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Summary Paragraph

South Garden is located on a rural estate at 6331 Pocahontas Trail in New Kent County, Virginia. The historic two-story, single-pile, side-passage dwelling (Period I), the one-and-one-half-story north addition (Period II), and the one-story north shed roofed addition (Period III) were constructed between c.1825-1840. Tax records indicate that Charles Smith constructed Periods I and II of South Garden between 1825 and 1826, and after William C. Smith inherited the property, he constructed the Period III shed roofed addition on the north elevation by c.1840.\(^1\) A non-contributing one-and-one-half-story south addition was constructed in the 1940s by then-owners Melville C. and Alice Reams. The wood frame dwelling retains its significant interior woodwork, much of which is finely detailed with ornament such as horizontal and vertical reeding and fluting, urns, flowers, and sunbursts. To the north of the house is a well of indeterminate age with modern features at the surface. There are no outbuildings on the property. After purchasing the home in 1939, Melville and Alice Reams undertook a series of alterations to the house to provide additional rooms and modern amenities, but retained the historic circulation,\(^1\)

 design, and materials of the nineteenth century portions of the dwelling. South Garden retains a high degree of integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and serves as an excellent example of a rural mid-nineteenth century dwelling.

Narrative Description

South Garden is a 29.94-acre residential and agricultural estate located on Pocahontas Trail (U.S. Route 60) in New Kent County, Virginia. Although the precise development history of the property remains partially obscured due to a significant loss of historical records in New Kent County, surviving tax records and physical evidence indicate that Charles Smith and Williams C. Smith constructed the earliest periods of South Garden between ca.1825-1840. The property was purchased by Melville R. and Alice Reams in 1939, after which time the Reams restored, updated, and added to the dwelling to make it habitable. Despite the alterations made in the mid-twentieth century, South Garden retains much of its original form, plan, and historic materials such as its remarkable interior woodwork and detailing.

The property is located on a low rise 200 yards west of U.S. Route 60 about three miles northwest of Providence Forge in New Kent County. A modern well with a brick collar and concrete pad is located just north of the dwelling. No other outbuildings are present. The dwelling is positioned at the edge of a field beyond which the land slopes off precipitously to the south and west. The slope to the south of the dwelling is terraced and was historically used as a garden. A modern pond and dam lie at the bottom of the slope on the western boundary of the property. Just beyond them are the CSX railroad tracks and the meandering Chickahominy River.

South Garden Main House (ca. 1825-1840, ca. 1940) – Contributing Resource

South Garden was built in four periods of construction between ca.1825 and 1958 (Figure 1). Charles Smith constructed the Period I two-story core of the dwelling in ca.1825, followed quickly by the Period II one-and-one-half story north wing between ca. 1825-1826. After inheriting the property, William C. Smith constructed the Period III one-story shed roofed addition on the north elevation in ca.1839-1840. The house existed in this configuration for roughly a century. In the 1940s, Melville and Alice Reams added the Period IV elevated south wing to the dwelling. Although the Period IV addition replicates some components of the woodwork detailing found in Period I, II, and III such as baseboards and window and door trim, it does not include the detailed chair rails or character defining reeding and fluting that is found throughout the earlier portions of the house. This lack of elaborate woodwork detailing in Period IV along with its elevated nature, which is out of character with nineteenth century residential design and construction, places it outside of the dwelling’s period of significance.

2 Carl Lounsbury, “South Garden: An Architectural Description,” January 24, 2022. Much of the architectural evidence within this National Register Nomination derives from Lounsbury’s 2022 report, and is included with the author’s permission.


Period I: The Original House, c. 1825

The original house measured 31.5 feet in length and 20.5 feet in width. The side passage is 11 feet 8 inches in width with an enclosed staircase rising along the north partition wall that separates it from the parlor on the main floor and a bedchamber on the second story. Though modest in size, with only two finished rooms on the first and second floors, the original portion of South Garden is impressive for its height. The building sits above an English Basement, the walls of which are laid in 1:5 common bond. The internal height of the cellar is 7 feet 11 inches from the brickbat paving (a twentieth-century improvement) to the underside of the exposed joists, which support the upper floor. The paving appears to sit directly upon the earthen floor, which may contain archaeological deposits associated with the construction and occupation of South Garden. The main floor is 10 feet 10 inches from floor to ceiling and the second story is 9 feet 1 inch in height. A steeply sloped, unfinished garret, partially enclosed with cedar boards in the mid-twentieth century, is lit by small, six-light gable-end windows.

The deep and wide gabled-roof porch on the south end of the Period I east elevation is a mid-twentieth century alteration, and replaced a more modest shed-roof structure that can be seen in the 1939 photograph of the house (Figure 2). There is structural evidence in the woodwork on the first and second floors of the side passage that the house had an earlier set of two-story porches on the front (east elevation) and back sides. Break joints in the base, surbase, and wainscot panels, as well as the lower height of the windows in the passages compared to those
that light the rooms to the north (seen on the east elevation in Figure 2 and on the west elevation in Figure 4), indicate that these spaces have been patched. Doorways that once gave access to the porches on the east and west of the passage at both floor levels were removed sometime in the nineteenth century and replaced by windows on the west elevation (back) and a window on the second floor of the east elevation above the main entrance.

Figure 2: South Garden, 1939, facing west. Richmond Times Dispatch.
Figure 3: Break joints in the wainscot panels, chair rail, and baseboards below the windows on either end of the first and second floors of the Period I side passage indicate these areas were patched when historic doorways were infilled. Left: Period I First Floor Entry Hall, West Elevation. Right: Period I Second Floor Landing, East Elevation.

