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7. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

Pocahontas Island Historic District is located on the northern edge of the city of Petersburg. Originally, it lay across the main channel of the Appomattox River from the city’s center but a diversion channel cut in 1915 north of the island is now the main river channel and separates Pocahontas Island from Chesterfield County. The original channel is only a small fragment of the original river bed and Pocahontas Island can now be accessed by land from downtown Petersburg. Today, Pocahontas is a quiet, primarily residential neighborhood with a view of the buildings and church spires of downtown Petersburg. The neighborhood consists of mostly frame, predominantly one-story dwellings that date from the turn of the twentieth century with only two buildings that are known to have survived from before the Civil War. A tornado in 1993 tore diagonally across the island from southwest to northeast drastically changing its landscape. Many of the homes on the island were damaged or destroyed by the tornado, creating more open space than historically existed in this once densely urban neighborhood. The historic district contains 47 contributing buildings and 14 noncontributing buildings and 6 contributing sites. The noncontributing resources are houses built after the tornado to replace those destroyed by the storm.

DESCRIPTION

Pocahontas was laid out in 1749 in a grid pattern that survives today with most houses aligned along the east/west streets Rolfe and Witten and the cross streets Logan and Sapony. The island was once more densely built up than it is today. Warehouses, storehouses, and wharves lined the waterfront of the Appomattox River and historic sketches show an urban landscape.1 Logan Street and the north side of Witten Street towards its east end retain that urban density. The streets of Sapony and Pocahontas have few historic buildings today. Only one house survives on Sapony Street, a two-story, frame dwelling at 747 Sapony (123-0114-0050). One historic house (123-0114-0048) and two noncontributing buildings stand on the north side of Pocahontas Street, which once was lined with buildings. The contributing building on Pocahontas Street is a one-story, frame cottage with the gable end to the street. Roper Brothers lumberyard occupies the south side of Pocahontas Street down to the former riverbed, where warehouse and wharves once stood. Although a lumber yard has been located here for many years, no historic buildings survive and it is not included in the historic district boundaries.

The 1993 tornado destroyed or damaged many of the houses on the island. Consequently, there are fewer homes in Pocahontas today and the landscape is much more open than it would have been historically. The existing houses (historic and new) all retain the same street setback with fairly small front yards. Some of the houses still retain a low concrete wall or curb that delineates the front of the lot. Few historic outbuildings survive and most houses do not have any outbuildings, historic or modern.

The 1915 Appomattox River channel serves as both the physical and visual northern boundary of the neighborhood. The new Pocahontas Bridge that carries U.S. Route 1 from Colonial Heights in Chesterfield County to Petersburg is a visual western boundary of the island. Also on the western end and within the historic district boundaries are the remnant railroad tracks of the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad and the site of the railroad depot (44PG472). When this railroad was constructed in the 1830s, its tracks terminated on Pocahontas Island and cargo and passengers had to be shipped by wagon into Petersburg. From the 1830s through the 1860s, the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad depot served as Petersburg’s main passenger and freight station. Recent archaeological excavations revealed the relatively intact...
foundation of the depot measuring approximately 300 feet (north-south) by 30 feet (east-west). The best-preserved section of the foundation consisted of several layers of brick in course.²

Today Pocahontas is primarily residential, but historically it was more of a mixed-use community. When surveyed in 1975, there were at least two churches in the neighborhood. The Pocahontas Chapel, destroyed by the 1993 tornado, was built shortly after the Civil War to serve the newly freed African American community. The chapel has been reconstructed since the tornado. The second church is no longer standing. Recent archaeological excavations identified the site of the Pocahontas Distilling Company, Inc., a local whiskey distillery that operated between 1911 and 1916. The site (44PG474) is located on the northwest side of the intersection of Rolf Street and Magazine Road. The excavations revealed that this site was also the location of earlier domestic occupations that spanned the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as well earlier Native American occupation. This site represents a chronologically broad range of occupations as well as a mixture of uses, domestic and industrial.³

The earliest surviving house on the island, known as the Jarratt House (123-0114-0002), is located at 808-810 Logan Street. Tax records indicated a date of construction about 1819-1820. It was definitely standing in 1820 when buildings first were valued separately from land in the land tax books. The house is also the only surviving brick building in Pocahontas and is a good example of Federal-style domestic architecture in Petersburg. It is a two-story, six-bay, brick, double house with two exterior-end brick chimney and the two doors located in the center of the façade. The double house is divided into mirror images with a single-pile, side-passage plan on each side. The façade is constructed of smooth handmade bricks laid in Flemish bond that joins the rougher brick on the sides in an odd fashion. Both the sides and rear are laid in three-course American bond. The façade also has a very unusual brick cornice with header bricks projecting beyond the plane of the cornice to resemble a modillioned cornice. The rear has a traditional and well-executed sawtooth cornice. The house originally had nine-over-six-light sash windows on the first floor with six-over-six-light sash windows on the second floor, all topped with gauged-brick jack arches. The two front doors have plain header lintels. The house is now in poor condition and all the windows and doors are covered with boards. The house had additions to the rear and remnants are still visible.

Archaeology has also been conducted at the Jarratt House (44PG470). Excavations here revealed considerable evidence of intact cultural features including those associated with the initial construction of the house as well as features likely associated with the former frame additions on the rear.⁴

The house located at 213-215 Witten Street (123-0114-0016) is the only other pre-Civil War dwelling known to have survived in Pocahontas and is locally called the Underground Railroad House. Standing by 1838 when mention of a double house with a center chimney appears in a property deed, it is a story-and-a-half, frame, double house that is now sheathed in bricketex. Just the opposite of the Jarratt double house, the doors for this house are located at either end of the façade and the chimney would have been in the center although it is now missing. Each unit had its own front porch although the porch deck now continues across the entire façade. At some point, the eastern façade door was covered with bricketx siding. The house has a shed-roof extension across the rear. Archaeological excavations at this house (Site 44PG471) yielded evidence of intact cultural features associated with the dwelling and lot and included both domestic and architectural materials. The excavations also revealed evidence for a former brick bulkhead entrance to the cellar. Native
American lithics and diagnostic historic ceramic types were recovered as well and suggest that there was activity on this lot prior to the construction of the present dwelling.\(^5\)

The remaining dwellings located on Pocahontas Island were built after the Civil War and most are frame and one story in height. There are also several shotgun houses in Pocahontas. The shotgun house type was a popular building type in the South especially in urban areas where building lots were narrow. However, they are not as prevalent in Virginia as they are in other southern cities such as New Orleans, Atlanta, and Louisville, Kentucky. They were predominantly built between the end of the Civil War and the 1920s. An influx of people to cities, both immigrants and transplants from rural areas all hoping to fill rapidly emerging manufacturing jobs, created a demand for housing in cities. Shotgun houses were thus built to fulfill the same need as rowhouses in Northeastern cities. Some scholars of architectural history argue that the shotgun type derives from Haitian and African housing sources.\(^6\)

Shotgun houses are long and narrow with the gable or narrow end to the street. The rooms, from three to five, are aligned one behind the other with the room doors all having the same alignment. This arrangement made optimum use of natural ventilation. Two shotgun houses were frequently paired to create a double shotgun. The double house type was also a popular house type in Petersburg. The term “shotgun” is usually said to come from the saying that a shotgun could be fired through the front door and the pellets would fly through the house and out the back door without hitting anything.

Several shotgun houses survive in Pocahontas. The house at 226-228 Rolfe Street (123-0114-0026) is an example of a small double-shotgun house. It is a one-story, four-bay frame house with the gable end oriented to face the street. Each unit has a one-bay front porch and a corresponding rear porch. Other double shotgun houses are located on Logan Street. A single shotgun at 710 Logan Street (123-0114-0046) is a small, two-bay frame house with a one-bay front porch. Although the façade has been partially veneered with brick, the sides retain their original weatherboards.

The one-story, side-gable house appears to have been a popular house type in Pocahontas and several are located on Witten Street. Usually three bays wide, they have a center chimney and a full-width front porch. Examples in Pocahontas are located at 147, 207, and 211 Witten Street (123-0114-0015, -0059, and -0061). The side-gable house located at 143 Witten Street (123-0114-0057) is a one-story double house with a four-bay facade. These all appear to have been built in the first quarter of the twentieth century.

Besides the Jarratt House, the only other masonry dwelling is located at 129 Rolf Street (123-0114-0006). Built around 1920, this is a one-story, gable-end-entry house constructed of rusticated concrete block. The gable roofs of the house and the front porch each have a slight kick at the eaves.

Most houses are only one story in height but there are several two story dwellings located on Witten and Logan Streets. Most of the two-story houses appear to have been built at the turn of the twentieth century or early in that century. One of the largest is located at 208 Witten Street (123-0114-0060). Built in the 1920s, this is also the only known architect-designed house on Pocahontas. It was designed by William Edward Lee, Jr. for his parents. This two-story frame house is two bays wide and is sheathed with bricktex. It has an exterior-end brick chimney and a fairly steeply pitched hip roof of
standing-seam metal. The one-story porch may originally have wrapped around the side of the house but has been partially enclosed. Bricktex is an asphalt sheathing material designed to look like brick. It came in sheets measuring approximately 18 x 28 inches and was nailed over the original siding. Numerous older dwellings were once covered with bricktex for many of the same reasons that newer synthetic sidings such as aluminum and vinyl are used. As the older buildings have either been rehabilitated or demolished, fewer buildings sheathed in bricktex survive. The house located at 228 Witten Street (123-0114-0017), another large two-story house, was sheathed with brcktex when it was initially surveyed in 1975 but is now covered with vinyl siding.

The Pocahontas community has a long and significant history as it evolved from a typical white-dominated town in the eighteenth century to a largely African American community during the first half of the nineteenth century. The buildings that survive today in Pocahontas were constructed for the most part at the turn of the twentieth century or in the early part of that century and represent housing built for African Americans. The dwellings are typical of houses built elsewhere in Petersburg during this time period. The double house, a staple of Petersburg housing stock, is represented in Pocahontas by both of the earliest surviving houses, the Jarratt House and Underground Railroad House. Double houses built during the early twentieth century are also located there. Pocahontas has a sizeable collection of shotgun houses, both single and double. This house type is associated with African American communities but was also built for immigrants and workers who flocked from the country to the city to take advantage of new manufacturing jobs. Today, Pocahontas is a quiet residential neighborhood where many of the residents are related to one another. It is representative of the African American community in Petersburg and their long involvement in the history of this city.

Inventory - Standing Structures

Logan Street

**Logan Street  123-0114-0001**

*Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1900*

2006 Survey - This is a small, one-story, two-bay frame dwelling sheathed with T-111 with a gable roof. There is a two-bay front porch with turned posts. There are two interior brick chimney flues. Windows are replacement two-over-two light horizontal sash.

*Individual Resource Status: Dwelling  Contributing Total: 1*

**Logan Street  123-0114-0044**

*Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1900*

This is a two-story, three-bay, frame dwelling on a low foundation. The house is sheathed with weatherboards. There is a gable roof of standing-seam metal and an interior brick chimney. There is a full width front porch with wrought-iron railing and posts. The original windows appears to have been two-over-two lights but most have been replaced. There is a one-story, shed-roof section across the rear.

