- V- joint, tongue- and- groove boards, 3- 1/2" wide.



Figure 40 View to west in Room 104. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)



Figure 41 View to east of ceiling in Room 104. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

Walls: The northeast wall between this room and Room 103 is unframed and composed of vertically- installed tongue- and- grooveboards, 5- 1/2" wide. The remainder of the walls are finished with typical double- V- joint boards, 3- 1/2" wide.

Room 105

This space was created in recent years by expanding and enclosing an historic back porch,

Physical Description



Figure 42 View northwest in Room 105. Arrow marks header at outside of historic porch. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

the outline of which is still evident in the existing space. Probably at the same time, a rudimentary bathroom was installed at the northwest (rear) end of the space. In addition, when the porch was enlarged and enclosed, the original shed roof was removed, exposing the roof structure of the main house as well as the roofs of the two earlier buildings.




Figure 43 View to southeast in Room 105. (NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

Floor: The floor is modern plywood and is suffering from severe water damage near the entrance to the bathroom area.

Ceiling: The ceiling is formed by the exposed framing and roof decking.

Walls: The northeast wall and part of the southeast wall are composed of the board-and-batten siding of the original structures. The remainder of the walls are formed by modern plywood.




Figure 44 Floor plan of existing building. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2002)

Physical Description

Treatment and Use

Architecturally, the Lewis- Davis House is of considerable significance in interpretation of the Cape Lookout Historic District. Created by relocation and combination of two earlier “fishing shacks” around 1920, the house contains some of the earliest examples of the cape’s historic architecture and illustrates one of many ways in which the cape’s residents have always adapted and re- used their buildings. In addition, it is especially significant for its associations with Carrie Arrendel Davis, whose store and dance hall on the Bight were focal points for life at the Cape in the 1930s and 1940s.

This section of the historic structure report is intended to show how a plan for treatment of the Lewis- Davis House can be implemented with minimal adverse affect to the historic building while still addressing the problems that exist with the existing structure. The following narrative outlines issues surrounding use of the building as well as legal requirements and other mandates that circumscribe its treatment. These are followed by an evaluation of

the various alternatives for treatment—preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration—before describing in more detail the ultimate treatment recommendations, which would encompass structural repairs and exterior restoration together with rehabilitation of the interior for continued residential use under the park’s leasing program for historic buildings.

Since 1976, the Lewis- Davis House and several other of the residences in the park have been leased under the terms of a special use permit, and there have been a number of modifications to the houses during that period. With the expiration and temporary renewal of these leases, the park’s approach to treatment and use of these structures has to be reconsidered in light of their recent historical designation as part of the Cape Lookout Village Historic District. For that reason, the park has ordered development of historic structure reports on the historic structures in the district. In addition to the Lewis- Davis House, reports are also being developed on the Nelson- Bryant House, the Gaskill- Guthrie House, the Guthrie- Ogilvie House, Fishing Cottage #2, the Seifert- Davis House, the old Life- Saving Station and its Boat House, and the 1907 Lighthouse Keeper’s Dwelling. As a result, all of the studies have benefitted from a comparative analysis in terms of both historical and architectural data that might not otherwise have been possible.

However, historical research on the Lewis- Davis House has not been exhaustive, architectural investigation was non- destructive, and given the building’s proximity to the ground and the presence of modern finish materials

both inside and outside the building, a number of questions regarding the building’s historical evolution and its present condition remain unanswered.

In addition, development of a Cultural Landscape Report for the district has not been funded and the update of the park’s historic resource study remains incomplete. Since none of these structures would probably be eligible for individual listing in the National Register, treatment options depend as much on the goals for the entire village as on the particulars of a single building. Final definition of the treatment approach to the historic district as a whole will await completion of the larger contextual studies now underway; but in the meantime, an approach to treatment of the individual structures in order to insure their continued preservation can certainly be recommended.