In a 1937 photograph (Figure 4) showing the west (rear) elevation of the house, there are straight joints in the weatherboards beneath the replacement windows on the first and second stories indicating that these early doorway openings have been patched. On the primary (east) elevation the main entrance door was retained and perhaps widened when these changes were made. Two prominent two-story porches would have given South Garden an even more imposing appearance during the antebellum period despite its modest plan of one room and a stair passage on the two main floors. Further research might determine whether the second-story porches were enclosed by roofs or were open with a balustrade or solid parapet.
South Garden was erected using traditional framing practices common in the Colonial and Early National periods. The major framing members (sills, floor joists, posts, studs, plates, and rafters) were fabricated from oak, pine, and poplar timbers, which were mainly hewn or pit sawn and joined together with mortise and tenon joints. A few timbers, especially those in the roof framing are sash sawn. Smaller framing members such as cripple studs, ashlars, and collars are fastened by mature (square-headed) cut nails, which was typical of the early nineteenth century when manufactured nails had supplanted the use of hand-forged wrought nails found in earlier buildings.

To ensure structural rigidity and deflect any spring in the span of the first floor, the parlor floor framing was strengthened by a pair of binder beams placed longitudinally at third points between the 4- by 8-inch joists. In the attic, the poplar common rafters measure between 2½ and 4½ inches in width and are 4.5 inches deep. These rafters are mortised, tenoned, and pegged at the apex and placed on two-foot centers. Their collar beams are lapped with a half dovetail joint and spiked into the rafter sides by two or three cut nails in each joint.

Other features are also typical of early nineteenth century traditional craftsmanship, which replicated methods dating from the Colonial era. The pine floorboards are gauged and undercut on the undersides on the main, second, and garret floors. All are butted together with tongue and groove joints. Those on the main and second stories are between 4 and 6.5 inches in width and
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are blind or secret nailed, though there are places where they have been re-laid and face nailed. Befitting their secondary status as storage space, the garret floorboards are 5.5 inches wide and face nailed, and contain far more knots and flat grain in the boards than those on the lower floors. The plastered ceilings and walls above the wainscoting are secured to the framing with split lath fastened with cut nails. The plaster consists of a thicker brown coat mixed with animal hair as a binder and a thinner finish coat covered in lime wash. Some of the rooms show evidence of paint or a color wash applied to the plasterwork. Most rooms retain their original raised panel doors that are hung on cast-iron, five-knuckle butt hinges, and include iron rim locks with brass knobs and keyhole escutcheons. Most of the locks are replacements rather than original. The window sash have wider muntins than those typical of the period. If original, they are anachronistic.

The staircase, which rises from the cellar to the garret is unusual in that it is enclosed by a wall from the main floor to the second. Most stairs in refined dwellings were open, and often contained elaborately carved stair brackets, turned balusters, and handrails fabricated from exotic woods such as mahogany. The staircase rises in the northeast corner of the main floor passage just to the north side of the double front door. Winder steps at the bottom turn to create a straight but steep flight to the second floor along the partition wall. The steps are relatively narrow in depth, measuring only 8 inches whereas most treads are between 10 and 11 inches deep.

What sets South Garden above most contemporary farmhouses in the region is its impressive joinery on the main floor. Although an opportunity for flashy display was lost with the enclosed staircase, the signature woodwork at South Garden appears instead on the doors and wainscoted dados in the passage and parlor. The raised panels in the doors and wainscot in the passage are finished with narrow reeding while those in the parlor are composed of wider bands of fluting. The six-panel door to the basement features vertical reeding, while the reeding runs horizontally in the wainscot. In the parlor, the six-panel door to the passage has horizontal fluting in its two smaller upper panels while the fluting is arranged vertically in the four larger ones below. The dado panels have horizontal fluting. Although such decorative schemes appeared in a few contemporary houses in Virginia, they were very uncommon as they required far more labor by the joiner than plainly-finished raised panels or molded-edge panels. The contrast between the use of reeding and fluting is deliberate. In both spaces, this woodwork was enhanced by molded bases and caps. The double architrave that frames the door and window openings is composed of a quirked Greek cyma backband with a small fillet offsetting the tangent point of the ogee, which terminates in an astragal; a smaller quirked ovolo with astragal in the center; and a 3/8"-inch bead, which projects slightly beyond the return of the jamb.

At the north end of the parlor is a Neoclassical wooden mantel replete with fluted pilasters, and a highly decorative frieze of elongated, bas relief, sunburst paterae alternating with vertical fluted

---

3 All of the window sash in the house appear to have been repaired or replaced in kind as necessary during the mid-twentieth century renovations.
4 On the passage side, the panels of this door are reeded.
blocks and terminated at each end by carved foliage sprouting from an urn in the molded recess of the corner brackets. The mantel is terminated by a molded shelf. Several layers of paint now cover some of the intricate carving and obscure any early variegated paint schemes that may have emphasized these details. The room is lit by two, 15-light windows on the east and west walls.

The more private second floor features less elaborate woodwork. Instead of a dado, the walls in the passage and bedchamber are plastered above a 6.5-inch molded base. Both spaces have 4 0.75-inch-tall surbases with two variants of horizontal reeding beneath a nosed cap with a quirked ovolo and astragal below it. The same architraves found below stairs are repeated on this floor around the doors and windows. The raised panel doors are plain compared to those below. The mantel in the bedchamber is far less elaborate than the one in the parlor downstairs, though it is of a similar Neoclassical design with reeded pilasters on tall plinths and a three-part frieze with a vertical reeded center block, capped by a molded shelf.

South Garden stands on a raised basement with a ground-level entrance. It does not, however, appear that the area below stairs was used for much other than storage when first built, as there is no evidence that it was finished in any elaborate fashion. The perimeter and partition brick walls that bore the weight of the rooms upstairs were whitewashed at best. There was no ceiling in the area beneath the passage though the lath nail holes and plaster stains on the underside of the joists in the area below the parlor indicate that this space was once sealed with lath and plaster. Though the brick walls are heavily whitewashed and patched, they show no evidence that they were ever plastered. The existing brickbat floor appears to be a modern improvement from the mid-twentieth century renovation when a low fireplace was added (or possibly rebuilt) into the base of the chimney on the north side of the room. Perhaps more indicative that the room likely served a modest storage function, is the fact that the windows on the west wall were enlarged during this renovation. Before this occurred, the 1937 photograph of the back of the house (west elevation) depicts much smaller apertures, more typical of a cellar storage room (Figure 4). The reuse of two small rectangular cellar window frames with diagonally set horizontal wooden slats across their openings on the south side of the mid-twentieth century front porch base (Figure 5) suggest that these may have been located in the rear basement wall before they were reset in their current location.