*Individual Resource Status: Dwelling  Contributing Total: 1*
709 Logan Street  123-0114-0045
*Primary Resource Information:* Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1900
This is a two-story, three-bay, frame dwelling sheathed with synthetic siding. There is a low-pitched hip roof with an interior brick chimney. There is a one-story, one-bay front porch with paneled posts and wood railing. There is a one-story section across the rear.
*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling  Contributing  Total: 1

710 Logan Street  123-0114-0046
*Primary Resource Information:* Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1915
This is a small, one-story, two-bay, frame, shotgun-type dwelling. The building is sheathed with weatherboards on the side with T-111 on the rear and upper portion of the facade. There is brick veneer on the lower half of the facade. There is a one-bay front porch with wrought-iron posts supporting a gable roof. There is an exterior-end concrete-block chimney flue on the rear. Windows are a combination of two-over-two vertical and horizontal lights.
*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling  Contributing  Total: 1

715 Logan Street  123-0114-0042
*Primary Resource Information:* Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1920
This is a small, one-story, two-bay, gable-end entry, frame dwelling sheathed with synthetic siding. The house has a gable roof of composition shingle. There is a three-bay front porch with turned columns and plain railing. Windows are six-over-six light double-hung sash.
*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling  Contributing  Total: 1

716 Logan Street  123-0114-0043
*Primary Resource Information:* Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1940
This is a one-story, four-bay, frame, double house on a brick foundation with pressed board siding and a gable roof of composition shingles. There is an interior brick flue. There is a one-story, three-bay front porch. The windows are boarded up.
*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling  Contributing  Total: 1

717 Logan Street  123-0114-0041
*Primary Resource Information:* Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1950
This is a one-story, gable-end entry, frame, double house on a low foundation with synthetic siding. Composition shingles cover the gable roof and there is at least one interior chimney. There is a one-story front porch with heavy screen that obscures the facade.
*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling  Contributing  Total: 1
### 723 Logan Street  123-0114-0039
*Primary Resource Information:*  
**Dwelling, Stories 1.00,**  
**Style: No Style Listed, post 1993**

This is a one-story, three-bay, gable-end entry, frame house on a low foundation of concrete blocks and is sheathed with synthetic siding. It has a gable roof. There is a one-bay, gable-roof front porch with wrought-iron posts and concrete steps.

*Individual Resource Status:*  
**Dwelling** Non-Contributing  
**Total:** 1

### 724 Logan Street  123-0114-0040
*Primary Resource Information:*  
**Dwelling, Stories 1.00,**  
**Style: No Style Listed, ca 1940**

This is a one-story, three-bay, gable-end entry, concrete-block dwelling with a gable roof of composition shingles. At one time this was a four bay dwelling and one of the front doors has been enclosed concrete blocks. There is a one-story, two-bay front porch with wrought-iron posts. Windows are six-over-six light double-hung sash.

*Individual Resource Status:*  
**Dwelling** Contributing  
**Total:** 1

### 727 Logan Street  123-0114-0037
*Primary Resource Information:*  
**Dwelling, Stories 1.00,**  
**Style: No Style Listed, ca 1970**

This is a one-story, modern, frame dwelling sheathed with synthetic siding with a gable roof.

*Individual Resource Status:*  
**Dwelling** Non-Contributing  
**Total:** 1

### 728 Logan Street  123-0114-0038
*Primary Resource Information:*  
**Dwelling, Stories 1.00,**  
**Style: No Style Listed, ca 1950**

This is a one-story, four-bay, gable-end entry, concrete-block double house with a gable roof of composition shingles. There is a one-story, three-bay front porch with wrought-iron posts. There is an interior brick chimney flue.

*Individual Resource Status:*  
**Multiple dwelling** Contributing  
**Total:** 1

### 807 Logan Street  123-0114-0036
*Primary Resource Information:*  
**Dwelling, Stories 1.00,**  
**Style: No Style Listed, ca 1950**

This is a one-story, gable-end, frame building on a low foundation and sheathed with synthetic siding. Rolls and shingles cover the gable roof. Although the gable end is oriented to the street, there are two doors located on either side. A pent supported by straight brackets shelters the north door. There is a small stoop. Windows are a mixture and include six-over-six, two-over-two horizontal light, and two-light. There are two interior masonry chimneys.

*Individual Resource Status:*  
**Dwelling** Contributing  
**Total:** 1
Primary Resource Information: Multiple dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: Federal, 1819-1820

Architecture Summary,
1975: This circa 1795-1820 2.5-story brick Federal style double house is in fair condition at the time of this survey. The overall design of this building has not been altered. This fine example of Federal style architecture is with little doubt the finest structure on Pocahontas Island and should definitely be preserved. The transoms of this double house, and most particularly the brickwork at the cornice, are highly unusual. This very outstanding building is in bad need of repair.

Flemish bond, smooth handmade brick on facade, meshing with 3-course American bond and a rougher brick at the corners in a strange fashion. Exterior chimney at each end, flanked by small 4-light attic windows (glass gone). Nice closer brickwork. Original pine frames and sills in doors and windows. Original 6/6 sash. Gauged brick jack arches over windows; plain flat arches over door. Coping of bricks laid lengthwise can be seen in detail photo on south side at the top of the gable. Some modern brick and cement patching on south wall and chimney cap. Chimneys should be checked for safety. Note holes 18" above ground level in brick wall of facade; these gaps evidently supported the joists of a porch which extended across the front of the structure.

2006 Survey - This is a two-story, six-bay brick dwelling with a gable roof covered with standing-seam metal. The brick is laid in Flemish bond on the façade and three-course American bond and the sides and rear. The juncture of the façade brick and the brick on the sides of the house is clearly visible and unusual. There are two exterior-end brick chimneys laid in coursed bond that varies between three, four, and five courses. The stack above the roof line is missing on the southern chimney. The house has an unusual brick cornice on the front that appears to be a brick interpretation of modillions. The rear has a fine sawtooth brick cornice. All windows and the two rear doors have jack arches. The two front doors have header lintels. The windows and doors are covered with boards. The ghosts of former porches are visible on the rear.

Individual Resource Status: Multiple dwelling Contributing Total: 1

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1915

This is a two-story, three-bay, frame dwelling on a low foundation that has been parged and is sheathed with synthetic siding. It has a low pitched hip roof. The one-bay front porch has modern turned posts and wood railing. Windows are one-over-one light double-hung sash and are probably replacements.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Contributing Total: 1
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815 Logan Street  123-0114-0003
Primary Resource Information:  Single Dwelling, Styles 1.00, Style: Other, ca 1915
2006 Survey - This is a one-story, two-bay, frame dwelling sheathed with synthetic siding. Composition shingles cover the hip roof. There is a three-bay, full-width front porch with wrought-iron posts and railing and a canvas awning. There are two additions to the rear.  
Individual Resource Status: Single Dwelling Contributing Total: 1

912 Logan Street  123-0114-0034
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1970
This is a one-story, three-bay, modern frame dwelling on a low foundation with synthetic siding. Composition shingles covered the gable roof.  There is an integral three-bay front porch.  
Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Non-Contributing Total: 1

Pocahontas Street

141-143 Pocahontas Street  123-0114-0049
Primary Resource Information:  Civic, Styles 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1970
This is a one-story, three-bay building with synthetic siding and a gable roof of composition shingles. There is a wood stoop and stairs. This may be a manufactured building.  
Individual Resource Status: Civic Non-Contributing Total: 1

151 Pocahontas Street  123-0114-0048
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling, Styles 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1920
This is a one-story, three-bay, frame dwelling on a low foundation, sheathed in weatherboards with a gable roof of composition shingles. There are two interior brick chimney flues. There is a one-story, three-bay front porch with square posts and railing. Windows are one-over-one light double-hung sash. 
Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Contributing Total: 1

211 Pocahontas Street  123-0114-0047
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling, Styles 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1970
This is a modern, one-story, ranch type dwelling with a gable roof and a gable-roof porch.  
Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Non-Contributing Total: 1

Rolfe Street

224 Rolfe Street  123-0114-0024
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling, Styles 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1993
This is a one-story, three-bay, gable-end entry, frame dwelling with synthetic siding and a gable roof of composition singles. It has a one-bay, shed-roof front porch. Windows are 6/6-light double-hung sash. 
Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Non-Contributing Total: 1
125 Rolfe Street 123-0114-0018

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1890

This is a two-story, three-bay, frame dwelling on a parged masonry foundation. It has a low pitched hip roof with central chimney. The windows are two-over-two light double-hung sash. There is a one-story, three-bay front porch with plain columns and railing. The front door is four panel with the top panels having rounded tops. There is a one-story rear ell.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Contributing Total: 1

129 Rolfe Street 123-0114-0006

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1920

This is a one-story, three-bay, gable-end entry house constructed of rusticated concrete block. Composition shingles cover the gable roof. There is a two-bay front porch with a separate gable roof. The original porch posts have been replaced with decorative wrought iron posts and railing. There is also a wrought iron grill over the front door. There is an octagonal window in the gable end of the porch. Dwelling windows are one-over-one light double-hung sash. The front windows have shutters. There is one interior brick chimney flue.

Individual Resource Status: Single Dwelling Contributing Total: 1
Individual Resource Status: Shed Contributing Total: 1

133 Rolfe Street 123-0114-0019

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1900

This is a two-story, two-bay, frame dwelling covered with synthetic siding. It has a lot pitched hipped roof. There is a one-story, four-bay, wrap-around front porch with tapered posts on brick piers and a low brick balustrade. The windows in the main block are two-over-two light with six-over-six light in the rear ell. There is a one-story rear ell that has an interior-end brick chimney flue.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Contributing Total: 1

134-6 Rolfe Street 123-0114-0020

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.50, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1993

This is a modern 1-1/2 story, 3-bay, frame dwelling with a hip roof and an integral 3-bay front porch.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Non-Contributing Total: 1

206 Rolfe Street 123-0114-0021

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: Bungalow/Craftsman, ca 1920

This is a one-story, three-bay frame dwelling with weatherboard siding and a parged masonry foundation. It has a hip roof of composition shingles and an interior brick flue. There is an integral three-bay front porch with plain posts and railing. Sidelights flank the front door. The windows are 1/1-light double-hung sash.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Contributing Total: 1
217 Rolfe Street  123-0114-0022  
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1900  
This is a one-story, three-bay, frame dwelling sheathed with synthetic siding with a hip roof and two interior brick chimneys. The front porch is three bays with paired posts at the steps and a shed roof. The floor is concrete and there is a modern wrought-iron railing. Windows are two-over-two horizontal sash.  
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling Contributing Total: 1

218 Rolfe Street  123-0114-0023  
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1880  
This is a one-story, three-bay, frame dwelling with synthetic siding and a gable roof of composition shingles. There is a one-story, three-bay, shed-roof, front porch with wrought-iron posts and railing. There is a transom over the front door. Windows are three-over-one light double-hung sash and there is an interior masonry chimney. West side windows have metal awnings.  
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling Contributing Total: 1

223 Rolfe Street  123-0114-0025  
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1993  
This is a modern one-story, three-bay, frame ranch style house.  
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling Non-Contributing Total: 1
Individual Resource Status:  Garage Non-Contributing Total: 1

226-228 Rolfe Street  123-0114-0026  
Primary Resource Information:  Multiple dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1910  
This is a one-story, four-bay, frame, double-shotgun house sheathed with weatherboards on a low foundation. Composition shingles cover the gable roof with two brick chimney flues at the ridge line. There are two, one-bay, gable-roof front porches and two corresponding rear porches.  
Individual Resource Status:  Multiple dwelling Contributing Total: 1

227 Rolfe Street  123-0114-0027  
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1993  
This is a modern one-story, three-bay, gable-end entry frame house with synthetic siding and a gable roof. A one-bay, gable-roof porch shelters the entry.  
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling Non-Contributing Total: 1