Ultimate Treatment and Use

Because the Cape Lookout Village Historic District is a relatively new addition to the National Register, the park has not set a program of use for the private residences in the village, including the Davis- Lewis House. A comprehensive planning process resulting in an amendment to the park’s GMP will be necessary to insure that the park’s and the public’s needs are addressed and that the historic buildings are used appropriately.

The authorizing legislation (Public Law 89-366) for Cape Lookout National Seashore mandated the park’s establishment for the pur-

pose of preserving “for public use and enjoyment an area in the State of North Carolina possessing outstanding natural and recreational values.”

By the time the seashore was actually established in 1976, the historical significance of the cultural resources at Portsmouth and at the Cape Lookout Light Station were also recognized. The general management plan (GMP) developed for the park by the Denver Service Center in 1982 states that one of the park’s management objectives is “[t]o preserve intact, as feasible, the historic resources of the national seashore and to recognize that dynamic natural forces have influenced them throughout their existence and will continue to influence them.”²⁶ The GMP envisioned interpretation of the park’s cultural resources that would “emphasize man and his relation to the sea” with maritime history a focus at the lighthouse and the cultural and economic life of the Outer Bankers at Portsmouth Village.²⁷ Since that time, additional cultural resources besides the lighthouse station and Portsmouth have been recognized through National Register listing. In 1989, the Cape Lookout Coast Guard Station, with four intact historic structures, was listed on the National Register; and in June 2000, the Cape Lookout Village Historic District, with fourteen historic residential buildings, was listed as well.

An amendment to the 1982 GMP was completed in January 2001, but it only addressed

26. Cape Lookout *GMP*, p. 4.

27. *Ibid.*

improvements in overnight accommodations and transportation services for visitors to Core Banks and not the additional cultural resources that had been recognized since 1982. Nevertheless, these additional listings, which like the earlier listings are of statewide significance, do not appear to require any marked departure from the management approach established in 1982 for Portsmouth and the Cape Lookout Light Station.

Three points from the 1982 GMP are particularly relevant to treatment decisions on the buildings in the Cape Lookout Village and in the Coast Guard complex as well.

The 1982 plan “perpetuates the present level of use and development of Core Banks/Portsmouth Island. . . .”²⁸

Pointing out the resources’ state level of significance, the 1982 plan intended “to preserve intact, as feasible, the historic resources of the national seashore and to recognize that dynamic natural forces have influenced them through their existence and will continue to influence them.”²⁹

“As appropriate, some structures may be perpetuated through adaptive use. Contemporary public and/or administrative rights will be allowed with necessary modifications. The qualities that qualified these resources for listing on the National Register of Historic Places will be perpetuated to the extent practicable.”³⁰

28. *GMP*, p. iii.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Use: In keeping with these parameters, the historic (and present) residential use of the Lewis- Davis House and the other structures that were historically private residences should be continued, if rehabilitation can be accomplished with minimal alterations to the building's historic character.

Treatment: Termites, poorly- maintained windows and exterior finishes, a leaking roof, as well as a variety of haphazard repairs threaten the building's continued preservation. Major structural repairs are necessary, but damage is so extensive in some areas that parts of the structure will probably need to be dismantled and reconstructed.

In addition, the modifications to the building in the last twenty- five years have significantly compromised its historic integrity. Clearly, treatment of the Lewis- Davis House (and the other historic properties in the district) must, at a minimum, adhere to the Secretary's Standards if the historic character of the individual buildings is not to be diminished any further.

Removal of the porch additions would restore some of the building's historic integrity and, with relatively simple, straightforward repairs of the building's other historic features, would help insure the building's continued preservation.

In addition to simply preserving the building, continued residential use requires rehabilitation, especially replacement of the building's electrical and plumbing systems. The Light-

30.*ibid.*, p. 35.

house Keeper's Quarters (or Barden House), the Life- Saving Station, and other government buildings were wired for lighting shortly after World War I and the Lewis- Davis House appears to have been wired shortly before or during World War II. Indoor plumbing, however, appears not to have been an historic feature, and the house may not have had an indoor bathroom until the last quarter of the twentieth century. Designing and installing a more- permanent facility that will not intrude on the building's historic character will be a major component of the building's rehabilitation.