---

5 Raised basements became popular in Virginia at the beginning of the nineteenth century, with many used as additional bed chambers, “winter” kitchens, or summer dining rooms. Additional information can be found in Section 8 footnote.
Figure 5: Wood slat windows in the mid-twentieth century porch base may have historically been cellar windows on the west elevation of the Period I basement.

If modestly finished, it is clear that the room beneath the parlor was the main cellar space through the nineteenth century. A staircase was cut through the brickwork of the passage wall at the southeast corner in the cellar so that one could gain access to this space from upstairs. When the Period II wing was added to the north a few years later, a second staircase was constructed that descended into this space by cutting through the northwest corner of the original north gable end cellar wall. It may have been at this time that the room was upgraded with a plaster ceiling and perhaps some form of paved flooring.

The garret, too, could have been used for additional living space but apparently served as nothing more than storage in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Small gable windows lit the two rooms divided by the staircase. As noted earlier, the garret floor was tongue and grooved. The staircase that rose from the second-floor passage to the garret was originally open with a molded handrail, one-inch square balusters, and square newel post at the garret landing. It
appears that the builders anticipated finishing this space as they installed a series of ashlars or knee-wall studs beneath each rafter pair so that they could take lath for plaster to enclose the space. This was never done. Even if had been, there was no fireplace so it would have remained an unheated storage or possibly a sleeping space for enslaved house servants.

Period II: The North Addition, c.1825-1826

Immediately after constructing the original house, Charles Smith constructed a one-and-one-half-story addition against its north gable end. Measuring approximately 34 feet in length and 18.5 feet in width, this new section consisted of two rooms on the main floor (both of which were heated) and two rooms in the garret. The larger southern garret room was unheated and the smaller one on the new north gable end was heated. To keep the main floor of this wing on the same plane as the one in the original house, the new section was raised on a tall brick foundation laid in 1:3 common bond with an undercut finish mortar joint. The Period I exterior end chimney that heated the original parlor was enlarged in depth to incorporate a firebox to heat the new south room on the main floor in the Period II wing (see Figure 1). The smaller north room and the bedchamber above it at the north end of the wing were heated by an exterior brick chimney laid in 1:5 bond constructed against the north gable end. The plan of the new wing was essentially a hall-parlor arrangement, symmetrically designed on the façade (east elevation) with a center doorway opening into the wing’s larger, south room. The door gave access to a small front porch (basically a raised rail stoop with no roof by 1939), which was flanked on either side by an 18-light sash window.

Although a hall-parlor plan, the new wing communicated with the original section of the house in an odd way. To get from the old section to the new, a doorway had to be cut through the north wall of the Period I parlor on the east side of the existing fireplace. There was no communication at the upper level since the floor of the Period II garret was much lower than the Period I second story. Had there been an access created between them, it would have required a short stair from the new wing to the old at this level, and it would have made the old bedchamber a less private space. The placement of the new addition begs the question as to why the wing was built on the north end of the house rather than on the south side against the outer wall of the original entrance passage, as was the most common way of adding on to side-passage houses in the region. The old passage would have provided a common circulation space and reduced the necessity for a second front door on the east façade as well as a second staircase to the upper floor in the new wing.

Building the wing on the north side meant that there could be two heated main-floor rooms in the Period II wing. This was accomplished with the deepening of the Period I chimney to accommodate another chimney and flue, and the construction of a smaller chimney on the north gable end of the Period II wing that could heat the wing’s north gable end rooms on the first and second floors. This solution was a modest advantage over the more traditional pattern of adding on to a side passage plan. The decision to build onto the north side of the house may have also
been shaped by contemporary familial circumstances. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, dwellings were frequently shared by an extended family. Sometimes married children and their offspring moved into their parents’ house, sharing some common spaces such as sitting and dining rooms and kitchens, but finding privacy in upper bedchambers that were accessed by separate staircases. Occasionally, two grown siblings with their families might also choose to accommodate themselves in a single house, where wings might be added to provide some separation between the two.

Although nothing is known about the Smith and Price families who occupied the house in the antebellum period, there is the possibility that such familial dynamics may have governed the decision of how the occupants added on to South Garden shortly after the original house was constructed. The plan reflects some unusual arrangements. Besides a second front door on the east façade, the plan suggests that the south room in the Period II addition was designed to serve as an entertaining room. From its size and decorative treatment, it was probably intended to be used as either a dining room or a less formal parlor. The fireplace in this room, which shares the old chimney stack of the Period I parlor, is finished with a fine, but not grand, Neoclassical mantel. It has reeded pilasters on tall plinth blocks, plain molded brackets and a projecting central rectangular block in the frieze with vertical reeding, and a straight molded shelf. The room is plastered and has a tall base and molded surbase. This room and the smaller inner room have double architraves around the windows and six-paneled doors that are Neoclassical but different from those in Period I. These architraves consist of a quirked Greek ovolo with an astragal, which is repeated in the center molding at a smaller scale and a full 3/8-inch bead at the jamb. Except for the door that connects this room to the Period I parlor, which has fluted panels on both sides, the raised panels of the six-panel doors in this wing are conventionally treated.