229 Rolfe Street  123-0114-0029  
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: Bungalow/Craftsman, ca 1920  
This is a one-story, three-bay, frame dwelling sheathed with vinyl siding with a hip roof of composition shingles. There are two interior parged chimneys. The front porch is three bays with plain posts and a hip roof. The windows are replacements. There is an addition to the rear.  
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling Contributing Total: 1
230 Rolfe Street   123-0114-0028

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: Late 19th and 20th Century Revivals, ca 1930
This is a two-story, three-bay, frame house on a low concrete-block foundation sheathed with vinyl siding. It has a low-pitched hip roof. There is a one-bay front porch with turned wood posts and a hip roof. The windows are one-over-one light double-hung sash and shutters flank the facade windows. There is a one-story section on the rear with a modern wood deck.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling  Contributing  Total: 1

323 Rolfe Street   123-0114-0030

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: Bungalow/Craftsman, ca 1920
This is a one-story, three-bay, frame dwelling on a low foundation and sheathed with synthetic siding. Composition shingles cover the hip roof and there are two interior masonry chimneys. There is a full-width front porch with paired posts on rusticated concrete blocks. There is a metal railing for half the porch - the other half is screened. The porch has a metal awning. The windows are obscured by metal awnings. There are several additions, including a modern deck, to the rear.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling  Contributing  Total: 1

Individual Resource Status: Shed  Contributing  Total: 1

Individual Resource Status: Garage  Non-Contributing  Total: 1

334 Rolfe Street   123-0114-0031

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1993
This is a one-story, three-bay, gable-end entry, modern frame house with vinyl siding. It has a three-bay, gable-roof front porch.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling  Non-Contributing  Total: 1

338 Rolfe Street   123-0114-0032

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: Late 19th and Early 20th Century American Movement, ca 1940
This is a one-story frame dwelling on a low foundation sheathed with synthetic siding. It has a gable roof of composition shingles. Originally two bays, another bay was added to the west end. There is a one-bay front porch with shed roof. Windows are two-over-two horizontal light double-hung sash.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling  Contributing  Total: 1

350 Rolfe Street   123-0114-0033

Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: Colonial Revival, ca 1940
This is a one-story, three-bay frame dwelling on a parged foundation with synthetic siding. The side gable roof has a front facing gable on one end of the facade. There is one interior brick chimney. There is a one-bay front porch with a metal awning supported by wrought posts. Windows are six-over-six light and appear to be replacements. There is a shed roof addition to the rear and a modern deck on the east end.

Individual Resource Status: Dwelling  Contributing  Total: 1
Sapony Street

737 Sapony Street 123-0114-0050

**Primary Resource Information:** Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1915

This is a two-story frame dwelling on a low foundation sheathed with synthetic siding with a gable-front roof of composition shingles. There is a two-bay front porch with gable-front and shed roof. Windows are one-over-one light double-hung sash. There is a shed-roof extension down one side of the house.

*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling **Contributing Total:** 1

Witten Street

Witten Street 123-0114-0062

**Primary Resource Information:** Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1920

This is a one-story, front-gable, frame dwelling sheathed with weatherboards. There is a gable and hip roof. There are several doors on both sides. Windows are boarded up.

*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling **Contributing Total:** 1

127 Witten Street 123-0114-0051

**Primary Resource Information:** Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, pre 1915

This is a one-story frame house sheathed with synthetic siding with a hip roof of composition shingles. There is one interior brick chimney. There is a full-width front porch that is screened with a lattice lower half obscuring the facade. There is a shed-roof extension on the rear.

*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling **Contributing Total:** 1

128 Witten Street 123-0114-0052

**Primary Resource Information:** Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, pre 1915

This originally was a one-story, two-bay, gable-end entry frame dwelling with a gable roof. A large, shed-roof side addition was built onto the west side of the house. There is also a shed-roof extension on the rear. There is a screened front porch. There is one interior brick flue.

*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling **Contributing Total:** 1

130 Witten Street 123-0114-0054

**Primary Resource Information:** Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: No Style Listed, pre 1915

This is a two-story, three-bay, frame dwelling on a low foundation and is sheathed in synthetic siding. It has a low pitched gable roof. There is a shed-roof, full-width, screened porch on the front and a one-story, shed-roof extension across the rear with a screened porch on that. Windows are one-over-one and two-over-two light double-hung sash.

*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling **Contributing Total:** 1

*Individual Resource Status:* Shed **Contributing Total:** 1
131 Witten Street  123-0114-0053
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling,  Stories 2.00,  Style: Late Victorian, pre 1915
This is a two-story, frame dwelling on a low foundation and is sheathed with synthetic siding. The house has a hip roof of composition shingles. There is one chimney on the west end. There is a one-story front porch enclosed with screen. Windows are one-over-one light. There is a one-story, shed-roof extension across the rear.
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling  Contributing  Total:  1

134 Witten Street  123-0114-0055
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling,  Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1993
This is a one-story, frame, gable-roof church sheathed with modern siding. The double-leaf front doors are accessed by steps with a wooden railing. A handicap access ramp is located on the west side and across the rear. A louvered cupola topped with a cross is located at the front of the gable roof.
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling  Non-Contributing  Total:  1

138 Witten Street  123-0114-0056
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling,  Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1993
This is a one-story, three bay, frame house on a concrete-block foundation and is sheathed with synthetic siding. There is a hip roof of composition shingles. There is an integral, three-bay front porch with treated wood posts and railing.
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling  Non-Contributing  Total:  1

143 Witten Street  123-0114-0057
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling,  Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1900
This is a one-story, four-bay, frame, double house sheathed with synthetic siding. There is a gable roof of composition shingles. There is a full-width front porch with wood posts on a concrete floor. There is a shed-roof section across the rear.
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling  Contributing  Total:  1

147 Witten Street  123-0114-0015
Primary Resource Information:  Dwelling,  Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1915
This is a one-story, three-bay, frame dwelling sheathed with synthetic siding. There is a gable roof of composition shingles. There is a full width front porch that at one time was screened. Windows are two-over-two light double-hung sash.
Individual Resource Status:  Dwelling  Contributing  Total:  1
205 Witten Street  123-0114-0058
Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: No Style Listed, pre 1915
This is a two story, three-bay, frame house on a low foundation and is sheathed in synthetic siding. Composition shingles cover the gable roof. There is a shed-roof section across the rear. There is a one-story, hip-roof front porch with a metal awning that obscures the porch and facade. Windows are one-over-one light double-hung sash.
Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Contributing Total: 1

207 Witten Street  123-0114-0059
Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1915
This is a one-story, three-bay frame dwelling on a low foundation and is sheathed with synthetic siding. It has a gable roof of composition shingles. There in a single interior brick chimney. The one-story, three-bay front porch has plain posts on a concrete floor.
Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Contributing Total: 1

208 Witten Street  123-0114-0060
Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: Colonial Revival, pre 1915
This is a large, two-story, two-bay, frame dwelling on a low foundation and is sheathed with bricktex. The hip roof is covered with standing-seam metal. There are two interior masonry chimneys and a flue in a one-story rear section. The front porch is currently two bay and may have originally been a wrap-around porch that has been partially enclosed. Windows sash includes 3/1, 1/1, 2/2, and 6/6. There is a one-story rear section.
Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Contributing Total: 1
Individual Resource Status: Garage Contributing Total: 1

211 Witten Street  123-0114-0061
Primary Resource Information: Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, pre 1915
This is a one-story, three-bay, frame dwelling on a low foundation and is sheathed with weatherbords. The gable roof is covered with composition shingles and there are two central interior brick chimneys - one on each slope. There is a three-bay, full-width front porch with wood posts on a wood floor. A rear section has partially collapsed.
Individual Resource Status: Dwelling Contributing Total: 1

213-215 Witten Street  123-0114-0016
Primary Resource Information: Multiple dwelling, Stories 1.50, Style: Other, pre 1839
2006 survey - This is a one-and-a-half story frame dwelling sheathed in bricktex. Composition shingles cover the gable roof and there are two gable-roof dormers. The house originally was four bays with two front doors. The east door has been covered with bricktex. There are two front porches for each half of the house. Both have shed roofs. The west porch is one bay while the east porch is two bays. The raised foundation has been parged. There is a shed roof addition to the west side and a shed-roof extension across the rear.
Individual Resource Status: Multiple dwelling Contributing Total: 1
Individual Resource Status: Archaeological Site 44PG0471 Contributing Total: 1
223 Witten Street  123-0114-0063

*Primary Resource Information:* Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, ca 1950
This is a one-story, three-bay, frame dwelling on a low masonry foundation and is sheathed with synthetic siding. The house has a gable roof and a one-story, four-bay front porch with wrought-iron posts.

*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling  Contributing Total: 1

224 Witten Street  123-0114-0064

*Primary Resource Information:* Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: Late 19th and Early 20th Century American Movement, pre 1915
This is a two-story, two-bay, frame dwelling on a low foundation and is sheathed with synthetic siding. The roof is a low-pitched hip roof. There is a one-story, full-width front porch with a metal awning. Windows are two-over-two light double-hung sash. There is a one-story addition to the rear.

*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling  Contributing Total: 1

225 Witten Street  123-0114-0065

*Primary Resource Information:* Dwelling, Stories 1.00, Style: No Style Listed, post 1915
This is a one-story, three-bay, frame dwelling sheathed in asbestos shingles with weatherboard on the rear. It has a hip roof of composition shingles. There are two interior brick chimneys. The front porch is three bays wide with turned posts and wood balustrade. Windows are two-over-two light sash. There is an addition on the rear.

*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling  Contributing Total: 1

228 Witten Street  123-0114-0017

*Primary Resource Information:* Single Dwelling, Stories 2.00, Style: Other, ca 1875
2006 Survey - This is a two-story, three-bay frame house sheathed in synthetic siding. It has a lot pitched hip roof. There is a one-story, two-bay front porch with wrought-iron posts. Windows are two-over-two light double-hung sash. There is also a rear porch. The 1975 survey photo shows that this building was sheathed in bricktex at that time.

*Individual Resource Status:* Dwelling  Contributing Total: 1

Archaeological Sites

44PG0005

*Primary Resource Information:* Archaeological Site Middle Archaic – 19th Century
This is a multi-component site, with evidence of both prehistoric Native American and historic (late-eighteenth-and nineteenth-century) occupations. Stratigraphy across the site was somewhat inconsistent, with evidence of modern fill episodes likely associated with the construction of the recreation area to the east. However, there were scattered indications of a potentially intact prehistoric Native American stratum observed in the central portion of the site, in addition to subsurface historic cultural features.

*Individual Resource Status:* Archaeological Site  Contributing Total: 1
Richmond and Petersburg Railroad Depot 44PG0472

*Primary Resource Information: Archaeological Site 2nd Half 19th century – 1st Quarter 20th century*

This site consists of the archaeological component the former Petersburg depot of the Richmond & Petersburg Railroad. Excavations revealed the foundation of the depot, measuring approximately 300 feet (N-S) by 30 feet (E-W) remains relatively intact beneath less than 0.5 foot of fill. The best preserved sections of the building foundation consisted of several layers of bricks in course; in other areas, the early twentieth-century demolition had caused more damage, and the foundations were characterized by more scattered brick rubble.

