#### United States Department of the Interior 56-2139 National Park Service National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions.

1. Name of Property	(
Historic name: Montgomery Hall Park	_ JAN -8,2018
Other names/site number: DHR No. 132-5023	
Name of related multiple property listing:	
N/A	
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing	

#### 2. Location

Street & number: <u>1000 Montgomery Avenue</u> City or town: Staunton State: VA County: Independent City	
City or town: Staunton State: VA County: Independent City	_
City of town. <u>Staunton</u> State. <u>VA</u> County. <u>Independent City</u>	
Not For Publication: N/A Vicinity: N/A	

## 3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,

I hereby certify that this <u>X</u> nomination <u>request for determination of eligibility meets</u> the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property <u>X</u> meets \_\_\_\_\_ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:

national X statewide X local Applicable National Register Criteria: <u>X</u> C X A X D B

1.3.10

Signature of certifying official/Title:

Date

NUMBER OF STREET

Virginia Department of Historic Resources

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

In my opinion, the property \_\_\_\_\_ meets \_\_\_\_ does not meet the National Register criteria. Signature of commenting official: Date State or Federal agency/bureau Title : or Tribal Government

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service / National Register of Historic Places Registration Form NPS Form 10-900 OMB No. 1024-0018

Montgomery Hall Park Name of Property City of Staunton, VA County and State

2018

### 4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

entered in the National Register

- \_\_\_\_ determined eligible for the National Register
- \_\_\_\_ determined not eligible for the National Register
- \_\_\_\_ removed from the National Register
- \_\_\_\_ other (explain:)

us

Х

Signature of the Keeper

# 5. Classification

## **Ownership of Property**

(Check as many boxes as apply.) Private:

Public - Local

Public - State

Public - Federal

#### **Category of Property**

(Check only one box.)	
Building(s)	
District	x
Site	
Structure	
Object	

### Number of Resources within Property

(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

Contributing <u>3</u>	Noncontributing <u>8</u>	buildings
5	10	sites
<u>    1                                </u>	<u>    2                                </u>	structures
<u>     0                               </u>	<u>     0                               </u>	objects
9	20	Total

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register <u>0</u>

6. Function or Use Historic Functions (Enter categories from instructions.) DOMESTIC/single dwelling SOCIAL/meeting hall RECREATION AND CULTURE/ outdoor recreation

Current Functions

(Enter categories from instructions.) <u>GOVERNMENT/government office</u> <u>RECREATION AND CULTURE/outdoor recreation</u>

City of Staunton, VA County and State

#### 7. Description

Architectural Classification (Enter categories from instructions.) LATE 19<sup>th</sup> AND 20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY REVIVALS: Colonial Revival

**Materials:** (enter categories from instructions.) Principal exterior materials of the property: <u>STONE: Limestone; BRICK; ASPHALT;</u> <u>WOOD</u>

#### **Narrative Description**

(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with **a summary paragraph** that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

#### **Summary Paragraph**

Montgomery Hall Park is located in the southwest section of the City of Staunton in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. The City purchased the 148-acre facility in 1946 during the Jim Crow segregation era for use as a park for the local African American community and it remained in that capacity until 1969 when it was desegregated and incorporated into the rest of the city park system. Playgrounds, a swimming pool and other recreational features were added to the grounds in the late 1940s around Montgomery Hall, the house that predates the park's establishment. It is a large two-story brick residence designed in the Colonial Revival style by local noted architect T. J. Collins in 1907 after a fire largely destroyed an antebellum house. That original dwelling was constructed in 1822-1824 by a prominent political and legal statesman, John Howe Peyton, for his new bride, Ann Montgomery Lewis. The present house (built on the foundation of the original) largely retains its original exterior design with the exception of the removal of side wraparound porches and the porte-cochere in a 1978 conversion for the dwelling to become City of Staunton Parks and Recreation Department offices. The first floor of the interior was heavily remodeled during that conversion but the second floor was largely left intact. The dining room's original features also were retained when the space was converted into a conference room. The house retains much of its integrity with the exception of parts of the first floor. In addition to Montgomery Hall (now the Irene Givens Administration Building), contributing buildings are the bathhouse and the pool mechanical shed. The horseshoe pit is a contributing site associated with the property's recreational use. There also are four contributing archaeological sites, three of which date to the plantation era and the fourth that dates to the 20<sup>th</sup>

City of Staunton, VA County and State

century. There is one contributing structure, the swimming pool. The overall park itself also retains some of its integrity from its establishment as a park in 1946, although many new park amenities have been added in more recent years, thus accounting for the property's 20 non-contributing resources.

#### **Narrative Description**

#### **Site/Landscape Description**

The 148-acre park is located within the southwestern portion of Staunton's city limits and is bound by Montgomery Avenue and residences to the southeast, the CSX Railroad to the north, residential areas, open space and woodlands to the west, and farmland to the southwest. The main entrance is located at the northeastern corner of the property along Montgomery Avenue and the entry road leads up a hill to Montgomery Hall. The historic house is surrounded by wellkept lawns, a mix of mature deciduous and coniferous trees and other vegetation, several parking lots and the several of the recreational facilities. These include playgrounds, the swimming pool complex, as well as basketball and tennis courts and several playing fields.

A circa 1913 brochure describes the lawn around the house as follows:

"The lawn surrounding the house, consists of ten to fifteen acres and extends to the macadam highway, with wide driveways winding through groves of fine trees. This beautiful lawn which is terraced on the east, is carpeted with a heavy bluegrass sod, the native grass of this section. To the south of the lawn is a large terraced garden which furnishes vegetables for family use."

Continuing past the present facilities, a branch of the road exits back to Montgomery Avenue while the park road continues winding southward up a hill to additional facilities. Just south of the entrance is an additional softball field and most of the golf course fairways and greens. Completely separate in the southeast corner of the property, at the top of a hill, is the soccer complex with additional parking and a shelter with restroom facilities. An additional playground, three picnic shelters, restrooms, trail entrances, and additional parking are located at the termination of this road. There are five park trails that are all concentrated in the woodland areas along the western half of the park.

Contributing buildings include Montgomery Hall (now known as the Irene Givens Administration Building), the bathhouse, and the pool mechanical shed. Contributing sites include the springhouse foundation, barn foundation and the horseshoe pit. There is one contributing structure, the swimming pool. Additional site features that are noncontributing include two playgrounds, three softball fields, basketball courts, tennis courts, a soccer complex and the Kiwanis disc golf course. Noncontributing buildings include the soccer shelter, three picnic shelters, two restroom buildings and a softball concession shed. Noncontributing structures include a storage garage and a pool storage shed.

## Montgomery Hall Building: Development History

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Montgomery Hall (now known as the Irene Givens Administration Building) is two-story Colonial Revival style building that was built in 1907 on the foundation of the original circa 1822-1824 dwelling that tragically burned in 1906. In 1902-1903, then-owner Frank Walter had retained T. J. Collins, a prominent local Staunton architect, to update and expand the antebellum house. Collins had moved to Staunton in 1891 from Washington, D.C. where he had been listed as an engineer for the U. S. Post Office Department although he listed himself as an architect in the 1876 city directory. From the office's opening in 1891 until his retirement in 1911, Collins was responsible for over 200 building designs in Staunton and the surrounding region. His son, Sam Collins, joined the firm in 1903 and continued its operations as principal starting in 1911.

After the Montgomery Hall fire and before the renovation was complete, Collins revised the plans to build a completely new dwelling but kept much of the basic massing of the original. An 1850 plat of Montgomery Hall includes a simple east side elevation sketch of the main house. It shows a two-story main block with a smaller rear ell to the south and what appears to be a second rear addition with a cross gable or hip roof. Beyond that portion of the dwelling is another smaller structure that was likely the kitchen. This linear set of building forms is very similar to the 1907 drawings for the new house.

Collins' 1903 drawings do include side elevations and plans of the original 1824 house. It was a two-story, gable front, temple-style, brick dwelling with a rear ell. The plan contained a front cross hall with two rooms located behind it, each containing a fireplace. This plan is identical to another Staunton residence, the Stuart House (NRHP 1972; DHR #132-0006), which was originally owned by Archibald Stuart, another prominent statesman of the region and undoubtedly a good friend of John Howe Peyton. The 1791 Early Classical Revival-style design historically has been said to reflect the influence of Thomas Jefferson. This claim of a Jefferson connection on the house design has been passed down through the Peyton family for Montgomery Hall as well. It is known that Jefferson was friends with the original Montgomery Hall was located in the ell, not in the main block of the house. Likewise, the stair in the Stuart House is located away and almost hidden from the front hall, an approach that Jefferson favored in not making the staircase a prominent feature in his domestic designs.

After the 1906 fire, the earlier drawings were expanded and reworked to create a new Montgomery Hall. T. J. Collins favored Victorian-influenced designs in his domestic architectural designs over the emerging Colonial Revival movement. Interior photographs of Montgomery Hall taken shortly after its rebuilding confirm this preference. Dark wood interiors with built-in staircase benches are similar to other Collins interiors of that era.

It is interesting to note that on one of Collins' plans, it states that the remaining brick walls should be removed to ground level and the remaining basement foundation retained on which the new house would be erected. Several of the brick and stone walls under the front of the present house are evidence that these elements do date from the original construction of Montgomery Hall in 1822 to 1824.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Besides the kitchen, there were additional early outbuildings that included an overseer's house, a cottage, a limestone springhouse, a smokehouse, a barn, and slave quarters. None of these survive above ground today except for ruins of the barn and springhouse.