This larger south room in the Period II wing also provided access to the outside. Not only is there a front door, but in the southwest corner of the room, just west of the fireplace, there is an enclosed staircase that descends to the basement. This enclosed staircase takes up some room and makes it less convenient to arrange furniture in a way that does not interrupt circulation from the three doors that open into this room—from the Period I parlor on the south, an exterior entrance on northeast corner of the façade (east elevation), and the staircase to the cellar in the southwest corner. The staircase runs in a straight flight and alights in the cellar space beneath the Period I parlor. It did not provide access to the room directly below it in the Period II basement. The original cellar wall just west of the chimney base had to be cut through to reach this basement room. Presumably, this was done to provide access from the west door of the Period I basement room to the outside and, presumably, from there a direct route to an exterior kitchen, whose location has not been identified. It also reinforces the possibility that the south room in the wing may have served as the dining room.

Until recently used as a modern kitchen, the smaller inner room of the Period II north wing also may have served as a small sitting room. Heated by a fireplace in the north gable end, the room measures 13 feet 2 inches in length from north to south, is 17 feet 4 inches wide, and was originally lit by a single window on each of the east and west walls. There may have been additional apertures on the gable ends on either side of the exterior chimney. If so, they were
converted to doorways when the shed roof addition was added. The woodwork is the same as in
the larger room to the south with a tall base, surbase, and mantel of the same design, though
slightly smaller in scale. When the shed roof addition was added to the north gable end, there
was a small unheated room on the west side of the chimney and a porch on the east side. The
trim of the single architrave of these two openings are similar to that found in the Period II
garret, suggesting that the shed roof addition was nearly contemporaneous with the north wing.

Although there was no access to the outside originally, the smaller inner room of the wing was
not a private chamber as there is a small staircase in the southwest corner of the room. The stair
rises along the west wall just south of the window and then turns along the south partition wall
and rises to a vestibule landing in the garret. The lower part of the staircase is not closed off by a
doorway, but has a 4.5-inch square newel post with beveled cap, molded handrail, and one-inch
square balusters on the four open string steps at the bottom. There is a small, enclosed closet
beneath the winders.

The two garret rooms are modest spaces. The unheated larger south room measures 16 feet in
length and 12 feet 4 inches from knee wall to knee wall. The space is lit by a dormer window on
the east and west sides, which are positioned above the windows on the main floor. There is a
hatch in the ceiling that gives access to a crawl space above the collars in the roof. The room has
a base, plastered knee walls and ceiling. The doors consist of six, flat panels and are hung on 5-
knuckle butt hinges. The single architrave has a quirked Greek ovolo with astragal. The 5- to 6-
inch-wide floorboards are face nailed. On the north side of the vestibule is a small, heated room
used as a bedchamber that is 9.5 feet long and the same width as the south garret space. The trim
is the same as in the south room. In addition to similarly positioned dormers on the east and west
slopes of the roof, there are two, four-light windows in the gable end on either side of the
fireplace. The mantel is smaller but of similar design as the one in the room directly below.

Like the cellar space beneath the original house, the basement in the Period II wing was altered
substantially in the mid-twentieth century renovations. Now one large room measuring 33 feet in
length by 15 feet 10 inches in width (inside measurements), the basement has a concrete floor
poured during the Reams restoration, along with a low retaining wall along the west and north
walls to add reinforcement. Originally, the basement was lit by two windows on the west wall,
which measured 3 feet 1 inch in width and 4 feet in height and flanked a central doorway. These
three apertures lined up with the windows on the main floor. The northern most basement
window, which had been blocked at some time, was reopened in the 1940s to provide more light
into the large room. A small, low fireplace with a steel lintel was inserted at the north gable end
of the room at this time as well. The height of the room from the concrete floor to the underside
of the floor joists of the main floor is 6 feet 6 inches, nearly a foot and half less than that in the
Period I basement spaces.

Originally, the present large room beneath the Period II wing appears to have been subdivided
into two spaces. Ghost marks of scored lines on the east and west walls 14 feet 2 inches from the
face of the outer side of the original north wall of the Period I house indicate the position of an
8.5- inch wide brick wall (one brick thick) that subdivided the south end of the space from the
northern end. That wall was located just south of the outside door on the west side of the house that provided access into the Period II basement. It is not evident if the wall included a door to provide access from the south room to the larger northern room. If it did not, then the only access to this southern room was by way of a doorway that was punched through the north basement wall of the Period I house just east of the chimney. Because the floor of the original basement was lower than the one in Period II (by how much is difficult to tell since a modern concrete floor covers the Period II space), the floor now slopes upwards from the Period I basement into the Period II basement to the north. That new space was unheated, but the walls were plastered as well as the ceiling. Remnants of that plaster finish are still evident in places beneath the enclosed staircase that descends along the west wall, as well as with the appearance of lath nail holes and plaster scars on the soffits of the joists that abruptly stop in line with the scribed marks on the east and west walls, marking the location of the brick partition wall. How this plastered storage room functioned is not known.

Period III: The North Shed Roof Addition, c. 1839-1840

After inheriting South Garden, William C. Smith constructed a one-story, unheated shed roof addition on the north gable end of the Period II wing. This space was partially enclosed on the west side and included a small, covered porch east of the Period II chimney. The addition stands on brick piers, with mortar joints and bricks that are the same size and quality of those used in the Period II basement walls (the spaces between the piers were infilled during the 1940s renovation). The sills, trimmers, and joists that frame the floor are hewn and pit sawn, though it appears that some of the wall framing was replaced in the 1940s. The two door architraves that provide access to an enclosed but unheated space to the west of the north Period II chimney and to the porch on the east side of the chimney are single architraves to the ones in the Period II garret.

Originally used as storage, the enclosed space on the west side of the chimney measures 6.5 feet deep and 10 feet 11 inches from west to east. The space is lit by a four-light window on the west wall. Graffiti on the plastered face of the back and west side of the chimney indicates that since the second quarter of the twentieth century, this space had been fitted as a bathroom. A claw-foot tub, perhaps dating from July 1932, had occupied this space until recently. The 1937 and 1939 photographs of the house depict the northeast corner of the shed roof addition, east of the chimney, as a porch, which was open on the north and east sides with wooden steps descending to the ground on the north side. Renovations in the following decade enclosed the space with windows and a door on the north side.

