

LANDMARK



SURVEY

IDENTIFICATION

Street Address: 700 Harris Street
Map and Parcel: 35-132
Census Tract & Block:
Present Owner: General Electric Company
Address: 700 Harris Street
Present Use: Industrial Warehouse
Original Owner: James and James A. Armstrong
Original Use: Knitting factory

BASE DATA

Historic Name: Armstrong Knitting Factory (C.M.A.F.)
Date/Period: 1889-90
Style: Second Empire
Height to Cornice:
Height in Stories: 2
Present Zoning: M-1
Land Area (sq.ft.): 164,221 sq. ft.
Assessed Value (land + imp.): 51,400 + 81,210 = 132,610

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

This building is of a design common to many large brick industrial buildings of the time. It is a two story rectangular block with a central entrance tower, one story higher than the rest of the building, projecting from one side. The main block has an extremely low hipped roof and a deep wooden cornice. The tower is the most notable feature with central double doors and a double window on the second floor, both under a shallow arch. Brick corbels support a plain wooden cornice above which is a square mansard design roof for the tower with a dormer in each side and iron filigree railing around the top of the roof. On each side of the tower along the factory walls are six pilasters or shallow buttresses creating five recessed bays with a 9 over 9 window on both floor levels. The ends of the building are five bays wide, the central bay on each level containing double doors across the entire width under shallow arches. The back side is a simple eleven bays in length and of similar design. There is also a detached brick smokestack that is probably original. Numerous additions have been made, but Silk Mills signs painted on the building are still evident.

HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION

According to an agreement made September 25, 1889 (ACDB 93-424) the Charlottesville Industrial and Land Improvement Co. erected the building and conveyed it and a certain quantity of land (Block 2 of the Rose Hill Platt (ACDB 97-34)) to James and James A. Armstrong. "Upon consideration that they occupy said building for the manufacture of knit goods -- and employ sixty to seventy hands for a five year term and an average of one hundred day laborers." By 1890 the Armstrongs occupied the building. Since the Armstrong Knitting Co. the building has been in continuous industrial use. In 1903 the H.C. Marchant Manufg. Co. (DB 125-252) acquired the building possibly in connection with Marchant's Woolen Mills operations, with the intent to manufacture silk products. From Marchant the building passed to the Charlottesville Silk Mills (DB 154-193) in 1913. In 1923 the factory was assumed by Amalgamated Silk from the N.Y. Trust Co. that held a 1922 mortgage (DB 46-151) (DB 41-344-411). Amalgamated Silk conveyed the property in 1924 (CB 49-179) to Schepp & Rosenthal, which conveyed it to Julius Rosenthal and from him to S & R Silk Mills (Pres. William J. Schepp). S & R Silk Mills became William J. Schepp, Inc. in 1932 (DB 72-46) and in 1939 that corp. deeded the land to the Peoples Nat. Bank. Present owners acquired it in 1966.

SIGNIFICANCE

This is one of only 3 or 4 buildings in the area in the Second Empire style and a very impressive 19th century industrial building.

CONDITIONS

Very Good

UTM: 17/720780/4212550

SOURCES

City Records
County Records
(DB 97-348; 111-285; 276-522)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only
received
date entered

Continuation sheet

Item number

Page 4 of 9

Multiple Resource Area
Thematic Group

Name Charlottesville Multiple Resource Area

State Virginia

Nomination/Type of Review

Date/Signature

31. Cocke Building

Substantive Review

Keeper Ret.

Attest _____

32. Dabney-Thompson House

Substantive Review

Keeper and Lisa Duhis 4/10/84

Attest _____

33. Gardner-Mays Cottage

Substantive Review

Keeper Linda McClelland 10-20-84

Attest _____

34. Armstrong Knitting Factory

Substantive Review

Keeper Linda McClelland 10/20/84

Attest _____

35. Nimmo House

Substantive Review

Keeper Ret.

Attest _____

36. Barringer Mansion

Substantive Review

Keeper Linda McClelland 10/20/84

Attest _____

37. Keith House

Substantive Review

Keeper Ret.

Attest _____

38. Harmon House

Substantive Review

Keeper Ret.

Attest _____

39. Eddins-Tilden House

Substantive Review

Keeper Ret.

Attest _____

40. Locust Grove

Substantive Review

Keeper Linda McClelland 10-20-84

Attest _____

Review

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

Armstrong Knitting Factory (Charlottesville MRA)
VIRGINIA

Working No. 9/7/82-2425
Fed. Reg. Date: 2.1.83
Date Due: 10/1/82 - 10/22/82
Action: ACCEPT 10/21/82
 RETURN
 REJECT

Federal Agency: _____

- resubmission
- nomination by person or local government
- owner objection
- appeal

Substantive Review: sample request appeal NR decision

Reviewer's comments:

*Relies heavily on #7 + 8 as
general form for hist. and content.*

Recom./Criteria Accept A+C
Reviewer L. McClelland
Discipline A. Hist.
Date 10/20/80
 see continuation sheet

Nomination returned for: technical corrections cited below
 substantive reasons discussed below

1. Name

2. Location

3. Classification

Category	Ownership	Status	Present Use
	Public Acquisition	Accessible	

4. Owner of Property

5. Location of Legal Description

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

has this property been determined eligible? yes no

7. Description

Condition		Check one	Check one
<input type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> deteriorated	<input type="checkbox"/> unaltered	<input type="checkbox"/> original site
<input type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> ruins	<input type="checkbox"/> altered	<input type="checkbox"/> moved date _____
<input type="checkbox"/> fair	<input type="checkbox"/> unexposed		

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

- summary paragraph
- completeness
- clarity
- alterations/integrity
- dates
- boundary selection

8. Significance

Period _____ Areas of Significance—Check and justify below

Specific dates _____ Builder/Architect _____

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)

- _____ summary paragraph
- _____ completeness
- _____ clarity
- _____ applicable criteria
- _____ justification of areas checked
- _____ relating significance to the resource
- _____ context
- _____ relationship of integrity to significance
- _____ justification of exception
- _____ other

9. Major Bibliographical References

10. Geographical Data

Acres of nominated property _____

Quadrangle name _____

USGS References _____

Verbal boundary description and justification _____

11. Form Prepared By

12. State Historic Preservation Officer Certification

The evaluated significance of this property within the state is:

_____ national _____ state _____ local

State Historic Preservation Officer signature _____

Title _____ date _____

13. Other

- _____ Maps
- _____ Photographs
- _____ Other

Questions concerning this nomination may be directed to _____

Signed _____ Date _____ Phone: 202 272-3504

Comments for any item may be continued on an attached sheet

*Architectural And Historic
Survey*



Graphics



Architectural and Historic



Journey

Graphic

35-132

196 (M)

Please refer to the map in the
Multiple Property Cover Sheet
for this property

Multiple Property Cover Sheet Reference Number: 64000882