After Frank Walter rebuilt Montgomery Hall in 1907-1908, he decided to sell the farm to Bates Warren of Washington D.C. in 1911. Warren only used the property as a summer retreat and after two years he decided to sell the property. In that regard, he had a brochure printed to aid in that effort. It has various photographs of the house and its interior that largely reflect Collins' plans. Concerning the house, the circa 1913 brochure states:

"It is a two-story brick dwelling, built in the colonial style, with wide porches and is finished in hardwood, including hardwood mantels, staircases and stairs. On the main floor is a very large reception hall and parlor, tea room, a colonial bedroom with modern bath, a beautiful library, a spacious dining room, a conservatory, a large den, cloak room, kitchen and pantry, also a cold-storage room. There is a cellar under the entire house which contains a steam heating plant, laundry tubs, etc. The second floor contains 10 spacious bedrooms with large closets and four baths. From the windows of every bedroom one has an excellent view of the mountains and surrounding country. The house has every convenience and is lighted with gas and electricity."

The brochure reveals the following information about the outbuildings on the site:

"Immediately in the rear of the mansion is a two-story brick building. The first floor contains an office, a fine billiard room and a well-equipped bowling alley. The second floor contains a gymnasium and a number of bedrooms for week-end parties. There is a good cellar under the entire building use for storage of root crops. There is also a modern garage and stable combined with quarters for help, and near this is the manager's cottage, and other farm buildings for the home plant. About three hundred yards from the home plant is a comfortable house of twelve rooms and bath, a large sanitary dairy barn, silos, hog houses, etc. In addition to the above are five good cottages and a number of other valuable buildings."

Some of these facilities were erected before the fire, and some may postdate it, but none of them survives today with the exception of the manager's cottage that was moved ca. 1935 to another Peyton property, Steephill (NRHP 1984; DHR # 132-0031). While the building was called the manager's cottage, it actually was John Howe Peyton's mother's cottage that he built for her on his estate. Steephill was owned at that time by John Lewis Peyton, who was born at Montgomery Hall and the second son of John Howe Peyton. John Lewis Peyton constructed Steephill in 1877-1878 in the Gothic Revival style and then retained local architect Sam Collins (T. J. Collins' son) in 1926-1927 to remodel the house in the popular Colonial Revival style.

The City of Staunton acquired the Montgomery Hall property in 1946, during the Jim Crow era of segregation, for use as a park for the city's African American community. Maintenance and operation of the park was made the responsibility of a private group made up of African

City of Staunton, VA County and State

American volunteers. New park facilities were soon added, the most important of which were a swimming pool and pool house in 1948-1949 through a donation from the Catlett family of Staunton. Additional early elements also included a tennis court, a softball field, horseshoe pits, and a playground. In 1956 basketball courts were added. In 1959 the front section of the house was altered by removing interior walls and the main staircase to create a more open and larger space for special events, dances and other gatherings.

Integration occurred in 1966, following passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and by 1969 the City of Staunton took over the operations of the park. By 1974 some in the African American community were increasingly concerned about lack of maintenance at the park and the house and pressed the City to do more for this important facility. The result was that in 1975 the City of Staunton authorized \$25,000 in expenditures for restroom facilities, fencing, playground equipment, outdoor grills and improvements to the ballfields.

The City estimated that a comprehensive master planned series of projects would cost \$750,000. In June of 1976, a grant was secured in the amount of \$413,600 through the Commission of Outdoor Recreation for new construction and development projects throughout the park. None of these funds were used to improve or upgrade Montgomery Hall itself. In October of 1977, the City Council appointed a Montgomery Hall Committee to recommend what to do with the vacant, boarded-up building in the future and whether to demolish it or to reuse it for some undetermined use.

After meeting for a year, the committee made two findings: that the building was historically significant and that it was structurally sound. With the support of the committee chairman, John Lancaster, who was the Director of Parks and Recreation, the City decided to renovate part of the former dwelling as the new headquarters for the department. Due to limited funds, only the first floor was extensively renovated and the City used the architectural firm of T. J. Collins & Son for the project. Since that project, the department has slowly made improvements to the second floor of the house and moved individual offices into former bedrooms.

In 2002 the members of the Staunton City Council officially dedicated the Montgomery Hall Park Administrative Building (Montgomery Hall) in honor of Mrs. Irene Givens, who had dedicated over twenty-five years of service to the park and its programs prior to 1970.

In 2005 additions to the park included a lighted soccer complex as well as the Kiwanis Disc Golf Course along with a new \$90,000 playground. In 2008 a new group of mountain bike trails were developed in the park.

## Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building): Plan

After the 1906 fire, T. J. Collins' new plan for the house still reflected several of the existing design elements of the 1822 dwelling. He retained the temple front form of the classical design but eliminated the cross front hall. He added an "L" shaped central stair and created a parlor on the west side of this section while creating a smaller parlor (tea room) on the east side behind

City of Staunton, VA County and State

which was a bedroom and bath. The interior walls and the staircase of this front block were removed in the 1950s to create a new large community multi-use space for the African American community. In the 1978 remodeling, the wainscoting and parlor fireplace and mantel were removed as well.

Beyond this front block, the 1906 plan had a new rear hall that contained a secondary entry off of an east side porch (a feature that also was present in the 1822 design). Collins also added another staircase off of the rear hall and a west-facing, three-part bay. The staircase remains today but has been enclosed. The area now contains the kitchen but previously was a den.

Beyond this area, a cross-axial wing was created to contain a new dining room (now conference room) with a butler's pantry and bedrooms above. The west side of this section contained a library along with a bathroom and storage areas; this area now contains restrooms for the facility.

The hall continued to a rear two-story ell that housed the kitchen, where a third staircase provided yet another route to the second floor. A large open room remained above the kitchen and may have been used for storage or for servants. (Notes on the Collins 1903 drawings indicate that there was an earlier or original kitchen in this same area and it should be demolished and expanded.) The kitchen space was divided into three offices in 1978 for parks staff while the second-floor room remains one large space for use as a crafts room.

The second floor of the rest of the house contains seven bedrooms (ten noted in the 1913 brochure), six of which have fireplaces and all of which open off of the extended central hall. There are two bathrooms and most bedrooms contained sinks as well. Most of these bedrooms are used for offices today while there are several storage rooms as well. The 1978 remodeling resulted in only one of three phases being constructed due to budget limitations. Thus much of the second floor retains more of its 1906 plan than the first floor.

The present basement extends under the entire house with the exception of the cross-axial area, under which is only a crawl space.

## Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building): Exterior

The painted brick residence, with its five-course common bond, has an irregular coursed, roughcut limestone rubble foundation, and a cross gable roof that is currently covered with architectural asphalt shingles. The original front (north) elevation is characteristic of the Colonial Revival style with its prominent front pediment with its unusual row of saw-tooth bricks capped by modillion blocks in the cornice and an elliptical lunette window. Symmetrical six-over-six, double sash window openings and a classically inspired entry are also present.

The dominant feature on the façade is a full-width one-story porch with a projecting entry capped with a shallow pediment containing a sunburst design. Tuscan columns resting on limestone piers support the shallow hip roof. The entablature has a plain frieze with dentils that surround the porch while the balusters are a simple rectangular design. The entry consists of an

City of Staunton, VA County and State

arched opening with an elliptical fanlight containing a leaded glass sunburst. Plain sidelights flank the paneled door with upper glazing. Pilasters frame the entire entry composition and support the entablature above. The Collins-designed front porch originally wrapped around both sides of the house and contained a porte-cochere on the west elevation. These parts of the porch were removed in the 1978 remodeling.

The majority of windows have six-over-six, double-hung, wood sash that can be found on all elevations. The windows on the main block of the dwelling have stone sills and lintels, with the exception of those that meet the entablature and therefore only have sills.

A secondary two-story, three-bay gallery porch is located within the east elevation in the area just south of the front section of the house. Like the front porch, it has a rectangular baluster railing, Tuscan columns, and a simple entablature with dentils. Central steps lead to an additional side entry that opens onto the rear hall. This entry has a paneled door with glazing, sidelights, and a transom. Additionally, an exterior stair to the second floor has been added on the south side of the porch and is enclosed at the main level. The west elevation of this section contains a two-story projecting bay with three windows at each level as well as a side entry.

The cross-axial section's east elevation is two bays with a central end chimney projecting through the roof with the decorative gable's peak meeting in front of the chimney in an unusual arrangement. A north-facing, two-part bay window opens from the dining room onto the lawn in front of the side porch. Its exterior consists of a paneled base underneath the windows that are flanked and separated by Tuscan pilasters. Above this arrangement is a classical entablature with a plain frieze architrave and a cornice with dentils. The west elevation of the cross-axial section has the same design as the east side.

The rear (south) ell addition is frame construction with brick veneer wall cladding and a brick foundation. Its end gable roof has minimal decoration but does have cornice returns. The east elevation of the ell has a centrally located large chimney but inside there is no evidence of remaining interior fireplaces. Like the main block, windows on the addition have double-hung wood sash with six-over-six lights and stone sills. The south end elevation features a six-paneled solid door with a small roof overhang supported by decorative brackets that dates from the 1978 remodeling. Two west side entrances are located at the intersection of the rear ell with the cross-axial section of the house. A small hip roof covers these entries and also dates from 1978. The kitchen wing was divided into three separate rooms and serve as offices in the present facility.

## Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building): Interior

Much of the plan on the first floor was heavily altered in the 1978 conversion to park facilities and offices. The original center hall was removed earlier in the 1950s to create a new large community multi-use space for the African American community. All finishes in this space and much of the first floor were updated in the 1978 renovation, including sheet-vinyl flooring and a dropped acoustical ceiling with fluorescent lighting, and flush metal doors and frames. At that

City of Staunton, VA County and State

time the remaining mantel and hearth were removed as well as the wainscoting in this large space.

Beyond this area, a hall extends along the east side porch and contains a second staircase of a dogleg design that has been enclosed. It is constructed of oak and has turned balusters and rectangular newels with fluted and paneled sections. This stair extends to the attic that is floored and contains mechanical equipment and ducts to serve the second floor below.

Also opening off of the hall is a new community kitchen that has been installed on the north side of the house where an original bay window is located. New restroom facilities are beyond the kitchen in the cross-axial portion of the house.

Off of the hall on the east side is the original dining room that has been converted to a conference room. It is one of the few first-floor spaces that retain its original features from 1907 including maple flooring, oak woodwork, decorative ceiling joists, and a classically inspired mantel. This element has pairs of half-fluted Ionic columns supporting a tiered shelf with bead-and-reel decoration and a plain frieze. An unadorned over-mantel with tapered sides and a bead molding caps the composition.

Most of the second-floor bedrooms have been converted to office spaces or for storage. Several walls and fireplaces were removed in the former two front bedrooms to create a single large office. In two of the former bedrooms on the west side of the hall are identical Colonial Revival era mantels with elongated bracket like supports on which rests a frieze containing applied floral designs. The office on the west side of the cross-axial section contains what appears to be an earlier mantel relocated from another structure. It has pilaster-like elements that are composed of symmetrical semi-circular moldings, a design that is repeated horizontally within a panel of the frieze. The maple flooring (some painted) remains on the second floor as does the molded baseboard and trim. The original doors on the second floor are the five-stacked panel variety.

The original section of the basement has a combination of painted and unpainted brick and limestone rubble walls with brick interior arched supports and brick piers as well. A reused six-panel door with its original blue paint and brass knob, likely dating from the early nineteenth century, remains in this section of the basement as well as an outside entrance that remains from the 1822 construction. It retains its original wood lintel although the batten door has been installed within a later smaller opening. The base of the original fireplace of the east front parlor remains as well. The basement extends to the south under most of the house and further study might reveal more of the original plan as the dwelling was expanded in its early period. The rear of the basement under the cross-axial section is a crawl space with brick piers. A concrete floor has been installed in the entire basement along with a variety of mechanical equipment.

#### **Outbuildings & Site Features**

In addition to Montgomery Hall itself (a contributing building), the following resources are associated with Montgomery Hall Park. Their status as contributing or non-contributing was

City of Staunton, VA County and State

evaluated based on their association with the property's areas and period of significance as well as whether their integrity is sufficient to illustrate those associations. Resources postdating the property's period of significance are non-contributing. All resources are keyed to the Sketch Map by the numeral at the end of each resource's heading.

### Contributing Architectural Resources

#### Bathhouse (c. 1948 with later upgrades) Contributing Building #2

The bathhouse is located on the main lawn east of the Irene Givens Administration Building and south of the main playground. This one-story, three-bay, rectangular building is constructed with concrete block and has a side gable, asphalt shingle roof. It has wide, boxed eaves and the gables have vertical board siding. Entrances are located through flush metal doors on both the west and north elevations. The south elevation has two window vents, and the north elevation has a window vent, an equipment window, and one two-over-two fixed window with multiple lights.

#### Pool (1948, Renovated 1990) Contributing Structure #3

The pool, located on the main lawn east of the Irene Givens Administration Building is an inground pool with both a deep portion and a shallow area. A concrete terrace surrounding the pool contains multiple metal picnic tables, metal benches, and a water slide to the deep end of the pool. A small lawn is located on the west end of the pool area. The pool borders the bathhouse and is surrounded by a tall chain-link fence topped with barbed wire.

#### Mechanical Room at Pool (1948) Contributing Building #4

This small, one-story, L-shaped building is attached to and located under the pool, situated against the east sloping side of its hillside site. It has a metal door with a lower vent in the center of its east elevation.

#### Horseshoe Pit (1940s) Contributing Site #5

The horseshoe pit is located on a flat portion of the main lawn east of the Irene Givens Administration and south of the pool. It has two facing sets of frames and stakes. Each pit location contains a wood frame, reinforced with three metal supports along the back, and a metal stake in front.

#### Noncontributing Resources

#### Main Playground (2006) Noncontributing Site #8

This large playground is located on the main lawn south of the Irene Givens Administration Building and north of the pool area. The main feature of the playground is a large play system with multiple slides and climbing components. In addition to another separate climbing net, there is a small climbing wall, three swing sets, monkey bars, and a whirl. The playground equipment is contained in a wood-chip area with several metal benches and picnic tables placed around it.

#### Lancaster Girls' Softball Field (c. 1940s, later upgrades in 1970s) Noncontributing Site #9

One of the earlier softball fields, this small field is located south of the Irene Givens Administration Building across the road from the building's parking lot. This facility that has been completely upgraded consists of a traditional softball diamond surrounded by a chain-link

City of Staunton, VA County and State

fence, two dugouts, and a backstop. Additional site features include bleachers, light poles, and a scoreboard.

Frank L. Hamilton Basketball Courts (1956, later upgrades in 2005) Noncontributing Site #10 The basketball courts are located on the main lawn east of the Irene Givens administration building. The rebuilt basketball area consists of two courts with a polymeric rubber surface contained within a tall chain-link fence.

#### Restroom Facility by Basketball Courts (1970s) Noncontributing Building #11

This one-story, three-bay rectangular building has a running brick bond and an asphalt-shingled side gable roof. The side gables, on the north and south elevations, are comprised of wide louvered restroom vents. The west elevation contains three evenly spaced flush metal doors.

#### Tennis Courts (1972) Noncontributing Site #12

There are four tennis courts located on the sloping hill east of the Irene Givens Administration Building. Two of the courts are located on a terrace that connects by a stair to the two lower courts. Each court has a polymeric rubber surface and is bound by its own chain-link fence. One of the upper courts recently has been replaced with a new rubber surface.

#### Upper Restroom Facility Near Shelters (1972) Noncontributing Building #13

This restroom facility is located at the far southwestern corner of the park well beyond most of the additional park features. This one-story rectangular building has vertical board siding and a front gable asphalt-shingled roof. The front or south elevation has a recessed vestibule with side entrances to the separate restrooms.

#### Shelter #1 (1972) Noncontributing Building #14

This picnic shelter is located at the far southwestern corner of the park just north of the Upper Restroom Facility. This open-sided rectangular shelter has an asphalt-shingled gable roof with vertical board siding enclosing the gable ends. The shelter has a concrete floor, and thick, braced wood posts support the roof. The east end of the shelter has a large stone exterior chimney.

#### Shelter #2 (1972) Noncontributing Building #15

This picnic shelter is located at the far southwestern corner of the park northwest of Shelter #1. This open-sided rectangular shelter has an asphalt-shingled gable roof with vertical board siding enclosing the gable ends. The shelter has a concrete floor, and thick, braced wood posts support the roof. The west end of the shelter has a large stone exterior chimney.

#### Shelter #3 (1972) Noncontributing Building #16

This picnic shelter is located at the far southwestern corner of the park south of both Shelters #1 and #2 and the restroom facility. This open-sided rectangular shelter has an asphalt-shingled gable roof with vertical board siding enclosing the gable ends. The shelter has a concrete floor, and thick, braced wood posts support the roof. The south end of the shelter has a large stone exterior chimney.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

### Harold V. Harlow Softball Field (1984) Noncontributing Site #17

This larger field is located in the middle of the park closer to the secondary park entrance. This field consists of the traditional softball diamond surrounded by a chain-link fence, two fenced dugout areas, and a backstop. Additional site features include bleachers, lighting poles, and a scoreboard. This field has its own gravel parking area south of the field and can be reached directly from the road winding through the park.

#### Springel Softball Field (1994) Noncontributing Site #18

This field is located across the road and down the hill northwest of the Irene Givens Administration Building. It consists of the traditional softball diamond surrounded by a chainlink fence, two dugouts, and a backstop. Additional site features include bleachers and lighting poles.

<u>Temporary Garage/Shed Near Flag Football Field (2005) Noncontributing Building #19</u> This one-story, one-bay, long rectangular temporary shed has vertical board siding and an asphalt-shingled gambrel roof. The single-bay northeast elevation contains a vinyl, mechanical sliding, sectional garage door. A single shed door is located on the northwest elevation.

### Kiwanis Disc Golf Course (2005) Noncontributing Site #20

This full eighteen-hole golf course consists of the traditional fairways, green and tee areas. The course is spread throughout the east portion of the park amongst the park's main facilities. Course areas are not heavily marked. This small, white, metal-clad pavilion consists of a double-sided two-person bench with an advertisement board and a small overhang clad with standing-seam metal roofing. A flat concrete pad is located just east of the bench.