Requirements for Treatment and Use

The Lewis- Davis House has a fragile character that can be easily destroyed by insensitive treatment. The historic character is embodied not just in the vernacular form of the building but also in its structure and its component materials, including wood and cementitious siding, flooring, paneling, windows, doors, nails, and hardware. The more these aspects of the building are compromised, especially through replacement or removal of the historic material or feature, the less useful the building becomes as an historical artifact.

The key to the success of any historic preservation project is good judgement in determining where replacement of a deteriorated building element is necessary. Deterioration in a portion of an element should not necessitate total replacement of the element, since epoxy consolidants and fillers can repair the damaged area, often without even removing the damaged

element to make the repair. While total replacement of a damaged element is often recommended, especially in rehabilitation projects, the success of most preservation projects can be judged by the amount of historic material that remains. Even "replacement in kind" does not typically address natural processes that give the historic materials an aged appearance that cannot be duplicated except by the passage of time.

Because it is a contributing building in a National Register district, legal mandates and policy directives circumscribe treatment of the house. The NPS' Cultural Resources Management Guideline (DO- 28) requires planning for the protection of cultural resources "whether or not they relate to the specific authorizing legislation or interpretive programs of the parks in which they lie." Therefore, the house should be understood in its own cultural context and managed in light of its own values so that it may be preserved unimpaired for the enjoyment of present and future

To help guide compliance with legal mandates and regulations while still maintaining the building's historic integrity, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties have been issued along with guidelines for applying those standards. Standards are included for each of the four separate but interrelated approaches to the treatment of historic buildings: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. These approaches define a hierarchy that implies an increasing amount of intervention into the historic building. Rehabilitation, in particular,

allows for a variety of alterations and even additions to accommodate modern use of the structure. However, a key principle embodied in the Standards is that changes be reversible, i.e., that alterations, additions, or other modifications be designed and constructed in such a way that they can be removed or reversed in the future without the loss of existing historic materials, features or characters.

Modern building codes and accessibility issues are a major factor in designing repairs to historic structures and often necessitate significant changes to the building. Assuming continuation of leasing of the house for residential use, public access will be restricted, and full compliance with accessibility codes will, therefore, not be necessary. In any event, the close proximity of the house to the ground facilitates handicapped entrance, although the width of doors and configuration of interior spaces limits full accessibility without significant alterations to the building.

However, the Lewis- Davis House as well as most of the other structures in the district have major deficiencies in terms of compliance with building and life safety codes. Electrical and plumbing systems, for instance, are thoroughly inadequate and must be corrected if the building is to remain occupied.

More difficult to address are the house's foundation and framing, which, as with most of the other historic houses in the district, do not meet all of the requirements of modern building codes, particularly those related to coastal storms and flooding. While it is worth noting

that, in spite of what appears to be relatively weak framing, the houses in the district have survived hurricane and flooding for over seventy years, the deteriorated condition of the Lewis- Davis House, which is far worse than any other structure in the historic district, makes it susceptible to whole or partial collapse during high winds. Therefore, improvements in the structure could and should be made. Floors should be strengthened and stabilized by the addition of support sills at mid- span beneath the present joists, and the building's wood frame should be tied to the piles that form the building's foundation. In rebuilding the existing, most of which is not considered historic, it will also be possible to improve the roof structure and to properly tie it to the historic framing that survives. During the course of repairs to the exterior siding, many of the boards will no doubt need replacement, and during the course of that work, the walls can be more closely inspected and appropriate repairs and improvements made.

A number of structural issues would still remain, but the very nature of the vernacular design and construction of the house makes full code compliance impossible without dismantling and reconstructing the building, which would have a significant negative impact on the historic character of the building. However, the park has faced similar issues with many of the buildings at Portsmouth and has generally been able to make necessary repairs without totally compromising the buildings' historic character. In any case, the small scale of the house will naturally restrict occupancy, and mandatory

evacuation of the house during hurricanes should preclude the need for extensive structural alterations.