*Individual Resource Status: Archaeological Site Contributing Total 1*

Vacant Lot, 301 Rolf Street 44PG0473

*Primary Resource Information: Archaeological Site 2nd Half 18th century – 20th century*

Testing consisted of the excavation of 24 test units throughout the vacant lot, the majority of which measured two feet square. Unit excavation yielded a large quantity of architectural and domestic artifacts, suggesting that the site was occupied from the mid- to late eighteenth-century through the twentieth century. A number of intact features were noted, the locations of which correspond with the early twentieth-century structures depicted on the Sanborn Fire Insurance map of 1915.

*Individual Resource Status: Archaeological Site Contributing Total 1*

Vacant Lot, 343 Rolf Street 44PG0474

*Primary Resource Information: Architectural Site 19th century – 20th century*

Archaeological testing consisted of the excavation of 34 shovel tests across the lot at 25-foot intervals, as well as 10 test units (2-foot-square and 3-foot-square). Testing suggested that much of the northern half of the lot was characterized by destruction layers most likely associated with the distillery. However, a significant quantity of domestic artifacts suggested an earlier occupation beginning in the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

*Individual Resource Status: Archaeological Site Contributing Total 1*
STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Pocahontas Island Historic District, located on the north side of the Appomattox River in the city of Petersburg, is a historic African American community dating from the mid-eighteenth century with evidence of earlier Virginia Indian occupation. The street grid is virtually identical to the one laid out about 1749. Pocahontas is significant for its evolution during the first half of the nineteenth century from a typical white-dominated river town to a largely African American residential and commercial neighborhood. Petersburg had the largest free black population of Virginia’s cities, and more free blacks lived in Pocahontas than in any other part of Petersburg. At least two dwellings survive from the antebellum period to reflect that story. The district also contains an abundance of archaeological sites with good integrity that illustrate the scope of Pocahontas’s history from prehistoric times through the twentieth century. Today, a quiet residential neighborhood where many of the residents are descendants of the earlier free-blacks, Pocahontas Island continues as a representative of the African American community in Petersburg and their long involvement in the history of this city.

JUSTIFICATION OF CRITERIA

The Pocahontas Island Historic District is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as locally significant under Criterion A for its association with African American history in Petersburg. It is eligible under Criterion C as an example of an evolved community with surviving buildings constructed over the course of almost two centuries. It is also eligible under Criterion D for its intact archaeological sites that are likely to contain diagnostic artifacts with the potential to reveal important information about the lifeways of the inhabitants from prehistory to the late twentieth century. The Pocahontas Island Historic District retains the integrity of its historic location, association, setting, feeling, and design.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Pocahontas Island Historic District is located in Petersburg on the north side of a bend in the Appomattox River, near the falls of the river. This neck of land did not become an island until 1915, when a diversion channel was constructed across the neck on the north side of the community. The diversion channel is now a more noticeable body of water than the original river channel.

Geography has kept Pocahontas, since its establishment in the mid-eighteenth century, relatively isolated from other communities. The Appomattox River to the south has separated it from the rest of Petersburg, while swamps, the diversion channel, and bluffs to the north have formed a natural barrier between Pocahontas and “mainland” Chesterfield County and, later, Colonial Heights. Physical isolation, as well as its transformation in the early nineteenth century from a white community to a predominately black enclave, has given Pocahontas its unique character and shaped its history.

Early in the eighteenth century, as the Virginia colony spread inland from the coastal plain, trading communities grew at the head of navigation (the “fall line”) of each major river. These communities included—from north to south—Alexandria, established on the Potomac River in 1749, Fredericksburg on the Rappahannock River in the 1720s, Richmond on the James River about 1737, and Petersburg on the Appomattox River about 1738. Like Richmond,
Petersburg had its origins in trade with Virginia Indians. Fort Henry, which had been erected about 1645 at the falls of the Appomattox River in response to the Powhatan Indian attack on the English settlements the previous year, formed the nucleus of the new town. Petersburg’s lots were laid out on the land of Abraham Jones in Prince George County about 1738; the town became part of Dinwiddie County when the county was separated from Prince George in 1752. Also about 1738, Blandford was developed on the land of William Poythress, just across the future county boundary in Prince George, east of Petersburg. Both communities were called towns by 1748. Another town—Pocahontas—was laid out in Chesterfield County just across the river from Petersburg and Dinwiddie County in 1749, when Chesterfield was formed from Henrico County, on the land of Richard Witton and at the site of a tobacco warehouse that John Bolling erected about 1732.7

Witton resided many miles to the southwest in Lunenburg County, where between 1745 and 1763 he patented thousands of acres. About 1749, he surveyed the new community on the Appomattox and recorded its dimensions and lots on a plat titled “The Plan of Wittontown in the County of Henrico,” assigning a number to each lot. He sold the first lot to Peter Gill, of Chesterfield County, on December 14, 1749, as well as a smaller parcel “forty by twenty-four feet by the Riverside,” assigning it the same number as the lot—27. By June 1751, Witton had sold thirty-five lots, eleven to residents of Prince George County, ten to Chesterfield County residents, seven to owners in Amelia County, four to Lunenburg County residents, and two to owners in Surry County (one lot was purchased by owners whose county of residence was not identified). After each sale, Witton recorded the owner’s name on the plat within the appropriate numbered lot. The Wittontown plat shows most of the area now called Pocahontas Island, with sixty-seven numbered lots of about half an acre each, as well as the smaller parcels along the north bank of the Appomattox River. The smaller parcels, located on a narrow strip of land above the river and below what is labeled “Swamp or Meadow,” probably were wharf sites for the residents. All but two bear numbers corresponding to the principal lots (the riverfront parcels do not bear the owners’ names). The area to the west and north of the town, corresponding roughly to the future location of the diversion channel, is labeled “Swamp” on the western part and “Meadow” on the northern portion. The plat also shows several unnamed streets that correspond to those on the island today. They include present-day Pocahontas (formerly Main) Street, Witten (first named Second and later Powhatan), and Rolfe (formerly Third)—all east-west streets—as well as a north-south street (later called Cross and now named Logan).8

During the legislative session begun in February 1752, the House of Burgesses passed an act that established the town of Pocahontas (named for the Bolling family’s alleged descent from Powhatan’s daughter). The legislature acknowledged that Richard Witton had already surveyed and divided the tract “into sixty six [sic] lots of half an acre each, and made sale of the said lots to divers persons, who have since settled and built, and continue building and settling thereon.” Several property owners were appointed “directors and trustees” of the new town: “John Bolling, Richard Eppes, Clement Reade, Augustine Claiborne, William Kennon, John Archer, Richard Royal, Robert Kennon, and Roger Atkinson, gentlemen.” The act forbade the construction of wooden chimneys (actually of wood coated with mud) to lessen the threat of fire. It also authorized the directors to establish a “public quay” and other public landings as well as to “direct the making of wharfs and cranes at such public landings, for the public use.”9

The legislature passed another act the same year that authorized the construction of a bridge across a narrow point of the Appomattox River just east of the present-day Doctor Martin Luther King Memorial Bridge (U.S. Route 1). The
Pocahontas Bridge, as it came to be known, facilitated transportation by road between Petersburg and Richmond, which lay about twenty miles to the north. John Bolling, Richard Eppes, William Kennon, Roger Atkinson, Robert Bolling, Frederick Jones, and William Pride—some of whom were also town trustees—were appointed overseers of the construction work. The act specified that the bridge was not to be “less than twelve feet in breadth, and railed on each side three feet high, with one arch across the channel, at last ten feet above high water, and thirty feet wide, for the passage of flats and other vessels.”

In a colony with bad roads and fee-charging ferries, a good bridge attracted comment. A traveler wrote in 1773 that he journeyed south from the vicinity of Richmond “and reached Blandford in the afternoon, having crossed the Appomattox by a lofty wooden bridge at the town of Pocahontas, one of the three towns at the falls of the Appomattox—Petersburg, Blandford and Pocahontas.” A British officer who visited Petersburg during the Revolutionary War after being captured at the Battle of Saratoga in October 1777 reported seeing the large wooden bridge at Pocahontas, “up to which sloops, schooners and small vessels continually sail.”

The bridge became a tactical target once the fighting moved to Virginia late in the war. During the infantry battle at Petersburg on April 25, 1781, the outgunned American forces retreated across the bridge and made a brief stand at Pocahontas before continuing their flight north to the heights. They also took up the bridge’s plank flooring to stop the pursuing British, who followed the next day anyway and then burned the bridge after them. Lafayette quickly rebuilt it, but later in May Lord Cornwallis burned it again. The destruction must have been thorough, as the bridge seems to have still been out of use late in April 1782, when the marquis de Chastellux visited Petersburg. The marquis wrote that “Petersburg is situated on the right bank of the Apamatock; there are some houses on the opposite shore, but this kind of suburb is a district independent of Petersburg, and called Pocahontas. We passed the river in a ferry-boat, and were conducted to a little public house” in Petersburg. If the bridge had been repaired by then, Chastellux, who had ridden southeast from Chesterfield Court House, would have used it instead of a ferry to cross the river to Petersburg.

Three years after the battle at Petersburg and Pocahontas, in May 1784, the General Assembly passed an act incorporating the town of Petersburg and uniting it with the towns of Blandford, Pocahontas, and Ravenscroft. Petersburg, like Pocahontas, had existed as a town for years before incorporation. Ravenscroft was a suburb located south of early Petersburg. The newly combined town was thriving because of its role as an inland port, due in part to Pocahontas and its vital role in commerce and trade.

Pocahontas was an important commercial site during its early years. Tobacco warehouses and inspection stations—descendants of John Bolling’s 1732 tobacco warehouse on the site of Pocahontas—flourished there and in Petersburg by the 1780s. They drew trade from the surrounding countryside and as far south as North Carolina. Lumberyards stood close to the river on the Petersburg side by 1783, and mills were likewise established. By 1795, Pocahontas was advertised as “an agreeable retreat from the noise of the town” of Petersburg, which suggests that it was becoming more of a residential community and less of a commercial or industrial center. Two insurance policies from 1803 show what may have been typical houses in Pocahontas. William Rowlett’s dwelling, a one-story, frame, three-bay, hall-parlor-plan house, had two dormer windows, exterior end chimneys of brick, and measured thirty by sixteen feet. It had a brick foundation, a cellar, and a rear shed addition measuring twenty-eight by ten feet. William and Charles Corling’s house was more
substantial: two stories, three bays, one exterior end chimney of brick, and a side-passage plan. It also had a brick foundation and a cellar. In addition, there were two outbuildings, a wooden smokehouse and a wooden kitchen.\textsuperscript{14}

Although the first property owners in Pocahontas, such as Rowlett and the Corlings, were almost all white males, their slaves and an increasing number of free blacks formed an ever-growing part of the population. According to the 1790 census, 310 free blacks lived in Petersburg; by 1830 the number was 2,032, and by 1860 it was 3,244. Many of them flocked to Pocahontas, so that during the first half of the nineteenth century, “Pocahontas became a section inhabited by free Negroes,” according to Petersburg historians. The laws of the Commonwealth required “Free Negroes and Mulattoes” to register periodically with local authorities, who measured them, noted any distinguishing marks, described their skin color, and recorded their occupations. Several of Petersburg’s registers survive and range in date from 1794 to 1864. They provide a fascinating glimpse into the state’s system of social control during the early Republic and antebellum periods. Individuals, recently freed slaves sometimes bearing only one name, appeared before the hustings court, and free blacks who had just moved to Petersburg also registered. Mothers or fathers brought their children; elder children came with siblings in tow. Re-registrations took place when physical characteristics or marital status changed. The rules hardened during the antebellum years, especially after Nat Turner’s slave uprising in 1831, as the words “free” and “black” or “Negro” appeared contradictory in the opinion of many whites. Cities and towns offered free blacks more employment opportunities than the countryside, and communities such as Pocahontas—densely populated free-black neighborhoods—afforded some relief from the prying eyes of whites. Although free blacks have been called “slaves without masters” because of the numerous laws that were enacted to control their lives, many found relative freedom nonetheless within such black-dominated enclaves such as Pocahontas.\textsuperscript{15}