Period IV: The South Addition, c. 1940s

In 1939 Melvin and Alice Reams of Richmond purchased South Garden and undertook to restore, modernize, and expand the house to make it habitable according to twentieth-century living standards. This included the addition of mechanical heating, electricity, an up-to-date kitchen, and bathrooms. What aspects of the old house had been upgraded prior to their purchase is not known since subsequent work erased evidence of earlier efforts to add heating, plumbing,
and electrical systems. Perhaps the claw-footed bathtub that had been in the north shed roof addition was the only surviving evidence of such earlier improvements. Just when the Reams undertook the renovations is not precisely known as documentary evidence has yet to be found that identifies when this was done or whom the couple employed to design and undertake the alterations made to the house. Photographs of the house taken in 1958, however, indicate that the changes had been completed by that time (Figure 6). An old sink that had been removed from one of the Reams’ bathrooms by a subsequent owner in a late twentieth-century has a 1946 date of manufacture stamped on its underside. Dated porcelain fixtures were generally installed within a year of their manufacture, which might indicate a post-war period of the late 1940s for South Garden’s alterations.

![South Garden, 1958, facing west. HABS survey photo, courtesy of Virginia Department of Historic Resources.](image)

The Reams’ work was thorough and thoughtful, respecting the architectural character of the nineteenth century house by integrating modern necessities without greatly disturbing the historic fabric on the inside. Where necessary, the owner refurbished or replaced worn out fabric. Part of the shed roof addition, for example, appears to have been rebuilt. As noted earlier, most of the window sash were either repaired or replaced in kind. Most of the sash have a small tag with a number on them and a couple in the gable end of the Period I garret have the initials of one of the workmen (“AT”) written on it. Decayed exterior trim was replaced and most if not all...
the weatherboards were replaced by modern ones. The new weatherboards imitated the original boards with bottom beads, but utilized a more acutely cut bead. Original beaded weatherboards survive, trapped on the original north wall of the Period I house where the staircase from the Period II dining room/parlor descends to the cellar, as well as on the north wall of Period II where the north porch has been enclosed.

To provide for modern bathrooms and additional bedrooms, the owner had a one-and-one-half-story wing added to the south side of the Period I side passage, which balanced out the earlier north wing, though the ridgeline is taller. This wing stands on tall, ungainly piers at the basement level, leaving an opening that was enclosed with removable glazed panels to provide for a shaded patio. An outside fireplace was added or later rebuilt on the north side to create an outdoor grill. Access to this wing opens off the south wall of the Period I stair passage on the main and second floors. It contains a bedchamber with ensuite bathroom and closet on the main floor and in the garret. The garret is lit by dormer windows, matching those on the north addition.6

The woodwork in these rooms, including the double architraves and raised six-panel doors, as well as the hardware closely match that found in Period II. In some areas, historic materials such as the bead-and-buttwork paneled door were reused, while others are twentieth-century replicas of nineteenth century craftsmanship. Missing from Period IV are the reeding and fluting details in the mantels and paneling, and the heavy chair rail, which are character-defining features of South Garden’s earlier periods.

As mentioned earlier, the 1940s renovations transformed the basements in the Period I, II, and III sections of the house. A window on the west wall of the Period II section was reopened to its original size of 3 by 4 feet. The brick partition that divided the Period II basement was probably removed at this time and a low retaining wall was added along the west and north sides of the room. A low fireplace was added to the base of the Period II north chimney. On the west wall of the Period I basement, two small openings that appear in the 1937 photograph of the house were enlarged in height, from 2.5 feet originally to 5 feet 10 inches. It may have been at this time that the floor of the cellar was lowered slightly and the brickbat floor laid. A fireplace was either rebuilt or newly installed in the base of the Period I chimney. In the cellar space beneath the Period I side passage, a door was cut through to provide access to the patio beneath the Period IV south wing. It may have been during this time that historic door openings on this elevation were infilled. A doorway in the basement level of the Period I façade was enlarged to provide room for the installation of oil tanks beneath a new front porch for the new heating system. The smaller wood grill windows that may have been on the west wall of the Period I basement were removed and reset into the south brick wall of the new enlarged front porch foundations (see Figure 5). Period III’s pier foundation was infilled to create a continuous brick foundation.

Besides the new south wing, the most significant alteration to the exterior was the reconstruction of the two porches and staircases on the façade (east elevation). On the two-story Period I

---

6 One of the closets was lined with cedar. A cedar closet was also created in the southeast corner of the attic where the rest of the unfinished space was enclosed with boards that were set flush with the rafters and knee wall studs.
section, the narrower porch with its shed roof that appears in the 1939 photographs of the house at the time the Reams purchased the house, was removed and a wider and deeper porch with a pedimented gable supported by four wooden posts was constructed on a solid brick foundation composed of salvaged handmade bricks. The porch platform measures 9 feet 10 inches deep from the front wall and 14 feet 4 inches in width. As noted previously, when the new weatherboarding was installed during this renovation, a conscious effort was made to raise the height of the window above the porch to bring in closer alignment with the others lighting the bedchamber. This was done to remove the earlier evidence that the lower lintel height was the result of its having been converted originally from a doorway, and it also occurred to the window on the west (rear) side of the passage. The old stoop that stood in front of the Period II doorway in 1939 was also replaced by a porch with a pedimented roof supported by four posts like the larger main porch. Raised on piers composed of reused old bricks, the new platform measured 5 feet 6 inches in depth and 7 feet 8 inches in width.

**Well (c.1940) – Non-contributing Resource**

Located to the north of the house is a well of indeterminate age with a modern brick collar on a concrete slab. Previously, the well had a slate shingled hipped roof covering with exposed rafters supported by wood posts; however, the well covering was removed due to safety related structural concerns. As all of the visible components of the well are modern, it is non-contributing to the significance of South Garden.