Treatment of the building should be guided by the International Building Code, including that code's statement regarding historic buildings:

3406.1 Historic Buildings. The provisions of this code related to the construction, repair, alteration, addition, restoration and movement of structures, and change of occupancy shall not be mandatory for historic buildings where such buildings are judged by the building official to not constitute *a distinct life safety hazard* [emphasis added].

Threats to public health and safety will be eliminated, but because this is an historic building, alternatives to full code compliance are recommended where compliance would needlessly compromise the integrity of the historic building.

Alternatives for Treatment and Use

There are three main approaches to treatment that might be entertained for the Lewis- Davis House: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. Each implies more aggressive levels of intervention into the existing building, usually accompanied by significant increases in the project's budget. Yet quite often simple preservation does not satisfy requirements for modern use, while rehabilitation may not facilitate and in fact might diminish the opportunity for historical interpretation. On the other hand, many buildings

are of insufficient historic significance to warrant full-scale restoration. In addition, the condition of the house is such that reconstruction, an approach that usually applies to buildings or parts of buildings that no longer exist, must also be considered as an option. An examination of each of these approaches in terms of the Lewis-Davis House is useful in determining the most efficacious approach to its treatment and use.

Preservation: This approach attempts to maintain the historic features and fabric that exist today by making repairs, including replacement of antiquated wiring, sewer, and water supply lines. Structural repairs would be made as necessary to replace deteriorated members but not to restructure the building's framing. Although various features of the house, including many of the interior finishes need nothing more than simple preservation, the building's condition is so poor that preservation as an overall treatment approach is simply not an option.

Rehabilitation: One of the more common approaches to treatment of historic buildings, rehabilitation would go a step further than preservation. Under this approach, more modifications to the existing building might be considered, including alterations to bring the structure into better compliance with modern building codes. Wood sash could be reinstated where missing and the closed window and door openings reinstated, but the asbestos siding (an extremely durable material) would be maintained. The kitchen and bath might be completely replaced as well and modern light-

ing and central heat or air-conditioning installed. All work, of course, would be designed to be reversible and would not diminish the historic building fabric or the house's historic character beyond the changes that have already been made.

Under this scenario, the main goal would be, at a minimum, to eliminate hazards in order that residential use be continued. In addition, the park would probably want to install a modicum of creature comforts that would make the building attractive to a wider range of prospective tenants. However, here again the building's condition is such that necessary treatment goes far beyond the normal rehabilitative process.

Restoration: Instead of simply preserving the building or rehabilitating it for continued residential use, there are a number of opportunities for restoration that could benefit interpretation of the historic district and its architecture. The Lewis-Davis House as well as the other houses in the district are mainly significant for being part of a larger ensemble of vernacular buildings, most of which are quite similar in appearance and in historical evolution. Therefore, treatment of any one house should not be considered outside that context, and a consistent approach to treatment of all the houses must be established.

Restoration of the Lewis-Davis House and the other houses in the district to their appearance prior to the 1960s would be relatively simple, but immediately raises a number of contextual issues surrounding presentation and interpretation of the historic district as a whole. Over

the last twenty- five or thirty years, the character of the landscape in the village has changed so dramatically that, today, views from most of the residences are restricted to a few hundred feet due to the myrtle and other plants that have grown up thickly throughout the historic district. It is no longer possible to see all of the buildings on the cape in a single sweep of the eye, as it was historically, and it is often difficult for a visitor to perceive a “village” at all. To present the district as it appeared during the historic period prior to 1950, three major projects or groups of projects would need to be undertaken in addition to building restoration:

- return to their historic locations of the government- constructed buildings that were moved in 1958 - - the light-house keeper’s quarters, the old life-saving station, and the boat house;
- removal of modern houses and structures from the district; and
- restoration of the historic landscape.