The transformation of Pocahontas from a typical “white” river town in the mid-eighteenth century to a densely populated free black community a century later occurred mostly during the three decades preceding the Civil War. According to the land tax records, in 1820, Pocahontas’s lots were divided among forty-two identified owners (estates, resident owners, and nonresidents); there were also some lots for which owners were unidentified. Five landowners were African American (two living and two estates), thirty were white (living or estates), and seven could not be identified as to race. In 1830, there were seven black owners, thirty-two whites, and seven of unidentified race. Fourteen blacks, thirty whites, and twelve persons of unidentified race owned lots there in 1840. By 1850, there were eighteen black, forty-three white, and seventeen racially unidentified owners. In 1860, thirty blacks owned lots, compared to thirty-eight whites and sixteen of unidentified race. Proportionally, blacks accounted for 12 percent of all owners—black, white, and unidentified racially—in 1820, while the latter two categories amounted to 71 and 17 percent respectively. In 1830, the proportions were 15 percent black, 70 percent white, and 15 percent unidentified; in 1840, respectively 25 percent, 54 percent, and 21 percent; in 1850, 23 percent, 55 percent, and 22 percent; and in 1860, 36 percent, 45 percent, and 19 percent. Black ownership grew significantly in the 1830s, in other words, and even more in the 1850s.\textsuperscript{16}

Why did free blacks flock to Pocahontas? Simply put, changes in white Virginians’ attitudes toward free blacks, expressed in the increasingly restrictive laws passed by the General Assembly, helped drive free blacks to Pocahontas for reasons relating to safety, prosperity, and a measure of independence. In the years following the American Revolution, white Virginians took at least some of the rhetoric of liberty seriously, and a wave of manumissions occurred before 1800. The slavery system remained unchanged, and free blacks could not vote, serve on juries, or testify against whites, but
individual slaveholders could and did free their bondsmen without governmental interference. This began to change after the turn of the nineteenth century as the free-black population exploded, especially in Petersburg. Numbers of free blacks from Haiti had settled there, bringing dangerous notions (in the opinion of many white Virginians) from that conflict-ridden island, where the whites were ousted in 1803. The General Assembly responded to the fears of Petersburg whites, among others, in 1805 by forbidding free blacks from carrying guns and also requiring newly liberated blacks to leave the state after one year. Individual manumissions ground quickly to a virtual halt. In 1815, however, the state relaxed the manumission law by empowering local governments to grant free blacks permanent-resident status, and emancipations increased again. The growing back-to-Africa movement for free blacks that gained momentum in the 1820s, with some success, as well as the lack of servile or free-black insurrection, also calmed the fears of whites.

All of that changed late in the summer of 1831, when a slave named Nat Turner led a group of followers on a campaign of slaughter in Southampton County. The governor called out the militia, Turner was eventually hunted down, tried, and hanged, and his followers were likewise executed, confined, or transported out the state. Innocent slaves and free blacks were caught up and killed as well in the frenzy of retribution and hysteria that swept white Virginia. The General Assembly briefly considered whether the answer to such violent episodes lay in dismantling slavery or in crushing the slaves, and decided on the latter approach. Free blacks were affected as well. Teaching blacks to read and write became a criminal offense and black congregations could meet only if whites were present, while free blacks could no longer carry firearms at all, could only buy slaves if they were family members, were denied jury trials except in capital cases, and became subject to the same punishments as slaves (mostly whipping). In Petersburg, because the large free-black population could not be policed, its members were frequently subjected to white scorn and petty harassments, such as being compelled to step off the sidewalk to let white persons pass.

For Petersburg’s free blacks, the easiest way to mitigate the misery caused by such laws and ordinances was to congregate in their own neighborhoods away from the prying eyes of whites. It is no surprise, then, that Pocahontas—isolated by the Appomattox River from the rest of Petersburg and probably less desirable for white residences because of its low-lying, flood-prone terrain—became attractive to free blacks. From a small number in 1820 and earlier, the free-black population of Pocahontas grew quickly after the disaster of 1831, as the more prosperous of them bought lots and houses there. The dramatic change in ownership, however, does not tell the whole story, for most free blacks did not own their homes but leased them from white and black owners.

By 1860, Petersburg had become Virginia’s haven for free blacks. A total of 3,244 lived there, and they comprised almost 18 percent of the city’s population of 18,266. By comparison, smaller numbers of free blacks lived in Virginia’s other major cities in 1860: Richmond, 2,576 (less than 7 percent of the total population); Alexandria, 1,415 (11 percent); and Norfolk, 1,046 (7 percent). That year, the population of Pocahontas was 510, with 395 free blacks (77 percent) and 119 whites (23 percent). More than twice the proportion of free blacks (77 percent) lived in Pocahontas, then, than owned lots there (36 percent), and about half the proportion of whites (23 percent) were occupants versus landowners (45 percent). Although other parts of Petersburg had predominantly free black neighborhoods easily identified by scrolling through the census microfilm, Pocahontas has more pages of free black households than any other section of the city. Pocahontas had
become what was a rarity in Virginia until the Jim Crow era of the later nineteenth century: a racially segregated, predominately black community.\textsuperscript{19}

The census record provides a snapshot of Pocahontas in 1860. All but twenty-two of the white residents were born in Virginia; one was born in North Carolina, one in Scotland, two in Massachusetts, three in New York, and fifteen in Ireland. All of the blacks were Virginia-born but one—seventy-year-old John Updike of Rhode Island. Although many of the residents, both white and black, no doubt crossed the Pocahontas bridge to work in Petersburg, Pocahontas was, for free blacks, the center of a vibrant if not especially prosperous community. White occupations included four laborers, three grocers, two watermen, two blacksmiths, two hotel keepers, two clerks, and one each of the following: attorney, baggage agent, barkeeper, bookkeeper, broker, butcher, carpenter, gardener, horse trader, huckster, merchant, physician, railroad engineer, schooner master, tailor, and tinner. All were men; no women held employment. In contrast, many of the black women of Pocahontas worked: one was a nurse, six were laborers, eight seamstresses, eleven washerwomen, and thirty-four tobacco stemmers. One woman was a tobacco twister, compared to thirty-one men who performed that job; only one man was a stemmer. There were ten male laborers, ten fishermen, eight sailors, five cooperers, four carpenters (including two apprentices), four cartmen, three watermen, three hucksters, two shoemakers, two waiters, two draymen, and one barber, caulker, ditcher, fishmonger, porter, train hand, and upholsterer.\textsuperscript{20}

The stories of two antebellum residents of Pocahontas in particular enliven the statistics and demonstrate the success some free blacks had in achieving a measure of independence from white authority. Richard Jarratt, an early free-black owner of property in Pocahontas, established a family and business that survived him for many years. The saga of Eliza Galle, who owned property northeast of the intersection of Sapony and Rolfe Streets, encapsulates the resiliency of free black women during the period. In addition, two dwellings survive from the antebellum years to illustrate the community’s development during that era: the frame “Underground Railroad” double house at 213–215 Witten Street and John Wilder’s brick double house at 808–810 Logan Street.

Richard Jarratt was born free about 1779 and reared in Chesterfield County. He was living in Pocahontas by 1807, when his son Alexander was born. At about age thirty, on December 11, 1809, Richard Jarratt appeared before the Petersburg hustings court to register as a free black. He was described as a “dark brown Mulatto man” standing five feet seven and three-quarter inches tall in his shoes. He had “a long scar about the middle of his forehead and . . . a Cut about the first joint of his left thumb.” Jarratt’s trade was recorded as “waterman.” He must have prospered, for on May 3, 1815, he bought a half-acre lot in Pocahontas from William J. Calvin (Calvin’s father, Joseph, had purchased it from Robert Stewart, Jr., in 1791). The lot, number 12, was located on the north side of Third Street (at present-day 217-223 Rolfe Street). It probably was unimproved until Jarratt bought it and constructed a house for his family; the rental value increased from zero in 1815 to $60 in 1816, according to the land tax books. In 1820, the first year in which the tax books recorded the values of buildings on lots, Jarratt’s tract had $393.75 worth of buildings on it. The rental value remained at $60, further suggesting that Jarratt built the house shortly after acquiring the lot in 1815.\textsuperscript{21}

Jarratt’s prosperity may have been in jeopardy in 1824, however, when he mortgaged his lot as well as a source of his livelihood as a waterman, his half-interest in a sloop named the \textit{Jolly Sailor}. Jarratt was indebted to Robert Hamilton, a Petersburg resident, for $200, and he pledged the lot and vessel as security for repaying the debt by January 20, 1825. The
Jolly Sailor was built in New Bedford, Massachusetts, in 1793 and registered with the federal government on Nantucket on August 27, 1823, as required by laws governing the “coasting trade and fisheries.” When it was registered at the port of Petersburg on October 25, 1823, the ship was described as having “one deck, and one mast, and . . . her length is fifty seven feet, and her breadth sixteen feet four inches, her depth four feet nine inches, and . . . she measures thirty-eight and 50/95ths Tons; she is a sloop and has a square stern, no galleries, and a billet head.” There is no further record regarding the vessel, but since Jarratt continued to own his lot and house, presumably he retained his share in the ship as well. In 1828, Jarratt bought another lot in northwestern Pocahontas, part of a tract owned by the late Jonathan Curtis. Jarratt paid David Cary $300 for it, but when he sold it to Rebecca Brown the next year, he received only $130.22.

Richard Jarratt died about 1838 without leaving a will. His four children, however, divided his property amicably, reflecting the wishes their father had expressed while he was alive. Alexander and Thomas Jarratt shared equally in the estate with their sisters, Charlotte Jarratt and Lucinda Jarratt Holland, but because Richard Jarratt wanted each of his sons to receive one of the two “tenements” (the two halves of the double house), his daughters yielded their interest in it to their brothers. Because Thomas Jarratt was under age, Charlotte and Lucinda relinquished their shares to Alexander Jarratt immediately and then to Thomas when he came of legal age to inherit. They reserved to themselves, however, “the right if they or either of them think proper to have the privilege of putting up a house or houses for them . . . each to live in (not to rent out or sell) and to have each one fourth of the Lot taking the same where no house now stands.” The siblings thus avoided competition for tenants.

Although the brothers Alexander and Thomas Jarratt owned the house jointly thereafter, Alexander Jarratt occupied it while Thomas lived elsewhere in Petersburg. Alexander Jarratt had registered as a free black with the hustings court on January 6, 1829, and then reregistered on March 20, 1830. He was born in Pocahontas of free parents on November 19, 1807, and reared there. He was described as being “a bright mulatto man,” five feet nine inches tall in his shoes (his height was revised downward to “rather under 5 feet 9 inches” in 1830). He bore three identifying scars: one on the calf of his right leg, a second on his left wrist, and a third on the back of his head just below the hairline. Like his father, he was a “waterman.” The 1860 census recorded him as a “fisherman,” fifty-two years old, the owner of $600 worth of real estate and $100 of personal property (he paid taxes on $25 worth of furniture). He needed the furniture for his large family: his wife, Nancy, aged forty-seven, and nine children ranging in age from two to eighteen.