**Integrity Analysis**

South Garden retains a high degree of architectural integrity. South Garden retains integrity of **location** and **setting** on 29.94 acres in rural New Kent County, Virginia. The surrounding fields, terracing of the south slope beside the dwelling, and natural topography indicate that South Garden also retains integrity of **feeling** and **association** as a nineteenth century dwelling and agricultural estate that evolved to suit the needs of successful planters during the early-nineteenth century. Despite twentieth century additions and alterations to the dwelling during the twentieth century, South Garden’s evolution remains legible and the property retains integrity of the historic **design** that developed during the period of significance. The dwelling also retains evidence of the historic changes that occurred, such as physical evidence of the original location of the main door on the west elevation, and the locations of the history two-story porches. South Garden also retains a high percentage of its historic materials including historic doors, windows, plaster, and, most importantly, its highly unusual interior woodwork and detailing. Features such as the vertical and horizontal reeding and fluting, and detailing such as carved urns, flowers, and sunbursts demonstrate trends in Federal style detailing that are unparalleled in the area. Although there has been some loss of historic materials, such as the historic siding and porches, this loss of material does not compromise the overall integrity of the property, and South Garden retains a high degree of integrity of **design**, **materials**, and **workmanship**.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

☐ A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

☐ B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

☒ C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

☐ D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

☐ A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes

☐ B. Removed from its original location

☐ C. A birthplace or grave

☐ D. A cemetery

☐ E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure

☐ F. A commemorative property

☐ G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
### Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

**ARCHITECTURE**

| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |

### Period of Significance

1825-1840

| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |

### Significant Dates

N/A

| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |

### Significant Person

(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

N/A

| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |

### Cultural Affiliation

N/A

| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |

### Architect/Builder

Unknown

| ______________________ |
| ______________________ |
South Garden                   New Kent County, VA
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Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

South Garden is recommended eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C for Architecture at the local level of significance. South Garden has a period of significance beginning with its initial construction in c.1825, and lasting until the construction of the Period III shed roofed addition in c.1839-1840. South Garden is significant as a notable and rare example of early-nineteenth century architecture in New Kent County which retains its rural setting and impressive early-nineteenth century interior finishes. The interior woodwork within the dwelling’s first three periods utilizes Federal style trends of the period in ways that are unparalleled in the area. This includes detailing such as horizontal and vertical reeding and fluting, as well as other ornamental mantel details such as carved urns, flowers, and sunbursts. While the mid-twentieth century south wing, Period IV, was constructed with compatible decorative details, the trim work does not include the elaborate reeding and fluting seen in the dwelling’s earlier periods. The elevated nature of the twentieth century wing is also out of character with nineteenth century residential design and construction, and therefore the Period IV wing does not contribute to the architectural significance of the property as a whole.

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

The earliest reference to South Garden is in the 1821 New Kent County tax assessment records, which note that the property was owned by Charles Smith and valued at $200. The value of the property jumped substantially from $200 to $1,400 between 1825 and 1826. In 1835, the records noted that William C. Smith had inherited South Garden from Charles Smith the previous year, and in 1840 the property’s valuation rose from $1,400 to $1,500. In William C. Smith’s November 1846 will, he left South Garden to his nephew Charles L. Price, and Charles Price’s ownership was first recorded in 1847. Between 1840 and 1856, the property continued to be valued at $1,500, and in 1857 the assessed worth declined to $1,000 and remained at this value through 1860.

Prior to 1826, the valuation of South Garden’s built improvements was $200, which historian Matthew Laird notes in his report “Historic Building values for the South Garden Property: Data and Interpretation,” was too low a value for the Period I core of the present dwelling. Laird indicates that this amount may have represented an earlier dwelling on the property that was replaced by the Period I construction. Additionally, since physical examination indicated that Periods I and II were constructed within a short time of each other, Laird suggests that this large jump (and lack of subsequent large jumps) encompasses the construction of Periods I and II, placing their construction date at c.1825 and c.1825-1826, respectively. Lastly, the small rise
from $1,400 to $1,500 between 1839 and 1840, combined with physical examination of construction methods, suggests that the shed roof addition on the north elevation was added during this time.9

William C. Smith’s 1846 will does not describe the South Garden property; however, it does indicate that enslaved persons lived and worked on the property, saying Smith “would emancipate [a] woman Elly, but laws would not permit her to remain within the limits of Virginia, thus she is to remain & work on [the] plantation lent to nephew & be supported until her death, her youngest child (Ellick) to remain until age 21 & then be emancipated (with $500 if he chooses to leave Virginia).”10 Maps from 1863 show that the 610.75-acre property was still owned by Charles L. Price at that time.11

At some point between 1863 and 1878, ownership of the property transferred to R.J. Lacey, who then sold the property in November 1878 to John N. Harris.12 The property then passed to Octavia D. Harris, who sold it to Marian Beebe in September 1902.13 A few years later in 1907, Octavia sold the property to M.E. and Fannie L. Stroup, who then sold it to John A. and Emma W. Palmer in 1910.14 One year later, in 1911, the Palmers sold the “South Garden Farm” to Albert Pfau.s.15 The property then exchanged hands within the Pfau.s family, between Albert and Elizabeth Peebles Pfau.s, Isabella Pfau.s Brothers and B.C. Brothers, and Fred Pfau.s, Jr. between 1911 and 1917, when the entirety of the property was deeded to Fred Pfau.s, Jr.16 17

In 1939, Melville W. and Alice R. Reams purchased South Garden from Fred and Mattie Pfau.s with the intention to “restore the property for their country home.”18 News reports claim that the name “South Garden” was original to the property and “was so named because a colonial garden