Relocation of historic government buildings, removal of non- contributing structures, and restoration of the historic landscape are technically possible, but would undoubtedly generate rather significant operational, financial, and political issues. Resolution of these issues is far beyond the scope of the present study, but it makes little sense to undertake restoration of the private residences (it is unlikely that any of them would be eligible for individual listing in the National Register) without at least some restoration of the context in which they exist. Completing a cultural landscape report and, perhaps, revisiting the park’s general manage-

ment plan would be necessary to appropriate decision- making on these complex issues.

In addition, restoration would, in most cases, eliminate many modern conveniences, since only two of the residences seem to have historic bathrooms in place. Unless interpretation of cultural resources becomes the prime focus at Cape Lookout, which does not seem likely, there is little justification for this level of intervention in the historic buildings.

However, a case can be made for restoration of a typical “Banker house” for interpretive purposes. Restored to its original appearance, such a house could help visitors envision the harsh, almost primitive living conditions at the cape and, along with historic photographs, convey some sense of the village’s appearance between the World Wars.

However, the Lewis- Davis House would not be the best choice for restoration to its early twentieth- century appearance, primarily because the scale and condition of the house if restored to its appearance late in the historic period lends itself to leasing and other modern uses, whereas many of the other houses (e.g. the Gaskill- Guthrie House), if restored, could not be so well adapted for modern use. In essence, restoration of the Lewis- Davis House to any but its appearance late in the historic period cannot be justified under the present circumstances.

Reconstruction: As an approach to treatment, reconstruction must be considered for at least part of the building. Although mostly intact,

the building has severe structural problems, and the condition is such that at least the rear shed of the roof and perhaps some of the rear wall will almost certainly have to be taken down and rebuilt. Additional structural damage can also be expected elsewhere and, given the amount of visible damage, may be quite extensive.

None of the other houses, except perhaps the Gaskill- Guthrie House, show so clearly the character of the early “fishing shacks” that once dotted the cape, and every effort, including the

extraordinary step of reconstruction, should be made to preserve this building. If necessary, the building might even be stabilized and mothballed until there are the resources for full rehabilitation.

If it is determined that treatment of the entire house is not feasible, consideration should at least be given to preserving the original building that forms the front half of the house, since it appears to be in much better condition than the rear half of the house.

Recommendations for Treatment & Use

In essence, the goal for treatment of the historically- private dwellings in Cape Lookout Village, including the Lewis- Davis House, is restoration of the exteriors to their appearance around 1950 and rehabilitation of the interiors for continued residential use, if rehabilitation can be accomplished with minimal alterations to the buildings' historic character. This would include removal of the additions to the front and side porches, complete rehabilitation of the kitchen, design and installation of a new bathroom, replacement of electrical and plumbing systems, and limited structural improvements to improve the building's capacity to withstand wind and flood.

However, unlike the other houses, the Lewis- Davis House is in poor condition structurally, which greatly complicates its overall treatment.

Site

Treatment of the landscape around the house will be defined through a Cultural Landscape Report, but at a minimum, the piles of rubbish, broken- down vehicles, and general debris should be removed. The small storage building, too, is not historic and should be removed. Although the condition of the grounds

around this house is the worst, improvements in the tenants' maintenance of all of the sites around the houses should be a high-priority requirement in any new lease agreements.

Site drainage is extremely poor, and water routinely ponds beneath the house. This condition must be eliminated to prevent continued deterioration from rot and termites. As the foundation is repaired, the grade level beneath the house should be raised to prevent water collecting under the structure.

Improvements to the water and septic systems at the site are being planned, but these should have little, if any, effect on the visual character of the site.

- Clear site of rubbish and debris.
- Remove storage building.
- Follow recommendations of Cultural Landscape Report in determining treatment of the surrounding landscape.
- Improve site drainage and eliminate standing water beneath house.