In contrast with free black men, relatively little is documented about the lives of the free black women of Pocahontas. Eliza Gallee (nee Boswell) is a rare exception. She was born free about 1801 and reared in Petersburg. After her parents died, she lived with a woman named Eliza Kennon, who owned a lot and house that “was of considerable value . . . it being a handsome two story white house.” When Boswell was not quite fifteen years old, Kennon tried to persuade her to marry sixteen-year-old Joseph Gallee, a free black who was teaching school in Petersburg. Boswell, who cared nothing for Gallee, refused. Kennon promised Boswell that if she married Gallee and he abused her, Kennon would give her the house and lot, but Boswell still refused. One day, however, Kennon, Boswell, and Gallee rode to North Carolina in a hack that Kennon had leased, and there she prevailed on Boswell to marry Gallee. When they returned to Petersburg, the Gallees lived in a small house at the rear of Kennon’s lot. The marriage was miserable but fairly brief. It soon became clear that Gallee hoped to gain control of his wife’s inheritance, which he had been told amounted to $15,000 (in reality it was $1,500); perhaps Gallee and Kennon had schemed to share the fortune. Gallee beat his wife after he got drunk using
money she lent him to pay off debts and start a business, and she fled to a neighbor’s house. From that point on they lived apart while he sank into dissolution and petty crime. A few years later, Eliza Gallee asserted her independence, using her inheritance to buy and develop real estate in Petersburg.\textsuperscript{25}

Her first purchase, made through a trustee so that Joseph Gallee would “have no concern or control over the same,” was of a lot on the east side of Union Street in Petersburg, on September 8, 1832, for $375. She bought a second lot, also on the east side of Union Street, near the Methodist church, on July 19, 1838. She paid $250 for the second lot, sold part of it to Patrick Foley in March 1839 for $50, then borrowed $350 from him to have John Fitzpatrick build her a brick house on the remainder of the lot. The house was completed by July 1839, when Gallee sold it and the lot to Catherine A. Cooke. The next month, through Cooke, “her next friend,” Gallee filed for divorce from Joseph Gallee. In part because her vagabond husband was difficult to find and serve with a summons, Eliza Gallee did not gain her divorce until November 27, 1840. In the meantime, on August 8, 1839, she bought for $700 a lot on Washington Street in Petersburg that included “the eastern tenement in the Brick house and about twenty five feet” of street frontage. On January 30, 1844, Gallee insured this house, in which she resided, for $450, and described it as “one story high, walls brick, roof wood, 15 by 30 feet.”\textsuperscript{26}

Gallee sold the first lot she bought (for $375 in 1832 on Union Street) for $1,000 on June 10, 1843. She sold the Washington Street house in which she lived to Mary Ann Rebecca Williams for $400 on November 3, 1848, and Williams mortgaged the house to Gallee and a trustee on the same date. The mortgage was paid off and the transfer completed in 1849. These sales, including that of the house in which Gallee lived, may be explained by her growing involvement with a white man about eighteen years her junior, Henry Badger. At some point, perhaps in the 1840s, Gallee had acquired at least two slaves: Susan, aged about thirteen in 1847, and George, aged about six or seven. On August 26, 1847, Gallee put up the two children as security for Badger’s recognizance for good behavior and a subsequent court appearance on charges of “unlawful gaming.” Badger was fined $30 on November 30, 1848, and Gallee retained her slaves for the time being. In the 1850 census, she was reported as owning one unnamed slave, a female aged fourteen (perhaps Susan, assuming her age was merely a guess).\textsuperscript{27}

Eliza Gallee shared a household, probably in Petersburg proper, with three other women in 1850: Jane Ivins, aged thirty-six, M. Ivins, aged 16, and Mary Richards, aged thirty-six. Ivins and her daughter were reported as black, Richards as white, and Gallee as mulatto. At about the same time, Gallee and Badger, separately, began buying lots in Pocahontas. Badger bought a lot on February 2, 1850, “with the buildings and appurtenances thereunto belonging,” for $455 on present-day Roslyn Lane from a trustee as a result of an Elliott family lawsuit. Next, on April 20, 1852, he purchased a lot in Petersburg on Gilliam Street. On May 4, 1852, Gallee bought a lot in Pocahontas from Thomas N. Deaton for $300, and Badger bought a lot there the next month, on June 18, from James Lynch for $800. His lot fronted on a street opposite the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad depot and tracks, and was located west of the McCutchan Oil Company tanks. Another of James Lynch’s lots bordered it to the south, and a lot owned by the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad Company lay to the north. Badger next bought a lot on the south side of Third Street (present-day Rolfe Street) for $293, again as the product of a lawsuit. Here Eliza Gallee resided when on 19 December 1857 she purchased an adjoining lot to the south that fronted on Second Street (now Witten Street) for $535.50. It had belonged to Alexander Stevens and his wife Mary Ann Stevens, both recently deceased, and Gallee bought it from their estate at the conclusion of a Stevens family lawsuit.\textsuperscript{28}
Gallee and Alexander Stevens had a history—one with most unpleasant consequences for Gallee. In November 1853, Stevens accused Gallee of stealing cabbages from his garden, and because the parties were considered free blacks (Stevens and his wife were recorded as “black” in the 1850 census, while Gallee was reported as “mulatto”), the case was tried in the mayor’s court, where Gallee was adjudged guilty. Petty offenses of this sort would have resulted in a fine had she been white, but as a black she was sentenced to receive thirty-nine lashes on her bare back at the public whipping post. Gallee fought back, hiring three Petersburg lawyers and one from Richmond, and taking her case to the Petersburg hustings court. “If the Commonwealth, God bless her,” observed a local newspaper, “has not met her match in Miss Liza, it won’t be for lack of lawyers.” In March 1854, when the case came to trial, Gallee’s small army of attorneys argued first that she was not a mulatto but a descendant of whites and Indians, therefore deserving to be tried (and if found guilty, sentenced) as a white person. When that failed to convince the court, they asserted her innocence, but that did not succeed either. Gallee was convicted and sentenced to receive twenty lashes. Although she considered an appeal, Gallee probably realized that the deck was stacked against her, dismissed her lawyers, and took her whipping. Perhaps it gave her some satisfaction, almost three years later, to become the owner of her accuser’s property.29

That Gallee and Badger grew closer in the mid-1850s is evidenced by a joint deed written on September 25, 1856, in which they sold part of their respective lots in western Pocahontas to the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad Company, which had constructed a bridge and track there in 1851. A dispute had arisen over the railroad right-of-way, and to settle it Gallee and Badger sold strips of their properties to the company for a total of $600. A railroad company map, undated but probably from this period, shows the tracks and various lots bordering them, including Henry Badger’s as previously noted, and Eliza Gallee’s lot and house just west of the northeastern corner of the intersection of Witten and Sapony Streets.30

In 1860, Eliza Gallee lived in a dwelling in Pocahontas that included two households. One contained a black family (Cornelius and Sarah Heath and Margaret Pelham), while Gallee’s household included her and Henry Badger, as well as William Robertson, another white man, perhaps a lodger. Gallee, whose age was given as fifty-eight, owned real estate valued at $1,500 and personal property in the same amount, making her one of the more well-to-do inhabitants of Pocahontas. Her Virginia taxable personal property included a watch valued at $50 and $100 worth of furniture; she also paid taxes on two female slaves aged at least twelve. The census record, however, noted that she owned two female slaves, one of age four and the other thirty-five. Badger, aged forty, owned no slaves, but did possess a horse or mule worth $100, a carriage valued at $40, a $50 watch, and other personal property worth $25.31

Gallee’s elder slave, whose name was given as “Maria Gallee,” died of “brain fever” on October 1, 1860. Gallee may have fallen ill herself soon thereafter. On December 5, 1860, she wrote a brief last will and testament, and she died by April 29, 1861, when the will was presented to the hustings court. William Robertson and Richard Boyd had witnessed the document, in which Gallee named Henry Badger executor. She wrote simply that she left “to my friend Henry Badger all my property both real and personal.” Badger disappeared from Petersburg not long afterward, selling his Petersburg lot on Gilliam Street in 1862. A man of that name is listed as a private in the Third Battalion Virginia Reserves, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Fletcher H. Archer, in the defense of Petersburg during the Civil War. Perhaps Badger enlisted and died in the war; he does not appear in the 1870 census of Virginia or North Carolina.32
Eliza Gallee was a woman who defied convention as well as stereotypes—and, occasionally, the law. She transformed herself from a persuadable girl and battered wife to an entrepreneur who bought lots, built houses, and leased and sold property. At a time when women—especially black women—had few rights, she stood up for those she had, hiring lawyers and fighting charges of theft. She also defied the greatest of her era’s taboos when she associated herself with Henry Badger, a white man and far younger as well. In addition, although the law considered her a free black (mulatto in the census records), the personal property tax books usually listed her among the whites rather than listing with other blacks or identifying her as “colored.” Her claim of Indian and white ancestry may not have been a mere legal ploy but a firm belief, and one she backed with defiance of the laws requiring the registration of “free Negroes and mulattoes,” for she never registered. Regardless of her ancestry, Gallee embraced many of the privileges that whites enjoyed, even to the owning of slaves. Although Eliza Gallee may not have been typical of the free black women of Pocahontas, she did epitomize the longing for true freedom that they all possessed. To a greater extent than most of her contemporaries, Gallee successfully willed herself to escape the system that confined women and blacks.33

Other blacks found other ways to escape, especially from the confines of slavery. White slaveholders lived in fear of slave uprisings, which were rare, and of the killings of individual masters by angry slaves, which were just common enough to promote feelings of paranoia among many whites. White lawmakers responded by passing increasingly harsh legislation to restrict the activities not only of free blacks but of slaves, and to punish undesirable behavior. Bondsmen resisted in a variety of ways: work sabotage, “insolence,” fighting back against overseers or masters, the occasional murder, and—most commonly—by running away. During the antebellum period, about 1,000–1,500 blacks escaped from slavery annually throughout the South; perhaps 100,000 escaped successfully between 1790 and 1860. Gradually, there evolved a network of people, white and black, who were sympathetic to the plight of slaves and willing to help them escape to free states or to Canada. This network became known as the Underground Railroad.34

Because the very nature of the Southern branch of the Underground Railroad required secrecy, there is no direct evidence suggesting that Pocahontas was a “station” along one of its many “rail lines.” Other factors, however, suggest that it may have been a center of such activity. As a relatively isolated community densely populated with free blacks, most of whom probably would have been sympathetic and helpful to escaping slaves (Eliza Gallee, a slaveholder herself, may not have been among them), Pocahontas may have been an attractive hiding place. The white residents of Petersburg may have avoided the neighborhood. When the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad Company constructed a bridge over the Appomattox River from Petersburg to Pocahontas in 1851, white Petersburg residents were not impressed with the Pocahontas depot or the appearance of the neighborhood. One critic called it “a general depository of antiquities and iniquities” with “scary looking streets and antedeluvian houses.” The neighborhood’s riverside location, its function as a “port” for Petersburg, the fact that many free blacks there were engaged in sailing and fishing, and the availability of rail transportation, also would have made it an appealing “stop” on the way north, since port and river towns were well-known as safe havens for escaping slaves. For example, John Henry Hill, a Petersburg slave, escaped from a Richmond auction house in 1853 as he was about to be sold, hid first in a Richmond kitchen, then returned on a forged pass to Petersburg, where “a very prominent Colored person, who was a friend to Freedom” concealed him until he finally escaped by steamer to Canada via Richmond and Norfolk. The principal elements that Hill employed in his escape—sympathetic blacks and river transportation from port towns—were available in abundance in Pocahontas. Finally, Pocahontas has a strong oral
tradition of having been a “station” on the Underground Railroad, and that tradition relates directly to one of the
tantebellum dwellings still standing there. The house’s association with the Underground Railroad is even less certain than
for the community of Pocahontas, but neither can the possibility be dismissed entirely.35