#### MHP Soccer Complex (2005) Noncontributing Site #21

The soccer complex is located at the far south end of the park away from the main area of the park. It features one large soccer field closest to the road, and a second field to the east. Other site features include goals, bleachers, and lighting throughout the complex.

#### Soccer Pavilion and Restroom Facility (2005) Noncontributing Building #22

The soccer pavilion is located at the Montgomery Hall Park soccer complex just north of the fields. This one-story rectangular building with its asphalt-shingled gable roof is divided into two sections The north side is a concrete block restroom and concessions area while the south side is an open pavilion with a concrete floor and wood posts.

#### Second Playground (1980s) Noncontributing Site #23

This playground is located at the far southwestern corner of the park near the picnic shelters and restroom facility. Much smaller than the main playground, the equipment here is more spread out in a wooded area and includes two swing sets and a four-seat Buck-A-Bout.

#### Flag Football Field (1994) Noncontributing Site #24

This field was re-graded to create a football field size playing area and additional temporary boundary markers are added when games are played.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

#### Temporary Shed at Pool (2016) Noncontributing Structure #25

This small, approximately 50 sq. ft., walk-in resin storage shed has a front gable roof and doubledoors with glazing on the north elevation.

<u>Handicap Ramp from Parking Lot to Pool (2016) Noncontributing Structure #26</u> This recently installed handicap ramp consists of a poured concrete ramp with pipe railing in three ninety-degree turned sections leading from the building parking lot to the pool.

<u>Concession Building by Lancaster Girls' Softball Field (1970s): Noncontributing Building #27</u> This building is located next to the Lancaster Girls' Softball field in the main area of the park. This small, one-story, T-shaped building has vertical board siding and a cross-gable asphaltshingled roof. Both sections of the east elevation have single flush metal doors.

### Archaeological Sites

Between 2015 and 2017 the James Madison University (JMU) Laboratory of Archaeology undertook, at the request of the City of Staunton, an archaeological survey to locate archaeological sites on the Montgomery Hall Park property. Four archaeological sites were identified, of which three are associated with the nineteenth-century Montgomery Hall plantation of John Howe Peyton, and two have connections with use of the property for an African American recreational park. The archaeological investigations were conducted under the supervision of JMU Principal Investigator Dennis Blanton, and the descriptions of field investigations, sites identified, and results of analysis included herein have been taken from the ensuing report entitled, "Report on the Results of Archaeological Survey and Evaluation of Portions of Montgomery Hall Park in Staunton, Virginia" by Dennis B. Blanton et al.<sup>1</sup> The illustrative figures included with the report also are attached hereto.

#### Research Design

From spring 2015 through spring 2016, JMU students conducted investigation of selected areas of the park under Blanton's supervision. The leading archaeological objectives of that work are as follows:

- 1. Locate surviving archaeological sites;
- 2. Determine their periods of occupation and the nature of activities carried out on them;
- 3. Estimate their spatial extent;
- 4. Evaluate their physical integrity;

**5.** And make a preliminary evaluation of their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.<sup>2</sup>

The archaeological survey effort entailed evaluation of specific, high-probability locations on the property, rather than comprehensive coverage due to the park's large size and development over many decades as a public space. The areas of extensive earthmoving and paving, in particular, were subjected only to visual inspection if any at all. The greater parts of undeveloped tracts are

City of Staunton, VA County and State

steeply sloped and in many places are eroded to bedrock. These locations were likewise afforded only pedestrian inspection and occasional judgmental shovel testing.

Survey and evaluation concentrated in places that extant buildings and structures, historical records, and local informants were indicating greatest archaeological potential. For example, the most prominent architectural resource in the park is the Montgomery Hall residence, sited according to most accounts on the precise location of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century plantation home of the Peyton family. The sections of the park proximate to this building have been one of the focal points of the archaeological survey. Additional emphasis has been given to nearby areas where supporting plantation buildings such as a barn complex and spring house are known to have been located.

### Field Investigations

The sequential process for the survey and evaluation was designed as follows:

1. Continued collection of historical background information, with emphasis on acquisition of copies of early maps, plats, and photographs that detail structure locations.

2. Systematic exploration of the areas immediately surrounding extant historic structures and foundation remnants with small shovel tests and small-diameter cores. The interval of shovel tests in these areas measures 5-10 meters.

3. Selective exploration of the balance of the park property beyond the core area surrounding the main house. This process involved both surface inspection for obvious vestiges of past activity like foundations and landscape features, and judgmental subsurface evaluation using strategically placed shovel tests. The interval of shovel tests in this area was 10-30 meters.

4. Selective evaluation of locations with archaeological promise by excavating small test units, typically 1 x 1 meter in size.

5. All excavation proceeded according to natural strata to the extent they can be recognized. All excavation fill was sifted through 0.25-inch hardware cloth to ensure uniform recovery of artifacts.

6. All aspects of the survey process and all field observations were documented with standardized records, drawings, and photography according to professional standards, including guidelines set forth by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

## Laboratory Phases

All artifacts and related samples generated by the field work were taken to the JMU Archaeology Laboratory on its Harrisonburg campus. There, the basic sequence of laboratory treatment is as follows:

1. Wash all artifacts and complete a categorical rough-sort before re-bagging them;

2. Complete full inventory, in electronic format, of all recovered material according to standard descriptive criteria, mainly emphasizing temporally- and functionally-specific attributes; and

3. Complete final housing of artifacts for ultimate return to the City of Staunton.

#### Results of Investigations

Map Analysis and Historical Patterns of Land-Use

Basic cartographic data in the form of period plats and maps, as well as later maps and aerial photographs were collected and, using the ArcGIS platform, the cartographic information was digitized and "layered" in a map-style format. The results captured basic patterns of land-use that reflect the changeable nature of the local farm economy and the growth of Staunton.

Figure 3 portrays the natural topography of the project area as derived from a light imaging and ranging (LiDAR) dataset shared by the City of Staunton. Very clearly the local terrain consists of rolling uplands typical of the Shenandoah Valley. The dominant features are higher elevations on the west and the course of an unnamed creek to the north. The total elevation changes about 200 feet from the highest to the lowest point on the property.

In Figure 4 the historical plat of the Peyton plantation, made in 1850 near the time of John H. Peyton's death, is presented in its original form. It offers the best and only cartographic portrayal of the antebellum plantation property. In addition to the main house, an associated cottage, and a slave quarter, it locates a series of other vital resources and improvements, such as an overseer's house, two springs, a stream, a road, agricultural fields and wood lots. Conspicuously absent are barns and other utilitarian dependencies.

Figure 5 shows the digitized major features on the 1850 plat symbolically layered over the aforementioned contour map. Traces of a plantation-era road visible on mid-twentieth-century aerial photographs are also included. This overlay shows how the summits of prominent hills were maintained as wood lots, very likely because of shallow bedrock that would impede agriculture. Most of the remaining portions of the property were cleared and subsequent maps demonstrate how that landscape persisted through the middle part of the twentieth century.

Figure 6 is a relevant portion of the Augusta County map of 1876 by Jedediah Hotchkiss that corroborates details of the 1850 plat and provides additional information. For example, a connecting road through the plantation is clearly indicated, as are a number of buildings in the vicinity.

Figure 7 shows the digitized major features of the 1876 map symbolically layered over the contour map.

Figure 8 offers a depiction of the plantation-era features layered over a 1954 aerial photograph. Some of those features, including a road trace, a barn ruin, a spring house, and the overseer's house, are visible on the aerial without enhancement. As noted, the distinction between cleared and wooded land made in Peyton's era carries through to this time. It appears that the course of the creek along the northern boundary of the park was shifted and channelized at about this time to accommodate industrial development.

Figure 9 includes all of the recognizable plantation-era landscape features overlain onto a 2015 satellite image. These images illustrate how the long-established plantation landscape finally

City of Staunton, VA County and State

City of Staunton, VA County and State

began to change in the latter half of the twentieth century. As agricultural pursuits were supplanted by recreational interests, most of the area reverted to second-growth woodland and scrubland.

### Results of Field Investigations in the Montgomery Hall Yard Site (Contributing Site) #6 on Sketch Map

The hilltop chosen by John Howe Peyton for his plantation residence is located in the northeastern section of Montgomery Hall Park, overlooking an unnamed creek that forms the approximate northern boundary of the park (see Figures 1, 2 and 4). Despite ground disturbance related to the new playgrounds and original swimming pool and tennis courts, the area was correctly assessed as having a concentration of subsurface deposits related to its former plantation-related activity. Field investigations were undertaken to answer the following questions:

- Are archaeological traces of plantation dependencies (outbuildings/ support structures) present?
- Are midden-like deposits of the plantation era present in the surrounding yard?
- What effects did reconstruction of the dwelling have on archaeological integrity?
- What is the nature of the archaeological evidence from the African American period of park development and usage?

A total of 44 systematically-located shovel tests and four test units were excavated in the yard area, nearly all of which were placed in the eastern and northern sections of the yard within about 40 meters (approx. 130 ft) of the extant dwelling (Figure 10). Four judgmentally-located shovel tests were opened south and west of the structure. The standard interval between shovel tests was 10 meters but in some areas of particular interest that distance was halved to 5 meters. A careful inspection of surface exposures was also carried out. Four test units were ultimately placed in an area of obvious artifact concentration north of the main house (see Figure 10).