Foundation

The building's foundation is constructed of wooden piles of unknown vintage. Many of these are badly deteriorated, and all of them should be replaced, since the building will have to be lifted in order to complete inspection and repair of the sills and floor framing anyway. This would also provide the opportunity to strengthen the connection between the wood frame of the house and the piles on which it

sits. The size and spacing of the existing piles appears to be adequate and new piles should replicate the existing arrangement.

- Raise house and replace all wood piles, replicating the existing size and placement of piles.
- Design and install storm-resistant mechanism to tie the house's wood frame to the foundation piles.

Structure

The house has incurred widespread structural damage due to rot and termites, especially in the rear half of the house. At Room 104, floor and ceiling framing are so heavily damaged that total replacement will probably be necessary. Floor framing is also severely damaged around the center of the front part of the house and in Room 105. The building's close proximity to the ground and the non-destructive nature of the present investigation of the building prevented a full assessment of the building's structural condition, but additional structural damage can be expected throughout the building.

Except for removal of the porch additions, the logistics of making other structural repairs are complicated by the advanced deterioration of parts of the structure, with the rear shed of the roof and some floor systems collapsing or liable to collapse. All of these will have to be stabilized before any other work can proceed.

The building can be lifted to replace the foundation pilings and to repair sills and joists, and

there is easy access to the rear shed of the roof from the attic area. Finishes will have to be removed in areas where damage to studs and plates has occurred, but it should be necessary to remove the finishes from only one (preferably the exterior) and not both sides of the walls.

Sizing and spacing of historic and modern framing members do not meet modern code requirements. If deterioration is not too widespread, however, it should be possible to augment the historic framing without total replacement. Where reconstruction is necessary, there is no compelling reason to replicate the inadequacies of the historic framing.

The deteriorated roof that was added in the 1950s should be removed, and the two original roofs repaired and restored, including reconstruction of the missing rear shed of the back roof. In repairing the original roofs, good flashing of the valley between the two roofs will be critical. The partially-engaged front porch and the shed-roofed porch on the side of the house should also be rebuilt, using the photographs of the house in 1943 as a guide.

The two earlier structures that were combined to make the present house in the 1920s are some of the oldest private residential structures at the cape, and the house as it exists today is an important contributing resource in the historic district. It is possible that damage to the building's structure is so extensive that simple repairs will not be possible, and it will be necessary to reconstruct parts of the house. It is also possible that complete rehabilitation will not be feasible for financial reasons. However,

most of the damage is concentrated in the rear half of the house, and under any set of circumstances, it should be possible to repair and preserve the front portion of the house, which contains the nearly-intact, early-twentieth-century, "fishing shack" that forms that part of the building.

- Stabilize structure before repairs proceed.
- Remove 1950s roof structure and restore original roofs.
- Repair floor, wall, and ceiling framing as necessary and make improvements in connections of framing members to reduce the possibility of significant damage from high winds.
- Remove porch additions and restore porches to their appearance in the 1940s photographs.
- If entire house cannot be salvaged, repair and preserve original structure encompassing Rooms 100 and 101.

Exterior Finishes

The existing cementitious siding should be removed. Although the asbestos in this siding is not particularly friable, the shingles should be removed with a minimum of breakage. These shingles were often installed with spiral or ribbed nails that cannot be easily removed in a conventional way. Bolt cutters or other tools can be used to remove nail heads, allowing the shingle to be removed without breaking. Since the material is no longer manufactured and can now be considered an historic building mate-

rial, at least one complete shingle should be salvaged and archived in the park's architectural study collection.

Most of the boards from the historic board-and-batten siding remain in place and many of these can be salvaged and re-used. The original siding remains in place on the front wall of the house and on the walls around the back porch, and the siding in these areas should be repaired and preserved in place if possible. Window and door trim should be maintained and preserved wherever possible. Where battens and trim are missing, the surviving woodwork on the front of the house should serve as a model for replacement material on that part of the house, and the surviving woodwork on the side porch should be the model for replacement material on the rear of the house.