---

10 Evans, New Kent County Virginia Will Book 1, 1864-1887, 54-55.
11 Oslin, Jr., New Kent County Virginia In 1863, 92, 140.
12 Deed of Sale from R.J. Lacey to John N Harris, November 1, 1878. New Kent County Deed Book 2, page 637 (New Kent, VA: New Kent County Clerk of Circuit Court).
13 Deed of Sale from Octavia D. Harris to Marian Beebe, September 23, 1902. New Kent County Deed Book 8, page 144.
15 Deed of Sale from John A. and Emma W. Palmer to Albert Pfau.s, December 29, 1911. New Kent County Deed Book 12, page 345.
17 June Banks Evans’ New Kent County Virginia Will Book 1, 1880-1938 suggests that the South Garden property was willed to Mrs. Bessie Marston by J.W. Parkinson in 1916; however, this is contradictory to the deed records. It is possible that this will refers to a different portion of the historic South Garden property, which was subdivided through the years.
planter on three tiers was located on the southside of the house.”19 Evidence of this terraced garden remains onsite to the south of the dwelling. By 1958, the Reams added a one-and-one-half-story addition with conservatory basement to the south elevation.20 Records also claim that, during the time the Reams were restoring the property, the entrance to the house was re-oriented to face the roadway to the east, rather than the waterway to the west. However, physical evidence suggests that the dwelling historically had entrances on both the east and west elevations, and the 1937 photograph of South Garden (Figure 4) shows that the west entrance had already been infilled by the time the Reams purchased the property.21

**Criterion C: Architecture**

South Garden is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places at the local level under Criterion C for Architecture. South Garden is a notable and rare example of an early-nineteenth century dwelling in New Kent County which retains a high degree of integrity. The dwelling is notable for its impressive early-nineteenth century woodwork and detailing that utilizes Federal style trends of the period in ways that are unparalleled in the area.22

Based on tax assessment records and physical evidence, the earliest phases of South Garden are believed to have been constructed in the early-nineteenth century between ca.1825-1840.23 Period I consists of a two-story, single-pile, side passage core with a side gable roof and a raised brick basement.24 Period II includes a one-and-one-half-story side gable north wing with gabled dormers and a raised brick basement. Period III is composed of a shed roofed addition on brick piers along the wing’s north elevation. Periods I, II, and III of South Garden display the status of the early occupants as successful plantation owners through the early expansion of the dwelling and detailed woodwork.

**Interior Woodwork and Detailing**

21 “Old Houses in New Kent County,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 17, no. 3 (July 1937): 371.
22 Records of regional resources from the period were examined, and comparable examples of decorative elements used in ways similar to South Garden were not found at this time.
24 By the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, raised basements with exterior doorways became increasingly popular in tidewater Virginia and other regions, and their finishes often resembled those of earlier partial or fully subterranean cellars with modest finishes at best, small windows that were often unglazed, and perhaps a brick or tile flooring. Cellar fireplaces served for cooking or laundries, while unheated spaces provided dry and wet storage rooms filled with barrels, boxes, and miscellaneous household goods and farm implements. While some grander homes finished these spaces with plaster walls and ceilings, wood floors, mantels, and decorative trim, and used them as additional living spaces (as seen at Shuttlewood or Hampstead in New Kent County), South Garden’s basement spaces appear to have been modestly finished and likely served storage and service functions. Raised basement analysis provided by Carl Lounsbury.
South Garden retains its unique early-nineteenth century interior woodwork, the likes of which are unparalleled in New Kent County. The detailing within the house utilizes features frequently found within Federal style interior design, such as reeding and fluting; however, it is implemented in a unique way that demonstrates the craftsmanship of the artisan and the status of the owner. During the early-nineteenth century, the Federal, or Adamesque, style of architecture and design was making its way into private and public buildings across the newly formed nation. Pattern books, such as William Pain’s *The Practical Builder*, provided guidance on interior details that could be replicated and adapted. Rodris Roth, “Interior Decoration of City Houses in Baltimore: The Federal Period,” *Winterthur Portfolio* 5 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969): 80.


The significant details of South Garden’s woodwork are located within Periods I and II of the house, with differentiations that note the hierarchy of the interior rooms. The most notable woodwork in the house is located on the first floor in the central hall and parlor of Period I, as was typical for the most public rooms of the home. The main side passage entry hall in Period I utilizes horizontally reeded paneled wainscot beneath a flat-topped, deep chair rail, as well as six paneled doors with horizontal reeding in the top two panels and vertical reeding in the remaining panels (Figure 7). Within the Period I parlor, the most formal room in the house, the dado is surfaced with horizontally fluted paneled wainscot beneath a deep, flat-topped chair rail (Figure 8). The six-panel doors that lead into either end of the parlor have horizontal fluting in the top two panels, and vertical fluting in the remaining panels. The parlor’s mantel includes a reeded surround with horizontal reeding flanking the sides of the firebox and vertical reeding running across the top. Fluted pilasters are located on either side of the reeded surround and are topped with inset panels, each decorated with a flower. A decorative architrave tops the pilasters and firebox surround. The frieze includes an urn and plant in an inset panel on each end, triglyphs are replaced with vertical fluting, and the metopes are decorated with sunbursts typical of the Federal style. The mantel’s ornate cornice retains the tripartite style of an Adamesque mantel (Figure 9). The Period II north wing includes two fireplaces with matching Federal mantelpieces. As the least formal of the first-floor rooms within the nineteenth century portions of the house, the Adamesque mantels are much less ornate than the Period I parlor’s mantel, but they include vertical reeding on the pilasters and center of the entablature.
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Figure 7: Period I Side Passage, reeded wainscot panels.

Figure 8: Period I Parlor, fluted wainscot panels.
Although the second floor would have served more private uses, the rooms within Periods I and II still incorporated Federal stylistic elements that further reflected the status of the original owners and craftsmanship of the artisans. The rooms on the second floor of Period I are lined with a horizontally reeded, deep, flat-topped chair rail, the window and door frames utilize quirked moldings, and the simple baseboards have a single bead along the top. The mantel in the bedroom is similar in ornament to that on the first floor of Period II; however, it is larger overall, and the vertically reeded pilasters have a flat plane running down the center (Figure 10). Further signaling the hierarchy of rooms, the woodwork on the second floor of Period II is less ornate than that on the second floor of Period I, while still coordinating with the detailing throughout the house. The mantel in the Period II north bedroom is similar in design to the mantel in the second floor Period I bedroom; however, it does not include inset panels, and the center of the entablature utilizes vertical fluting rather than reeding (Figure 11). There are no chair rails in this portion of the house, but the trim around the windows, doors, and baseboards are detailed to match others throughout the house. While the trim within Period III is complimentary to that of the Period II trim, it notably does not include the detailed chair rail or characteristic reeding or fluting found throughout the historic portions of the dwelling. This lack of character defining, elaborately detailed woodwork combined with the elevated nature of the Period IV wing places it outside of the dwelling’s period of significance.
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Figure 10: Period II Second Floor Bedroom, mantel.