With the exception of one important area in the north yard, plantation-era evidence was found to be sparse. Very few artifacts or deposits associated with the Peyton family occupation have been identified in the east yard or in the area immediately adjacent to the northern (front) porch. Throughout those areas the typical deposits are shallow, seldom exceeding about 30 cm in depth, and they are largely devoid of artifacts pre-dating the twentieth century. Considerable evidence of disturbance was also encountered. More than likely this is a function of modern development, especially associated with utilities and paving. Much of the area surrounding the house has been heavily landscaped since the mid-twentieth century, and that pattern continues today.

Two exceptions to this general tendency bear description, however. In Shovel Test 3, off the southeastern corner of the dwelling, deep deposits were documented that contain significant quantities of architectural debris. The same is true in Shovel Test 37 off the southwestern corner of the house. The preliminary explanation is that these deposits represent disposal of material from the original house during the reconstruction process very early in the twentieth century. Alternatively, the debris is a vestige of former ancillary structures such as a kitchen.

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service / National Register of Historic Places Registration Form NPS Form 10-900 OMB No. 1024-0018

Montgomery Hall Park Name of Property City of Staunton, VA County and State

## Plantation-era Evidence in the North Yard

Impressive plantation-era archaeological evidence has been documented in the dwelling's north yard, beginning about 20 meters from the front porch and continuing northward to the current paved access road. It was revealed first in shovel tests and then more definitively in a trench-like excavation comprised of four 2 x 0.50 meter units. This evidence is strongly indicative of the location of a former domestic structure that we infer at this stage to have been the "cottage" constructed by John Howe Peyton for his widowed mother, Anne Hooe Peyton. She resided on the plantation for about a decade, between the time of its founding and the time of her death in 1833. This discovery is likewise believed to comport with the depiction of a curious, small structure on the aforementioned 1850 plat of the property, immediately in front of the main house (Figure 11).

Archaeological evidence in this area consists of a range of complex and relatively thick deposits containing a high density of nineteenth-century artifacts, most of which we can associate with the first half of the century, within an area measuring  $25 \times 30$  meters (approx.  $80 \times 100$  ft). Stratigraphy and other evidence exposed in shovel tests and in test units is believed to be the result of the following sequence of events:

- *1820s*: A small brick and stone building, probably with a cellar, was constructed on native soil in the front yard of Montgomery Hall. Probably associated with it was a well that might have served both the small building and the main house. This resource was the site of domestic activity.
- *Mid-nineteenth century*: The small building continued to be used for domestic purposes but patterns of disposal in the surrounding area were altered. Ultimately the building was razed and the area reclaimed by filling the cellar and well, and generally leveling the yard to obscure traces of the building.
- *Mid-twentieth century*: Park-related activity and development for that purpose began. Gravel was deposited in specific areas, apparently to create walkways and/or picnic table pads.
- *Late twentieth century:* Installation of utilities occurred along with an effort to erase evidence of earlier park activity on the front lawn of the manor house.

Archaeological evidence of the small masonry building in this area consists of ubiquitous fragments and "bats" of handmade brick, limestone fragments and chunks, hand-wrought and machine-cut nails, window glass, and plaster. Deep deposits with high densities of this material were penetrated by multiple shovel tests and exposed in a large rubble-filled feature in Unit 4. (Figures 12-15). These deep deposits potentially represent the filled-in cellar or related deep features. In general, the material is believed to be debris left over from removal of the building during the mid-nineteenth century.

Just north of this concentration of structural debris is a large depression that is believed to be a filled well (see Figure 10). Shovel Test 19 and Unit 1 were placed to explore it and they both revealed deep fill deposits within the depression containing common nineteenth-century artifacts. One of the uppermost strata in the depression is a dense clay layer that was very clearly put down

City of Staunton, VA County and State

purposely to "cap" the well and traces of the nearby structure. An obvious posthole feature between the well and the structure is potentially evidence of a well cover.

Domestic debris such as fragments of ceramic plates and cups, glass containers, and animal bone is distributed in the immediate vicinity of the structure, reflective of the common practice of disposal in yard areas. While most of it in and around the concentration of architectural debris dates from the first part of the nineteenth century, there is an isolated deposit of artifacts identified in Shovel Test 33 that dates closer to the middle part of the century. This is believed to reflect the second phase of domestic use of the nearby building following the death of Anne Hooe Peyton in 1833.

Ceramic fragments most closely associated with the structural debris are dominated by varieties of pearlware manufactured between 1775-1830. The ceramics in the later-dating, isolated midden are dominated by whiteware produced mainly after 1820. Less common are utilitarian wares such as locally made redware and stoneware. Working with a sample of 186 ceramic sherds, a mean ceramic date for the overall site was calculated as 1843.1.

As noted, handmade brick typical of earlier nineteenth-century construction was abundant here. While a few hand-wrought nails were identified, the majority of fasteners were machine-cut nails that became widely common early in the nineteenth century and remained so until the end of the century. Window glass was present across this area and speaks to the domestic nature of the building. Using the Moir method of window glass dating, the 115 fragments recovered thus far yielded a date of 1848.65. Also, the presence of plaster in some deposits was thought to be indicative of a well-appointed domestic resource.

Animal bone was fairly prevalent and represented a range of large to medium-sized mammals as well as birds. A full inventory of this material has not been completed but at least some is known to represent common food animals such as swine and chicken or turkey. Other artifacts recovered by this preliminary work included occasional fragments of kaolin and red-clay smoking pipes, buttons, decorative glass and metal items, horseshoes, and a knife blade fragment.

The well-preserved archaeological deposits in this section of the north yard are an important archaeological element of the Montgomery Hall property. They represent the earliest phases of the property's plantation era and an unusual associated occupation, that of a widowed mother resident in quarters separate from her son and his family but on the same estate. The site therefore is contributing to the significance of Montgomery Hall Park.

<u>Results of Field Investigations at the Barn Complex Site (Contributing Site) (#7 on Sketch Map)</u> A large barn complex historically stood west of Montgomery Hall on the opposite side of a large swale now occupied by playing fields (see Figure 2). Extant above-ground stone, brick, and concrete masonry remnants reveal as well as below-ground archaeological evidence demonstrate

City of Staunton, VA County and State

that development and use of this location extended across the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, most likely reflective of shifting agricultural practices and changing ownership.

### Architectural Remains

The barn ruin consists today of two distinct components. The earliest, believed to correspond to the Peyton plantation period, is a large stone masonry foundation defining the outline of a "bank barn" (Figure 16). It was constructed into the toe of a hillside by cutting away a portion of the slope and then installing the east-facing foundation. Vestiges of the ramp-like "bank" that gave access to the second level of the barn are evident as a low mound of stone and earth on the western slope just above the ruin. Local stone was utilized for the foundation. The masonry wall installed against the cutaway slope is relatively unrefined compared to the nicely finished east-facing wall which was originally pierced by a series of at least six, but probably a total of eight, arched openings (Figure 17). Gaps in the northern and southern walls strongly indicate they too were pierced by at least one opening, placed adjacent to those on the east wall. These openings clearly facilitated access to the lower level of the barn.

The second component of the barn ruin is defined by a series of concrete masonry walls (see Figure 16). One set of these walls marks a northern extension of the original barn and another represents an extensive retaining wall downslope to the east. The concrete walls appear to have been constructed in approximately one-foot-high courses and the mixture contains large chunks of handmade brick and limestone, presumably salvaged from plantation structures. At about the same time the openings giving access to the lower level of the original barn were closed with salvaged handmade brick and concrete (Figure 18), after which the entire lower level was filled with clay. A concrete basin with piped water was added to the southeastern corner of the original barn. These alterations to the barn complex probably signal a significant re-orientation of agricultural activity on the property very late in the nineteenth century or early in the twentieth century.

## Archaeological Evidence

A total of 14 shovel tests were excavated within and around the barn ruin following completion of a few exploratory and judgmentally-placed shovel tests (Figure 19). Overall, shovel tests and a small unit revealed quite variable deposits that speak to the complex history of activity here. Profiles exposed in the tests tended to be deceptively simple and at first suggested the deposits both within and around the ruin are deflated and shallow. Ultimately, however, it appears that dense clay fill was introduced to much of the barn area that masks deeper, artifact-bearing strata.

For example, a series of shovel tests in the northeastern portion of the barn complex very quickly encountered dense, reddish clay but below it and intermixed with it was a considerable quantity of domesticated animal bone (Figure 20). Farther south, within the confines of what appears to be the earliest part of the ruin, the same dense clay was present immediately below a thin, very dark A-horizon that might prove to be fire-related (Figure 21). The underlying clay was uniform in color and consistency, and also largely devoid of artifacts. Close inspection of the upper level of this deposit relative to the surviving foundation indicates that the clay represents an episode of intentional in-filling of what had originally been the lower level of the barn structure.