The 1940s photographs show a wood-shingled roof covering on the house, and this probably remained until the present roof was constructed in the 1950s. The restored original roof structure should also be finished in wood shingles.

- Remove cement-asbestos siding.
- Repair underlying boards and install new battens to match the original.
- Repair and preserve historic board-and-batten siding and trim on front and side porches.
- Repair and preserve other exterior woodwork.
- Paint siding dark green, matching surviving paint on side porch, and trim in white as seen in 1940s photographs.

Doors

The existing front door (D-1) should be repaired and preserved. The door between Rooms 102 and 105 is historic and again will be the back door to the house when the side porch is restored; it, too, should be repaired and preserved.

Existing doors between Rooms 100 and 101 and between Rooms 100 and 102 are historic and should be repaired and preserved. Doors were apparently not present originally at the openings between Rooms 102 and 103 and between Rooms 102 and 104, nor was there ever a closet door in Room 101. A new door should be installed at the opening between Rooms 102 and 104 and into the new bathroom. Both of these might be modern flush doors. Doors should not be installed at other openings that were historically only cased openings.

- Repair and preserve existing historic doors.
- Install new doors at Room 104 and at new bathroom.

Windows

Historically, all of the windows had six-over-six, double-hung sash. However, the two windows (W-1, W-2) on the front porch and possibly the window (W-4) at the northeast end of Room 102 appear to have the only historic sash remaining in the house. These should be repaired and preserved.

The window opening (W-3) at the northeast

end of Room 100 has been shortened by about 8" and fitted with modern, two-over-two, double-hung sash. The sash is deteriorating and the opening poorly detailed. The original opening should be restored and new six-over-six sash installed.

The other windows are modern replacements, but since the replacement sash are similar to the historic sash, they can be repaired and preserved or replaced entirely if their condition warrants.

- Preserve historic sash (W- 1, W- 2, W- 4).
- Restore altered opening (W- 3) in Room 100.
- Replace missing sash (W- 8) at rear porch.
- Repair or replace remaining sash as necessary.

Interior

The interior of the house should be rehabilitated as necessary for continued residential use. Although existing historic finishes should be preserved, the park should also be given some latitude in its treatment of the interior since it will not be open to the public or be interpreted.

Existing tongue- and- groove paneling on walls and ceilings, all of which is historic, should be repaired as necessary. The ceiling in Room 102, which is now covered with wafer board, may be badly damaged and at least some of the paneling will need to be replaced.

Because the floors are almost completely covered with linoleum and vinyl floor- coverings, the condition of the flooring could not be assessed, but some repairs will undoubtedly be necessary. When the layers of floor- coverings now in place are removed, they should be documented and samples of at least the earliest linoleum should be archived.

After repairs, the interior should be repainted, including the floors. Interior colors could be chosen by the park or by prospective tenants, since the interior will not be visible to the public.

The house should be completely rewired, adding convenience outlets as necessary and ceiling fixtures wherever they are now located. Simple keyless sockets with bare bulbs presently light most of the interior, and given the character of the house, their use might be continued. The house's two historic light fixtures (c. 1940) in Rooms 100 and 101 should be rewired and restored.

The existing bathroom should be removed along with restoration of the side porch, and since the porch is too small for a full bath, a new bath should be constructed elsewhere. The house's small scale reduces options for a new bathroom without eliminating a bedroom or significantly reducing the size of other rooms. In order to accommodate a modern bathroom and a modern kitchen within the present footprint of the house, a new bathroom should be constructed in Room 103 and a new kitchen at the northeast end of Room 102. In order to avoid installing a door in the present

opening between Rooms 102 and 103 and to provide space for a water heater and some storage, a new wall should be constructed to partition Room 103. Bathroom fixtures, kitchen sink, and cabinets would be new.