A frame, one-story, double house that at one time had a central chimney is located at 213–215 Witten Street. Known
locally as the “Underground Railroad House,” it stands on part of Richard Witton’s lot 28, which appears to have remained
unsold, and probably unimproved, until 1770, when George Robertson, of Chesterfield County, bought it. Although he
paid Witton then, no deed was executed until 1787, when Witton’s son and heir, Richard Witton, Jr., made it over to
Robertson. Robertson owned, at various times, eight or nine lots in Pocahontas; it appears that many or all of them were
unimproved, as the rental value given in the land tax books remained minimal until his death about 1797. In Robertson’s
will, written in 1795, he bequeathed lot 28 to his son Archer Robertson, who in 1802 sold it—probably still unimproved—
to John Brander. Brander must have constructed a dwelling on the lot about 1805, as the next year the rental value was
reported as $60 as opposed to $7 for 1805. The rental value increased to $80 in 1812 and $120 in 1815, thereby reflecting
continuing improvements. John Brander died about 1819; the next year, the property was recorded as “John Brander’s
estate.” In 1820, the first year that building values were given in the land tax books, the value of buildings on the lot was
$875, and the rental value was $114. Between 1820 and 1839, the buildings value remained at $875, but the rental value
slowly declined to $60 in 1837. A year later, a new owner acquired the property.36

In 1838, Brander’s heirs sold lot 28 to Samuel V. Brown, who less than four months later divided it into an eastern and a
western half and sold the western half to Walter Williams. Brown retained the eastern half, which included half of a house
standing in approximately the middle of the lot. The house, which faced south, had a central chimney with rooms on either
side. Unfortunately for both parties to the transaction, however, the new lot line did not pass through the exact center of
the house but “a few inches” through Brown’s side, technically denying him access to the central chimney and his own
fireplace in the room. The house had been constructed slightly to the west of the center of the lot. Because Brown’s
necessary living space, then, intruded slightly onto Williams’s side of the lot, the deed contained provisions—as well as an
addendum—detailing the matter and reserving Brown’s right of access to the full extent of his living space in addition to
part of the yard outside his front door. The parties also agreed that if the house ever burned down or fell into ruin, then the
new lot line would be confirmed, so that Williams’s rights to the entire western half of the lot would be preserved. This
deed strongly suggests that the dwelling called the “Underground Railroad House,” a one-story, frame, double house that
used to have a central chimney, was standing on lot 28 by 1838 and probably earlier.37

Walter Williams did not enjoy his complicated acquisition for long, for he sold it in 1840 to Carter H. Edloe to satisfy a
debt. The 1842 land tax book reflected the division of the property: each owner was charged with a building worth $150
and a rental value of $50. Brown likewise sold his half of the lot and house, in 1842, to Billy Brown, a free black man.
Edloe died by 1845, when his estate was recorded in the land tax books; the estate continued to own and rent out the
western half of the house at least through 1860. Billy Brown died after 1850, and his heir John Brown, and Brown’s wife,
Ann, both “colored persons” living in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, sold his half of the house and lot to John Hope, “a free
man of color” residing in Petersburg, in 1854. Hope evidently rented out his half of the house as well, because he was not
recorded as a Pocahontas resident in the 1860 census.38
A subsequent owner must have wearied of the potential problems that the house’s original off-center construction might cause with regard to the property line. An 1877 map of Pocahontas clearly showed the line passing through the dwelling. A 1915 map, however, recorded the house in its present location, entirely west of the Brown-Williams line, suggesting that in the interim the house was moved a few feet to a new site.39

The other antebellum building still standing in Pocahontas is the east-facing “Jarratt House” at 808-810 Logan Street, located on what was originally Lot 29. The six-bay brick dwelling is divided into two mirror-image units (a northern and a southern unit, each of two stories), with two stair halls in the middle of the building and a large room on either end. Upstairs, doors off each stair hall lead to a small room in the front of each unit and a large end room identical in size to the one on the first floor. There are no interior doors connecting the units. The eastern facade features Flemish-bond brick. The house is named for the Jarratt family discussed above, although John F. Jarratt did not purchase the dwelling until 1879.40

Richard Witton sold three half-acre lots (numbered 11, 29, and 53, as well as a small riverfront lot numbered 11), to “Theophilus Field, Gent.,” of Prince George County, for £22/10 in 1751. Field died before 1788 and left his property to his son Thomas Field, who died sometime later. Lot 29, which was listed as “unimproved” on the land tax books during the period 1790–1792, probably remained undeveloped until about 1819, as the rental value, which had always been minimal for what was essentially a vacant lot, was recorded as zero in 1817 and 1818. The sheriff of Chesterfield County had sold lot 29 in 1815 for nonpayment of taxes, and John Wilder purchased it from John F. May in 1817, as well as lot 11. The rental value of the two lots together rose from zero to $80 in 1819, perhaps reflecting the construction of a small dwelling on lot 11, and then the rental value of lot 29 alone jumped to $170 in 1820. This was also the first year that the land tax books reported the value of buildings, and the value for lot 29 was $1,312.50. Wilder was credited with “2 brick tenements”—the two halves of the brick double house—on the lot.41

Wilder died about 1824, leaving lot 29 and other landholdings to his son Joseph G. Wilder. Like his father an absentee landlord, Joseph Wilder rented out the house until his death in 1840. Wilder’s executor sold the lot and house in 1841 to Henry H. Robertson, who then subdivided the lot. Because the house had been constructed in the center, the new lot line ran from east to west through the building and divided it neatly into a northern half and a southern half. Robertson sold the northern half of the house and lot to William G. Wynn in 1841, and the southern half to Hugh Dooner in 1842. Dooner sold his half to John Finn the same year. Wynn held on to his northern half until 1853, when he sold it to Lavinia Sampson, a free black woman, in 1853. She lived there in 1860, when the census taker recorded her household. Sampson, aged fifty-one, was reported as a mulatto woman owning $3,400 worth of real estate (she owned several lots in Pocahontas) and personal property valued at $100. Elizabeth Graves, aged thirteen and also a mulatto, lived in the house, as did Major T. Duncan, a seventeen-year-old mulatto sailor. A white man, fifty-three-year-old John O. Tyree, also lived there and owned $2,500 in personal property, probably a ship, since his occupation is given as “master of schooner.” Finally, Edward Stevens, aged forty-five, and a black sailor, lived in the house as well. Whether everyone lived in the three rooms in the northern half of the house, or if some of them leased the southern half from Finn is unknown.42

Finn, who lived elsewhere in Petersburg and owned numerous lots, sold most of the northern half of his part of lot 29—the
part containing the southern half of the brick house—to Sampson in 1862. The deed mentioned the brick house

specifically, as well as the fact that she occupied the northern half. Fortunately for both parties, in contrast to the
“Underground Railroad House,” this double dwelling apparently was centered precisely on the east-west property line.
Sampson retained the lot and house until she died about 1877. Then in 1879, following a lawsuit to dispose of the tract,
John F. Jarratt, a son of Alexander Jarratt, bought the house and Lavinia Sampson’s lot.43

With the coming of the Civil War in 1861, many enslaved black people continued to liberate themselves but frequently
fled to the U.S. Army instead of across state lines or to Canada. Confederate authorities, meanwhile, put slaves to work
constructing fortifications, especially to protect strategically important cities such as Petersburg. Southern engineers
designed and mapped these defensive lines. An 1863 map of the “Approach to Petersburg and Defenses” shows the street
grid of Pocahontas, including the Pocahontas Bridge, and the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad bridge and tracks, as well
as the north-south Sapony and Logan Streets, the east-west Pocahontas, Witten, and Rolfe Streets, Haxall Lane, and a
street running diagonally between Pocahontas and Witten from southwest to northeast, connecting Sapony and Logan. No
sign of this street exists today.44

Throughout the Civil War, Petersburg remained vital to the Confederate war effort because of its rail and shipping
facilities. General Robert E. Lee among others, however, was frustrated by the lack of a connection between the
Richmond and Petersburg Railroad and the other lines that emanated from Petersburg. When the Richmond and
Petersburg Railroad was constructed in the 1830s, Petersburg merchants feared that goods would pass north through the
city to Richmond from the Virginia Southside and their businesses would suffer. The solution lay in making it easy for the
goods to stop in Petersburg and difficult to continue transporting them north. Products as well as passengers traveling
north had to be offloaded in downtown Petersburg and then carried across the Pocahontas Bridge by wagon—an added
expense as well as a nuisance. Lee wrote on June 18, 1861, to the Confederate convention urging the construction of
connections among the railroads in Petersburg: “All the guns, ammunition, etc., from Norfolk on reaching Petersburg have
either to be transported across the Appomattox to the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad [in Pocahontas] or forwarded to
the Richmond and Danville Railroad and to be again transported at Richmond. The transportation of troops has also been
delayed in the same manner.” Confederate authorities began negotiating with the railroad companies and Petersburg
leaders, who remained opposed to any permanent connections, over who would pay and how long it would take to
construct them. By 1863, the job was done; immediately after the war, the new track was taken up and the bed filled in.45

In 1864, as the opposing armies maneuvered south from the Rappahannock River after the Battle of the Wilderness in
May, the focus of each side in the conflict shifted to Richmond, the Confederate capital, and Petersburg. The latter was
especially important to Gen. Robert E. Lee and his Army of Northern Virginia, as Lee had anticipated in 1861, for the
Petersburg Railroad linked the city to Wilmington, North Carolina, by its junction with the Wilmington and Weldon
Railroad in Weldon, North Carolina. Trains transported essential supplies from Wilmington, the only major port to remain
open in the South almost until the end of the war, despite the efforts of the U.S. Navy’s blockading squadron to stop the
trade in military contraband. Many of the supplies passed through Pocahontas via the newly completed connection with
the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad en route to Richmond and Lee’s army until the summer of 1864.

In June, after the bloody Battle of Cold Harbor north of Richmond, Lieutenant General Ulysses S. Grant, commander-in-
chief of the Union armies, and Major General George G. Meade, commander of the Army of the Potomac, stole a march on Lee and crossed the James River east of the Confederate capital. Their target was not so much Richmond as it was Petersburg, where the Army of the James, under Major General Benjamin F. Butler, was already launching attacks from the area known as the Bermuda Hundred peninsula. Soon, the Federals had invested Petersburg and Richmond, Lee’s right flank as he faced east, and a ten-month-long siege began. Lee’s strategy was to keep his army supplied from North Carolina and the Shenandoah Valley, defend the two cities from a Union assault, and seek a way to break out and defeat the Federals in the field. Grant and Meade countered by keeping a steady pressure on the strong Confederate fortifications fronting the cities, launching attacks here and there to force Lee to shift his forces frequently, and maneuvering slowly south and west of Petersburg to cut the Confederate line of communication with North Carolina and the Shenandoah Valley and compel Lee to extend his right flank westward—to the breaking point, Grant hoped.