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service / National Register of Historic Places Registration Form NPS Form 10-900 OMB No. 1024-0018

Montgomery Hall Park Name of Property City of Staunton, VA County and State

Eastward of the main barn ruin is an early concrete retaining wall. A groundhog burrow at the upper (west) side of the wall exposed an abundance of artifacts indicative of relatively deep and informative deposits. This location was chosen for excavation of a 1 x 1 meter test unit (see Figure 19). Excavation in the test unit revealed a thick, intact cultural deposit about 80 cm thick. Figure 22 is the stratigraphic profile of the south wall of the unit. It records three distinct deposits: a pipe trench fill (10YR3/1-3/2 sandy loam), a builder's trench (also 10YR3/1-3/2 sandy loam), and a rubble and sandy mortar fill (7.5YR4/6-5/6). It also shows a brick footer at the southeast corner and the 6 cm pipe for which the pipe trench was built. The unit was excavated according to 10-20 cm thick arbitrary levels and the findings and observations from each of them are described below.

Stratum I consisted of a sandy loam (10YR3/1-3/2) that was dug 20 cm below ground surface, with dense roots and plant debris throughout. The stratum yielded bone, shell, brick (some vitrified), clinker, mortar, nails, glass (89 container glass, 11 window glass, four unidentifiable), melted glass, metal, modern objects, and a variety of ceramics. The most numerous ceramics were the ten sherds of ironstone bearing the logo of the Staunton Military Academy (SMA) – a nearby school that operated from 1884-1976 – along with one sherd of undecorated whiteware, one sherd of utilitarian porcelain, four sherds of decorated porcelain tableware, four sherds of Bristol/Albany stoneware, one sherd of blue spongeware, one fragment of industrial terra cotta, and two unidentified sherds. The nails appeared to become less common with depth, while glass became increasingly common with depth.

Stratum II also consisted of a sandy loam (10YR3/1-3/2) dense with roots, from 20 to 30 cm below ground surface. Artifacts consisted of bone, shell, brick, clinker, mortar, nails, glass (71 container, 6 window, 1 unidentifiable), melted glass, metal and very few modern objects – much of the same as Stratum I, though in considerably less quantity (save for the brick, which increased from I to II). Recovered ceramics include four SMA ironstone sherds, seven undecorated ironstone sherds, two utilitarian porcelain sherds, four undecorated porcelain tableware sherds, 1 undecorated porcelain sherd, and one Bristol/Albany stoneware sherd.

Stratum III was excavated 10 cm below Stratum II, from 30 to 40 cm below ground surface. Bone, shell, brick, clinker, mortar, nails, metal, glass (41 container, 12 window, 6 unidentifiable), melted glass, and ceramics were found. The ceramics include one SMA ironstone sherd, one decorated ironstone sherd, three utilitarian porcelain sherds, and one undecorated tableware porcelain sherd. Architectural material was denser than in Stratum II, while nails and non-architectural material continued to be less concentrated. A metal pipe was uncovered in this stratum, approximately 6 cm across and running north-south, 28 cm from the west wall at its center.

Stratum IV was excavated an additional 10 cm below Stratum III, from 40 to 50 cm below ground surface (though slightly higher on the south end of the test unit). Soil consisted of a sandy mortar and brick rubble fill (7.5YR4/6-5/6) that was dense with roots, with evidence of a builder's trench (10YR3/1-3/2) from the concrete wall. Artifacts included bone, brick, clinker,

City of Staunton, VA County and State

mortar, nails, metal, glass (23 container, 6 window, 5 unidentified), melted glass, and ceramics that include three sherds of undecorated ironstone.

Stratum V continued the sandy mortar and brick rubble fill, characterized by brick bats/fragments, mortar, and charcoal. Artifacts included bone, brick, clinker, mortar, charcoal, nails, metal, glass (8 container, 3 window, 1 unidentified), and melted glass. No ceramics were found in this layer.

Stratum VI, 10 cm below Stratum V, held sandy mortar and brick rubble, with a large ash component. Artifacts – which included brick, clinker, mortar, charcoal, nails, metal, glass (1 container, 2 window), melted glass, coal, and ceramics – decreased in density with depth. Recovered ceramics included one sherd of undecorated porcelain tableware and two sherds of Bristol/Albany stoneware.

Stratum VII extended approximately 20 cm below Stratum VI, nearly to subsoil. Soil was a continuation of the 7.5YR4/6-5/6 fill, through the brick appeared to be more of an orange color within this layer. Artifacts included brick, clinker, mortar, charcoal, nails, lime, metal, glass (3 container, 1 window, 2 unidentified), melted glass, and ceramics (one sherd of Bristol/Albany stoneware and one sherd of Albany slip).

Stratum VIII continued this sandy mortar and brick rubble fill until subsoil. Recovered artifacts included bone, brick, clinker, mortar, charcoal, nails, lime, metal, modern items, melted glass, and ceramics. Ceramics included one undecorated porcelain tableware and three sherds of Bristol/Albany stoneware.

Subsoil consisted of a silty clay (7.5YR4/6-5/6) approximately 90 to 95 cm from ground surface. A brick footer extended approximately 5 cm from the east wall. No cultural features were identified.

To summarize the Unit 1 results, considered from uppermost Stratum I to lowermost Stratum VIII, architectural materials increased while non-architectural materials decreased (Figures 23-24). Overall, recovered artifacts dated almost entirely from the early twentieth century, including glass container fragments largely of clear glass, machine-made varieties, nails mainly of the modern wire type, and an abundance of animal bone that was cut using machine-powered saws. Ceramics sherds were most numerous in Stratum I, particularly SMA ironstone, and they decreased significantly through Stratum VIII (see Figure 24). The prominent, lower horizon mainly consisted of demolition debris (primarily brick fragments and mortar). This layer is apparently the result of a major renovation event at the barn, perhaps following a fire. Later this material was capped by a zone of relatively uniform, loamy soil interspersed with coal cinders, animal bone, and other debris dating mainly from the first half of the twentieth century. The final period of deposition is attributed mainly to activity of the SMA or affiliates of the institution such as African American employees, but the nature of the institution's direct or indirect tie to the property remains to be ascertained.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Final results of the field investigations indicated the barn complex experienced three distinct periods of activity. The first corresponded to the plantation period when a large "bank barn" with a stone masonry foundation was constructed. It almost certainly served the diverse needs of the Peyton plantation operation through at least the mid-nineteenth century. At some point late in the nineteenth or early twentieth century the barn was modified with a northern addition supported by concrete masonry, and by closing in openings of the original masonry wall and filling the lower gallery of the original barn. Although it is not clear what precipitated this alteration, a significant shift in the nature of agricultural pursuits, perhaps more oriented to animal husbandry, is one hypothesis. There is ample evidence to suggest the barn burned by the middle of the twentieth century; only the foundation is visible in a 1954 aerial photograph. It was perhaps this event that ushered in the third phase of activity which dates to the mid-twentieth century when the property served as a public park for African Americans. Wire fencing and fence posts were strung atop and around the bare foundations, apparently to create an animal enclosure. Massive filling and dumping occurred, especially between the retaining wall and the main ruin. Material deposited at this time fairly clearly testifies to use of the area for kitchen-related disposal and perhaps butchery. The barn ruins site has yielded evidence of changing agricultural activities from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> through mid-20<sup>th</sup> century and provided information that augments the historic record pertaining to this property specifically and what is known about evolving agricultural practices in general. The site therefore is contributing to the significance of Montgomery Hall Park.

<u>Results of Field Investigations at the Spring House Site (Contributing Site) (#28 on Sketch Map)</u> The spring house site is in a wooded strip near the northern border of the park property, immediately south of the railroad and just beyond the outfield fence of a softball field (see Figure 2). The prominent feature of the site is a plantation-era masonry spring house, intact except for a covering. The spring is depicted on the 1850 plat of the Peyton plantation property (see Figure 4), and it is still active today. The structure was built into the slope behind it, which curves around the spring house and its outlet. In front of the structure is a sizable, perennially damp area supporting a growth of lush, grassy vegetation. The site is small as it represents a special-purpose facility. Based on results to date the full area is contained within a space measuring about 20 meters east-west and 20 meters north-south (Figure 25). This area encompasses the masonry structure, the saturated outlet, and a perimeter composed in part of redeposited soil. Both historic era and prehistoric material occurs within the bounds of the site.

The spring house structure measures 3.5 by 2.5 meters (see Figures 26-27). The stone masonry walls (1.5 meters in height), appearing to be fully intact, form a U-shaped enclosure open to the north. Two kinds of evidence confirm that it was originally covered. Traces of brick masonry are present on top of the stone that are configured in a way to suggest an original arched roof of brick. Four large, threaded bolts at approximate corners of the structure suggest a later covering of a different design. The interior of the enclosure is cluttered with brick and stone but the spring continues to flow. Excavation documents some evidence of other improvements to create a controllable outlet.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

The archaeological investigation of this site began with establishment of a 10 x 10-meter grid centered on the masonry structure. Eleven shovel tests were excavated at regular intervals within that space (see Figure 25). Shovel Test 1 was attempted inside the spring house structure but it was quickly abandoned due to the high density of rubble. Shovel Test 2 was located directly in front of the spring house, Shovel Tests 3 through 8 around the border of the 10 x 10-meter perimeter, and Shovel Tests 9, 10, and 11 were placed 5 meters outside of the control square to the west and east to determine the limits of activity area. Shovel Test 2 was expanded to 110 x 35 cm when wooden timbers were exposed.