- Rehabilitate interior for continued residential use.
- Repair and maintain historic paneling on walls and ceilings, flooring, and trim; preserve samples of historic floor coverings.
- Remove existing bathroom and install new bathroom in Room 103.
- Construct new kitchen at northeast end of Room 102.
- Install new plumbing supply and waste lines to bathroom and kitchen.
- Rewire building, restoring historic light fixtures in Rooms 100 and 101.

Additional Research

The nature of the current study allowed for only limited research, and a number of potential sources for historical information have not been investigated. Most important would be interviews with Davis and Lewis family members.

Paint analysis was not part of the research for this report. If public access and interpretation is ever considered for the interior, a paint study would be necessary to accurately portray the historic appearance of the interior.

- Locate and interview Lewis and Davis family members regarding house's history.
- Conduct paint analysis of interior should it ever be opened for public interpretation.




Figure 45 Proposed plan for treatment and use. (T. Jones, NPS-SERO-CR, 2003)

Notes

Remove 1950s roof structure and restore original roofs. Remove cement-asbestos siding, restore underlying board-and-batten siding. Repair and maintain existing historic interior and exterior woodwork.

1. Remove porch additions (hatched areas).
2. Restore front porch, reconstructing partial screened enclosure.
3. Remove existing bathroom installation on side porch, restore screened porch.
4. Install new wood sash, 6/6, to match historic windows.
5. Close opening at this location.
6. Construct new wall to partition this space; remodel for bathroom and utility storage.
7. Install new kitchen sink, counter and cabinets in this area.
8. Repair major water and termite damage to sills, floor and ceiling joists, and rafters in this area.
9. Repair major damage to floor framing in this area.
10. Repair major water damage to structure in this area.

Recommendations for Treatment & Use

Sources of Information

Cape Lookout National Seashore, Photographic Collection.

Carteret County Superior Court Record of Deeds and Mortgages,
New Bern, North Carolina.

Carteret County Death and Marriage Records, New Bern, North
Carolina.

Cecelski, David S. "The Hidden World of Mullet Camps:
African- American Architecture on the North Carolina
Coast," *The North Carolina Historical Review*. Vol. LXX,
#1, 1993.

Dunbar, Gary S. *Historical Geography of the North Carolina Outer
Banks*. Louisiana State University Press, 1958.

Erenhard, John E. *Cape Lookout National Seashore: Assessment of
Archaeological and Historical Resources*. NPS: Southeast
Archaeological Center, Tallahassee, FL, 1976.

- Holland, F. Ross. *A Survey History of Cape Lookout National Seashore*. NPS: Division of History, Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, January 30, 1968.
- National Park Service. *Cape Lookout General Management Plan/Development Concept Plan*. Denver Service Center: December 1982.
- National Park Service. *Cape Lookout National Seashore: Amendment to General Management Plan and Environmental Assessment*. Southeast Regional Office: January 2001.
- National Register of Historic Places Report, Cape Lookout Village Historic District.
- Olds, Fred A. "Cape Lookout Lonesome Place, Vol. XLVI, #26. *The Orphan's Friend*. Oxford, NC: The Grand Lodge of Masons of North Carolina.
- Rex Quinn. *The Gun Mounts at Cape Lookout, Historic Resource Study*. National Park Service, March 1986.
- Ruffin, Edmund. *Agricultural, Geological, and Descriptive Sketches of Lower North Carolina, and the Similar Adjacent lands*. Raleigh, NC: Institution for the Deaf & Dumb & The Blind, 1861. <<http://docsouth.unc.edu/nc/ruffin/ruffin.html>> (November 2002).
- Stick, David. *The Outer Banks of North Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958).
- United States Coast Guard. "Cape Lookout Life-Saving Station, Journals." January 1887- 1920. Record Group 26, National Archives and Records Administration, East Point, Georgia.
- United States Federal Census, Carteret County, 1880- 1930.
- United States Post Office. "Records of Appointments, Records of Post Office Locations." Microfilm, National Archives and Records Administration, East Point, GA.



The National Park Service cares for special places saved by the American people so that all may experience our heritage.