Figure 11: Period II Second Floor North Bedroom, mantel.
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**Secondary Resources**


South Garden  ___________________________  New Kent County, VA  ___________________________
Name of Property  ___________________________  County and State  ___________________________


Previous documentation on file (NPS):
   ____ preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
   ____ previously listed in the National Register
   ____ previously determined eligible by the National Register
   ____ designated a National Historic Landmark
   ____ recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey  # __________
   ____ recorded by Historic American Engineering Record  # _________
   ____ recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey  # __________

Primary location of additional data:
   X  State Historic Preservation Office
   ___ Other State agency
   ___ Federal agency
   X  Local government
   ___ University
   ___ Other
   Name of repository:  Heritage Public Library, New Kent, VA; New Kent County Clerk of Circuit Court; Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, VA

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned):  063-0031

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property  29.94

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates
   Datum if other than WGS84:  __________
   (enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)
   1. Latitude: 37.461194  Longitude: -77.104986
   2. Latitude: 37.461194  Longitude: -77.098639
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3. Latitude: 37.455856  Longitude: -77.098644
4. Latitude: 37.455864  Longitude: -77.104989

**Or**

**UTM References**
Datum (indicated on USGS map):

- NAD 1927 or NAD 1983

1. Zone: Easting: Northing:
2. Zone: Easting: Northing:
3. Zone: Easting: Northing:
4. Zone: Easting: Northing:

**Verbal Boundary Description** (Describe the boundaries of the property.)
The boundary for South Garden includes 29.94 acres of rural land in Providence Forge, Virginia. The irregularly shaped boundary follows the property’s existing parcel lines (GPIN: G11-2634-0479) as shown on the associated sketch map provided, labeled Sketch Map A. It is bounded on all sides by rural residential and agricultural properties, with U.S. Route 60 running along the northeast boundary.

**Boundary Justification** (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)
Due to subdivisions of the property over time, South Garden no longer retains its historic acreage. The South Garden boundary follows the current parcel lines which encompass the remaining historic resource associated with the dwelling. The property’s historic setting and all known associated historic resources have been included within the historic boundary.

**11. Form Prepared By**

name/title: Ashlen Stump
organization: Commonwealth Preservation Group
street & number: 536 W 35th Street
city or town: Norfolk state: VA zip code: 23508
e-mail: admin@commonwealthpreservationgroup.com
telephone: 757-923-1900
date: May 13, 2022

**Additional Documentation**
Submit the following items with the completed form:
- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)

**Photographs**

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.

**Photo Log**

Name of Property: South Garden

City or Vicinity: Providence Forge

County: New Kent     State: Virginia

Photographer: Ashlen Stump

Date Photographed: December 2021 and April 2022

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:

1 of 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number of 25</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Camera Direction</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Garden Façade</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4/2022</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Garden Rear Oblique</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>4/2022</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>South Garden Rear Elevation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4/2022</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Front setting</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>4/2022</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historic Images Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure No.</th>
<th>Caption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plan of the main floor of South Garden. Period I: The original side passage plan is outlined in red. Period II: the north two-room addition outlined in blue. At the right (North) end of the house is the small antebellum shed in green. Period III represents the mid-twentieth century improvements including the south wing and two front porches, outlined in yellow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Garden, 1939, facing west. Richmond Times Dispatch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure No.</th>
<th>Caption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Break joints in the wainscot panels, chair rail, and baseboards below the windows on either end of the first and second floors of the Period I side passage indicate these areas were patched when historic doorways were infilled. Left: Period I First Floor Entry Hall, West Elevation. Right: Period I Second Floor Landing, East Elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>South Garden ca. 1937, facing southeast. <em>William and Mary Quarterly.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wood slat windows in the mid-twentieth century porch base may have historically been cellar windows on the west elevation of the Period I basement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>South Garden, 1958, facing west. HABS survey photo, courtesy of Virginia Department of Historic Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Period I Side Passage, reeded wainscot panels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Period I Parlor, fluted wainscot panels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Period I Parlor, mantel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Period II Second Floor Bedroom, mantel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Period II Second Floor North Bedroom, mantel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** This information is being collected for nominations to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.). We may not conduct or sponsor and you are not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**Estimated Burden Statement:** Public reporting burden for each response using this form is estimated to be between the Tier 1 and Tier 4 levels with the estimate of the time for each tier as follows:

- Tier 1 – 60-100 hours
- Tier 2 – 120 hours
- Tier 3 – 230 hours
- Tier 4 – 280 hours

The above estimates include time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and preparing and transmitting nominations. Send comments regarding these estimates or any other aspect of the requirement(s) to the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, 1201 Oakridge Drive Fort Collins, CO 80525.
DISCLAIMER: Records of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) have been gathered over many years from a variety of sources and the representation depicted is a cumulative view of field observations over time and may not reflect current ground conditions. The map is for general information purposes and is not intended for engineering, legal or other site-specific uses. Map may contain errors and is provided "as-is". More information is available in the DHR Archives located at DHR’s Richmond office.

Notice if AE sites: Locations of archaeological sites may be sensitive the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) and Code of Virginia §2.2-3705.7 (10). Release of precise locations may threaten archaeological sites and historic resources.
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DISCLAIMER: This drawing is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as such. The information displayed is a compilation of records, information, and data obtained from various sources, and New Kent County is not responsible for its accuracy or how current it may be.
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