During a dry spell a 5 meter by 50 cm trench, oriented east to west, was opened across the outlet in front of the spring house to explore the potential for buried improvements such as a pool or channel. The trench was located 2.5 meters north of the spring house structure and it spanned the saturated outlet basin from its east side to its approximate center. Probing had confirmed the existence of substantial wood and brick or stone in this area. For the sake of efficiency only representative sections of the trench were excavated. A total of six 50 x 50 cm units were completed within the confines of the trench (Figures 28-29), all of which were excavated without stratigraphic controls. Trench Unit 1 was located 0 - 0.5 m from the west end of the trench, Trench Unit 2 was 2 - 2.5 meters from the west end, and Trench Unit 3 was 4 - 4.5 meters from the west end. Considering the results from these first units, Unit 4 was then placed 1.5 - 2 meters from the west end of the trench, unit 5 was 1 - 1.5 meters from the west end, and 6 was 2.5 - 3meters from the west end.

Deposits on the site vary considerably, especially depending on whether they are located on the upland slope or in the saturated basin. In the shovel tests placed on the upland around the spring house, the deposits were unexpectedly complex, marked more often than not by uneven fill layers, with especially thick strata on the western side. In the typical shovel test, Stratum I was a dark, loamy clay (10YR3/3), Stratum II was a lighter yellowish, reddish brown loamy clay silt (7.5YR4/6 and 10YR4/4), Stratum III was a slightly lighter and redder silty clay (7.5YR5/8) and Stratum IV was very similar in color to Stratum III but had a loamy clay texture and was only present in Shovel Tests 3, 6, and 10 (Figures 30-31). These results are indicative of redeposited soil, most likely generated by periodic episodes of spring-related maintenance.

Site-wide it appears that two kinds of landscaping were undertaken to enhance the water source. One involved wide area removal of sediment and even native subsoil to create a sizable basinlike outlet that averages about 10 meters wide and apparently extending some 20 meters northward toward the creek. Creation and maintenance of this basin accounts for most of the redeposited soil on the upland perimeter.

The trench excavation revealed evidence of improvements aimed at channelization and perhaps pooling of the outflow within the larger basin. The stratigraphic profile exposed by the trench reveals that the bottom of the basin was stepped (see Figure 25). Toward the center the bottom was lowest, or about 35 cm below the present surface, and then about 1.5 meters from the midline it rose rather abruptly by about 15 cm. Precisely at the margin of the elevation change the trench excavation revealed what appear to be traces of a collapsed stone wall or perhaps a

City of Staunton, VA County and State

rip-rap border. In effect, the main channel directing water away from the springhouse was somewhat formally defined. Assuming symmetry, the full width of the channel or pool must have been at least 3 meters. The formalized outflow was clearly recognized as late as the midtwentieth century since the trench excavation also exposed woven fence wire directly aligned with the stone rubble and a possible wood fence post was also exposed nearby. Further, the bottom of every unit completed in the trench (except Unit 3) encountered a dense layer of stone, apparently marking the improved bottom of the channel/pool.

Judging from the cross section of the deposits exposed in the trench, the main outlet was regularly maintained to allow free flow away from the spring, and perhaps some pooling immediately in front of the structure. The gravelly-stony bottom, largely free of fine sediment, is indicative of those conditions, as is the presence of small gastropod shells. Clearly, however, the maintenance activity eventually ceased and the outlet became choked with silt. Most likely this change occurred toward the middle of the twentieth century.

Artifacts found at the spring house indicate multiple periods of use, both prehistoric and historic, with most artifacts indicating significant activity during the plantation era. These artifacts include pearlware, which was produced between 1775 and 1830; redware, which was produced between 1700 and 1900; and black/olive green glass, which was produced until 1880. Most artifacts were either architectural, relating to the improvements around the spring, or they were domestic, representing parts of ceramic or glass vessels used for transporting spring water or for on-site storage.

Ceramics were dominated by early nineteenth century varieties such as pearlware and locallymade redware, as well as occasional types like British Brown stoneware (n=2) and Staffordshire slipware (n=1). A small subset of the ceramic sample signifies use of the area during subsequent periods. The spring house produced the least amount of glass of any of the sites examined in this report. Of the 27 pieces of container glass 6 were early-style black/olive green glass from Trench Units 4, 5, and 6. Nine of the 12 identifiable nails are machine-cut types common to nineteenth century structures. What appears to be a fragment of a gray chert gunflint was found in Shovel Test 2 and a possible round lead shot was in Trench Unit 6.

In the trench units, along with an abundance of stone and occasional brick bats, a few large chunks of coal and woven fence wire were identified, all testament to later periods of activity. The coal potentially originated at the nearby railroad and the wire fence was probably installed during the twentieth century to keep animals out of the water source.

Prehistoric usage of a prominent spring is to be expected and at this site it was documented by +recovery of a side-notched, quartzite projectile point (Shovel Test 6) and pieces of quartzite debitage in the trench units. The projectile point and the absence of ceramics confirm prehistoric use at least during parts of the Archaic Period (5000-1000 BC).

Archaeological investigations confirmed that the spring site was part of the property's everyday activities from the plantation era at least through the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The artifact assemblage

City of Staunton, VA County and State

and the evidence of improvements to channelize the stream's flow provide information about historic uses. The ruins of the springhouse itself also are indicative of the historic importance of the site. Consequently, the site is contributing to the property's overall significance.

<u>Results of Field Investigations at the Dump Site (Contributing Site) #29 on Sketch Map</u> This small site is located fairly centrally on the park property, immediately adjacent to an electrical transmission corridor and about 100 meters south of the current dumping area (see Figure 2). The site occurs within a space estimated to measure at least 15 meters east-west and 10 meters north-south and it is covered in thick undergrowth and woodland. The location of the dump was shared with us by a parks department employee. Ample evidence of early twentieth century dumping activity is visible on the surface in the form of debris ranging from toilet fragments, wheels and tires, to glass bottles and ceramics.

The testing operation began with establishment of a temporary datum. Three shovel tests were then placed in the area where cultural material was visible on the surface. The test pattern was later expanded outward in two-meter intervals to determine the extent of the dump deposit. Specifically, Shovel Tests 1, 3, and 6 were clustered on the obvious deposit and Shovel Tests 2, 4, and 5 were placed further away (Figure 32). The dump area deposits retain excellent archaeological integrity. Shovel Tests 1, 3, and 6, had extremely high artifact densities. Shovel Tests 1 and 3 were expanded to 50 x 50 centimeters in size because the density of metal impeded excavation in a typical, smaller test. Shovel Test 2 was negative, and Shovel Tests 4 and 5 had very few artifacts and were comparatively very shallow (only about 40 cm deep).

Shovel tests in the dump area ranged between 25 and 80 centimeters deep (Figures 33-34). Typical tests had a dark—almost black —A horizon (7.5YR2.5/3, silty loam) with red clay subsoil (7.5YR4/4) and varying numbers of strata in between (Shovel Tests 1 and 6 had 4 strata each while Shovel Tests 3, 4, and 5 had 2 each). Strata below the A horizon all contained some amount of clay. Shovel Test 3 hit subsoil at a steep slope, first on the southern side of the test at 25 cm, then on the northern side at 34 cm below the surface. Shovel Test 3 was directly south of Shovel Test 1 and directly north of negative Shovel Test 2, which suggests that Shovel Test 3 was on the edge of that feature and that Shovel Tests 1 and 6 were likely in the center of it. In short, the dump was probably made in a naturally formed gully.

At the site and also as artifacts were washed it was evident from an odor that the debris was deposited along with manure. It should be noted that ceramics, glass, etc., were found most commonly above sheet metal, and the majority of material culture deeper than 15 to 20 cm below the surface was sheet metal.

Dumping activity at this site was confined to the early to middle twentieth century, as indicated by the types and ages of artifacts that occur in the deposit. Ceramics were dominated by late varieties of whiteware, such as decal decorated, gilt decorated, and transfer printed, as well as by undecorated porcelain. Other relatively recent ceramic types include Bristol slip stoneware, yellow ware, and ornately molded containers. Glass artifacts consisted mainly of machine-made containers including milk bottles and screw-top medicine bottles. The colors of container glass

City of Staunton, VA County and State

were typical of early twentieth century types, including clear, cobalt, rose, bright green, brown, and milk-colored.

Architectural material was common. Most of the 104 nails were too encrusted to identify by type but modern wire nails were prevalent among those that could be identified. Large sections of sheet metal, very probably roofing material, were present as well. Brick was very scarce. The origin of this material is uncertain but it was potentially moved from the site of a demolished building elsewhere on the property, perhaps even the barn. Observation – and odor – of manure in the dump deposits is suggestive of barn-related dumping.

Various domestic items were recovered beyond ceramics and glass. Among them were a small scrap of cloth, shoe leather, a small ferrous buckle, and two pieces of apparent light bulb glass. Also, a small quantity of large animal bone was recovered.