During the siege, each side kept a close eye on the other to ascertain troop movements, watch for reinforcements, and anticipate attacks. Signal stations were located on high ground, on the roofs of tall buildings, and atop tree platforms and log towers. Federal and Confederate signalmen used flags to wigwag messages from station to station. They broke each other’s codes and read each other’s “mail.”

U.S. Army Signal Corps soldiers occupied a station east of Petersburg at the Friend house on June 16, 1864, near the very beginning of the siege. On June 22, they occupied five other positions including the Walthall house and the Jordan house, outside the city. From the former, they could observe “the left bank of the Appomattox from the hills back of Pocahontas to Fort Clifton,” and from the latter, “the street in Petersburg leading to the bridge crossing the Appomattox River from Petersburg to Pocahontas.” The detailed view that the stations afforded is apparent from a report filed by the Friend house signal station at noon on June 25: “Two trains of cars left Petersburg in the direction of Richmond this morning at 2 o’clock. One train of two passenger and ten box cars, and one train of eleven box-cars arrived at Pocahontas at 10 a.m.” Later on the same day, the station reported: “The trains have been passing to-day back and forth upon the Petersburg and Richmond Railroad. Five trains went toward Richmond and two came into Pocahontas from the direction of Richmond. Two trains going in direction of Richmond were not loaded.” Three days later, the Jordan house station reported cavalry activity in addition to railroad movements: “Locomotives are more active than usual in Petersburg and Pocahontas this a.m. A column of cavalry has moved out of Petersburg in direction of Pocahontas; twenty-five minutes in passing a point.”

On October 2, 1864, after a major attack on the Confederate defenses east of Richmond at Fort Harrison and New Market Heights on September 29, there were reports of significant movements from a number of Federal observation posts. The chief signal officer wrote: “Several [Confederate] camps upon the north bank of the Appomattox northwest from Pocahontas have disappeared. Forty ambulances came toward Petersburg from the direction of Richmond; also one regiment of infantry.” The Friend house station reported that “a column of about 1,000 infantry passed into Petersburg . . . going toward the Appomattox or in direction of Pocahontas” at 4:45 p.m. on October 11.

In the spring of 1865, the military situation changed suddenly when on April 1 the Federals broke through or “turned” the Confederate right flank at Five Forks, south and several miles west of Petersburg. Now Grant had access to the
Confederate rear and ordered all-out attacks on the lines for the next morning. Breakthroughs at several points allowed

Union troops to march into Richmond and Petersburg within twenty-four hours, and Lee ordered the evacuation of both
cities. The Army of Northern Virginia began its retreat west on April 2–3, while fires raged in the night in Richmond.
Lee planned to pause briefly in Amelia County to await supplies, then turn south as soon as possible to join General
Joseph E. Johnston in North Carolina. Perhaps once his and Johnston’s armies united, they could defeat Major General
William T. Sherman’s army there and then turn on Grant. But Grant quickly sent his infantry and cavalry after Lee to
harass the Confederate rear, block the swing south into North Carolina, and eventually surround the depleted and
exhausted army at Appomattox Court House on April 9.

At Petersburg during the last weeks of the war, the Federal signal corps maintained their stations near the city. Several
sites afforded views of Pocahontas and the surrounding country. The Walthall house station “commanded a view of parts
of Petersburg [and] points on the Richmond and Petersburg road north of Pocahontas,” while another station on a hickory
tree on high ground near the Friend house permitted observation of “a road leading north from Pocahontas [and] the
enemy’s batteries on the left bank of the Appomattox.” The Avery house station had a good view of the same road. It was
probably these stations that reported some of the early signs of evacuation on April 2, particularly from the direction of
Pocahontas: “Large fires in Petersburg burning all day. Heavy wagon trains moving on north side of Appomattox, going
north, and a long column of troops moving north toward city, from direction of lead-works, in the afternoon. Re­
enforcements to the enemy of infantry, coming from the north side of Appomattox, also reported about noon.” On April 3,
the signal corps joined in the pursuit of Lee, abandoning its Petersburg stations and marching west to establish new posts
and keep the army commanders informed. The battle for the city was over; next came occupation and liberation.48

Newly freed slaves migrated to Pocahontas in large numbers, drawn by the black community already there and looking for
employment opportunities away from the plantation and the farm. The neighborhood, however, suffered the same sort of
economic collapse in commerce and trade as did the rest of Petersburg, Virginia, and the South generally. Overcrowding
and unemployment were rampant in Pocahontas. The Freedmen’s Bureau (Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and
Refugees), established by Congress on March 4, 1865, assisted by establishing schools, helping blacks find work,
arbitrating labor disputes, and investigating claims of unfair treatment. Northerners sympathetic to the plight of the
freedmen also formed organizations to raise money and sent agents south to work among the blacks and defend their
interests. On August 18, 1866, for example, the New York Freedmen’s Relief Society joined local trustees in purchasing a
vacant lot in Pocahontas where the society had “caused to be erected . . . a School house or Chapel” for educational,
religious, and “other kindred benevolent purposes.” The Pocahontas Chapel, as it came to be known, stood on the lot until
the tornado of 1993 destroyed it. A reproduction of the building has since been constructed on the original foundation.49

Gradually, the economic life of Pocahontas began to revive, in part because of a resurgence in rail transportation as
commerce and trade began to pick up. On November 28, 1867, a train pulled into the Pocahontas depot bearing the
president of Washington College, Robert E. Lee, who was on his way to Petersburg for the wedding of his son William H.
F. “Rooney” Lee. Amid applause for the former general from a large crowd, a band serenaded him with the Marsellaise—
the French anthem—in lieu of Dixie, then climbed aboard and continued playing as the train continued slowly into the
city.50
By early in the 1870s, Pocahontas’s commercial enterprises were mostly located near the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad depot. Four of Petersburg’s five wood and coal dealers operated in Pocahontas, for example, three of them near the depot. Both of the community’s grocery stores were located near the Pocahontas Bridge, just south of the depot. By 1877, a steam sawmill stood between Haxall Lane and the Appomattox River, while a powder magazine was located on the narrow neck of land east of the residential area and just west of the present-day sewage treatment plant. Elsewhere in the community, commercial fishermen and a baker lived and worked. John Jarratt attempted to revive the family commercial-fishing business but ultimately did not succeed. He later worked as an oyster dealer, laborer, and river pilot, while his brother William also tried fishing but eventually became a laborer as did their brother Thomas.

Pocahontas seems to have regained its prewar diversity of occupations by the 1880s. More than two hundred black residents were employed as “carpenters, cooks, confectionery dealers, coal and wood merchants, fruit dealers, . . . grocery store operators . . . helpers, hucksters, laborers, millers, porters, shoemakers, ship carpenters, washerwomen, and wheelwrights.” Increasing industrialization, and periodic economic downturns such as the Panic of 1893, however, periodically reduced the number of black businessmen and often restricted black employment opportunities to such categories as laborer and barber. At the same time, in the southwestern corner of Pocahontas between the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad Bridge and the Pocahontas Bridge, on the river, sat two boathouses belonging to the Appomattox Rowing Club, a white organization. Rowing and boating clubs had been popular in Petersburg since the 1840s.

Several businesses and industries established themselves in Pocahontas late in the nineteenth and early in the twentieth centuries. They included ice and coal companies located mostly between Haxall Lane and the Appomattox River near the bridge and rail yards. The Petersburg Wood Supply Company and the Standard Oil Company each had operations on either side of Saponyi Street just north of the intersection with Pocahontas Street by 1908. Other companies operating in Pocahontas about the same time included the Columbia Peanut Company on the south side of Pocahontas Street across from the oil company warehouse, and the Pocahontas Distillery Company (eventual producers of Richards’ Wild Irish Rose wine) at the northwest corner of Rolfe Street and Roslyn Lane, in northeastern Pocahontas. Roper Brothers Lumber Company occupied most of the area between Haxall Lane and the Appomattox River by 1915.

Beginning early in the twentieth century, the black population of Pocahontas grew as more jobs became available in nearby Hopewell. Older dwellings were altered, added onto, or demolished for new bungalows and one-story cottages. Black architect William E. Lee, Jr., designed the Lee-Dixie House at 208 Witten Street for his parents in 1928. It is one of the few two-story frame dwellings in Pocahontas. Lee, a Petersburg native, was one of Virginia’s earliest black architects. He studied at Hampton Institute earning degrees in 1928 and 1938. He began his career as a teacher working in Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Missouri. He spent most of his active years in St. Louis. Lee was also one of the first black architects to become a corporate member of the AIA. Periodic floods, however, especially in 1910 (destroying the Pocahontas Bridge) and the 1920s, swept across the island and drove many inhabitants to “mainland” Petersburg. The population gradually declined during the twentieth century, and the small stores that were such an important part of community life eventually all but disappeared.
On August 6, 1993, at about 1:30 p.m., a devastating category F4 tornado struck Petersburg and Pocahontas Island. The wind speed, estimated from damage in downtown Petersburg, may have reached 225 miles per hour. The tornado cut a twelve-mile-long swath through Petersburg, Colonial Heights, Prince George County, and Hopewell, stayed on the ground for fifteen to twenty minutes, killed four people and injured more than two hundred, and caused $47.5 million in damage. The Old Towne section of Petersburg and the historic community of Pocahontas Island were especially hard hit. Many houses in Pocahontas were damaged beyond repair, and the beloved Pocahontas Chapel was demolished.56

Several state and federal agencies soon arrived in Pocahontas to assess the damage and coordinate aid. The Virginia Department of Historic Resources assisted with technical advice and by evaluating the neighborhood’s potential eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The department’s evaluation team found the Pocahontas Island Historic District potentially eligible for listing on September 2, 1993. Since then, the Pocahontas Chapel has been reconstructed, dwellings have been repaired, and several new houses have been built.57

Between December 2005 and April 2006, the James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc., conducted intensive archaeological testing of six widely distributed sites within and just outside the proposed Pocahontas Island Historic District. The purpose of the testing was to evaluate the integrity and research potential of sites at different locations that encompass both the prehistoric and historic occupations of Pocahontas Island. The sites included the Jarratt House (44PG470), the “Underground Railroad House” (44PG471), the former Richmond and Petersburg Railroad depot (44PG472), a domestic site spanning the eighteenth through twentieth centuries in the vacant lot at 301 Rolfe Street (44PG473), the early-twentieth-century Pocahontas Distilling Company whiskey distillery site at 343 Rolfe Street, which also included a nineteenth- and twentieth-century domestic component (44PG474), and one previously inventoried site (44PG5) with prehistoric Native American and historic domestic components. These sites retained a high degree of physical integrity and yielded significant concentrations of diagnostic artifacts and evidence of intact cultural layers and features. Because these sites are widely distributed and retain their integrity, it appears that there is a high potential for additional high-integrity archaeological resources throughout the nominated district. These documented and potential resources contribute to the overall significance and eligibility of the district under Criterion D.58

The resources found in the Pocahontas Island Historic District reflect the long history of this community, which originated as a white-dominated river town in the mid-eighteenth century and evolved into a significant free-black commercial and residential center in the decades before the Civil War. The built environment ranges in date from early in the nineteenth century to the late in the twentieth century and illustrates the physical changes that have occurred there over more than two hundred years. Archaeological sites throughout the district retain sufficient integrity to relate important information about the daily lives and changing fortunes of Pocahontas’s inhabitants from prehistoric times to the recent past. In addition, an abundance of historic local, state, and federal records offer an outstanding opportunity for further research, study, and interpretation of Pocahontas Island’s rich history.
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