To summarize, artifacts from the tests, combined with observation of related debris at the surface, indicates that the dumping occurred during the mid- twentieth century into an eroding gully. The ultimate origin of the material remains uncertain but we propose that the location was either the barn area or a nearby farmhouse, or both. Potentially it represents clean-up associated with the "repurposing" of the property in the 1940s so that it could serve as an African American park. The dump site, together with the barn complex site, contributes information related to 20<sup>th</sup> century activity at the park (as well as habits for debris removal that predate modern environmental standards). This relationship, and the dump's likely association with the property's conversion to a public park for African Americans, the dump site is contributing.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

#### 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.

Х

Х

- 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.
- Х
- 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

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service / National Register of Historic Places Registration Form NPS Form 10-900 OMB No. 1024-0018

Montgomery Hall Park Name of Property City of Staunton, VA County and State

Areas of Significance (Enter categories from instructions.) <u>SOCIAL HISTORY</u> <u>ETHNIC HERITAGE: African American</u> <u>ENTERTAINMENT/RECREATION</u> <u>ARCHITECTURE</u> ARCHAEOLOGY – Historic – Non-Aboriginal

Period of Significance

<u>1821-1847</u> <u>1907-1967</u>

#### Significant Dates

<u>1903</u> <u>1907</u> 1947

#### Significant Person

(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.) N/A

**Cultural Affiliation** 

Euro-American

#### Architect/Builder

<u>Collins, T. J.</u> <u>T. J. Collins & Son</u> <u>Collins, Sam</u>

City of Staunton, VA County and State

**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.)

Montgomery Hall Park is eligible for the NRHP at the state level under Criterion A, in the areas of Ethnic Heritage: African American, Social History, and Entertainment/Recreation, for its historic significance as a segregated park for the African-American community during the Jim Crow era of segregation from its founding in 1946 until 1969 when the park was desegregated and incorporated into the City of Staunton's park system. During the segregation era, an African-American committee of private citizens operated the City-owned facility largely independently of City involvement. Together with nearby Booker T. Washington School, and the area churches, the park became one leg of the three-legged stool upon which the local African-American community rested. The park's significance stretched across the state due to the dearth of public parks that were accessible to African American citizens in most Virginia communities. The park's importance is evidenced by summer visitation numbers that reached past 18,000 and the fact that groups from African-American communities across the state came to Montgomery Hall Park. With its 150-acre size and number of amenities, Montgomery Hall Park had a reputation that extended throughout the Commonwealth. Montgomery Hall Park is also locally significant under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as a good example of a Colonial Revival residence as designed by noted local architect T.J. Collins. The Collins family spanned five generations of builder/architects since the late eighteenth century and the Staunton office provided design services for 115 years.<sup>3</sup> Under Criterion D, Montgomery Hall Park is locally significant in the area of Archaeology - Historic - Non-Aboriginal. The acreage associated with Montgomery Hall Park and the three antebellum archaeological sites are also associated with the contributions to the nation's early history during John Howe Peyton's lifetime. Montgomery Hall would have been one of the places in the newly established Republic where ideas about the course of the new nation were discussed at length. As one of America's most prominent local, state, and national early Republic leaders, John Howe Peyton was a member of social and political circles that included U.S. Presidents Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and U.S. statesman Henry Clay, all of whom stayed at the 1820s Montgomery Hall plantation dwelling and engaged in political discourse with Peyton. The fourth site is believed to be associated with the property's conversion to a public park. The archaeological sites already have yielded information important to understanding the property's history since the plantation era and future investigations are likely to yield additional information. The property has two periods of significance. The first is 1821-1847, beginning with construction of the original Montgomery Hall, ending with Peyton's death, after which his family left the property, and encompassing the dates of the contributing antebellum archaeological sites. The second period of significance is 1907-1967, beginning with construction of Montgomery Hall (now the Irene Givens Administration Building) and ending with the traditional fifty-year cutoff for properties where significant activities have continued into the more recent past.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

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

### The Creation of Montgomery Hall Plantation

When thirty-year-old John Howe Peyton, a Princeton-educated lawyer from Stafford County, Virginia, moved to Staunton to connect with some of America's most prominent political and legal statesmen, he was positioning himself at the top tier of Virginia's elite. In 1821, upon his marriage to Ann Montgomery Lewis of Sweet Springs, two of Virginia's more prominent families were joined. Peyton's family went back to seventeenth-century Tidewater plantation owners, and Montgomery's family went directly back to the patriarch John Lewis, considered among the earliest and most important settlers in Augusta County when it was the western frontier of European settlement.

### America's Leaders Visited Montgomery Hall

The marriage was the second for Peyton, his first wife having died in 1820, leaving him with one child. Peyton's new marriage prompted him to provide an appropriate living arrangement for his bride and he began building an expansive residence on his property of several hundred acres to the west of Staunton that he had purchased in 1810. More than likely he and his first wife had already been living on the property in an older dwelling. It took two years, from 1822-1824, to build Montgomery Hall. The house was based upon plans, according to an unsubstantiated family story, provided by Thomas Jefferson. Whether or not Jefferson was involved in the design of the mansion that came to be called Montgomery Hall (after Ann Peyton's maiden name), Peyton was acquainted with the third President as well as President James Madison and other leaders of the new republic, many of whom were entertained at the spacious mansion. There, undoubtedly, deep political discussions in regard to the development of the young United States took place. Peyton's son, John Lewis Peyton, wrote about his father's circle of acquaintances that they were "among the most distinguished for talents and acquirements, for rank and station in the State and Country."<sup>4</sup>

Peyton lived a full and active public life, making a difference on the local, state, and national levels. As a lawyer he served as Augusta County's Commonwealth Attorney for thirty-two years. Contemporary accounts praise his courtroom skills where he was a distinguished criminal lawyer. Some contemporaries called him the "greatest lawyer west of the Blue Ridge." His written and oratory work from the bar was recognized as superior.<sup>5</sup>

In 1808 he moved to Staunton, then one of the most important cities west of the Blue Ridge. Staunton was the seat of the superior courts for all of western Virginia, which at that time contained all of present-day West Virginia. There he rose to the top of the legal profession with one of his biographers noting: "He met in contest the strongest men in each department of the law and he made himself a champion in all." A contemporary, Daniel Sheffey, noted "He possessed gigantic power without effort, was leader in his circuit and at the head of the profession."<sup>6</sup>

City of Staunton, VA County and State

There were two instances of Peyton's absence from the bar – while serving in the military and while serving in the Virginia legislature. In 1802-1803 he joined a volunteer cavalry company and was commissioned captain. Later, during the War of 1812, he served as chief of staff to General Robert Porterfield from 1812-1815.

Twice Peyton served in Virginia's legislature, once as a young man and once late in life. In 1806 he was elected to the House of Delegates representing Stafford County and served for several years until moving to Staunton. Many years later he spent five years, 1839-1845, in the Virginia Senate representing Augusta and Rockbridge Counties. He also served as Mayor of Staunton in 1816 and 1817.<sup>7</sup> However, though he followed state and national politics with a passion, his love was in the legal profession, practicing law. As such he turned down judgeships in order to continue as a prosecutor.

Education was important to him, and his biographer noted that, "He regarded education or intellectual progress as the sure forerunner of moral improvement." In an effort to improve the young men and women of the upper Shenandoah Valley, he served diligently on the following institutional boards: Washington College (now Washington and Lee University), the Staunton Academy, and the Virginia Female Institute (now Stuart Hall). He played an important role in the founding of both the Virginia Military Institute (VMI) and Virginia Female Institute. He was very involved in the promotion of VMI and advocated the merger of Washington College and VMI into one university in Lexington, Virginia. Nationally, he accepted the position of "visitor" to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and penned one of the most highly regarded strategic plans for that institution at that time.<sup>8</sup>

His work in society went far beyond the educational and legal institutions of the day. "It may not be out of place to mention here that his interest in, and sympathy for the unfortunate and afflicted was manifested in various ways, but especially by his services as a member of the Court of Directors of the Western Lunatic Asylum," (now Western State Hospital; NRHP 1969; DHR #132-0009), noted one of his biographers. He served on that board for twenty years and was president for ten of those years.<sup>9</sup>

## A Wheat Plantation and an African-American Community

Although a lawyer and a statesman who served in the Virginia legislature, Peyton made his living as a plantation owner. As such Montgomery Hall was a working farm with wheat as the cash crop, but with diversified production that included a number of crops, orchards, and livestock. In order to run such an agricultural enterprise, Peyton exploited the labor of approximately fifty enslaved African Americans, making him one of the largest slave owners in Augusta County. In the Shenandoah Valley, unlike at single crop plantations of Tidewater Virginia, African-Americans often worked side-by-side with whites, even landed gentry such as the Peytons. The system of bondage that developed in the Upper Valley was different, although no less brutal, than other parts of the South. The family of both black and white individuals that evolved at Montgomery Hall provides an excellent example of the type of slave society that existed in the Shenandoah Valley during the first half of the nineteenth century. Thus the story

City of Staunton, VA County and State

during the Peyton era is two-tiered: that of an influential statesman and prosperous agriculturalist and his family and that of the African-American community upon which the success of Montgomery Hall rested.

### An Architectural Story

The architectural story that is interwoven into the social history is both grand, as in the mansion house and the mother-in-law's cottage that was built a few years after the main house, and vernacular – the slave quarters, barns, springhouse, smokehouse, and other utilitarian buildings necessary in a successful farm operation. The architectural story took an interesting twist in the first years of the twentieth century with the involvement of famed Staunton architect T.J. Collins, who was retained to redesign the residence after a tragic fire in 1906.

T. J. Collins was a Washington D.C. architect who designed a number of post offices before relocating to Staunton in 1891 as a part of a building boom in the Shenandoah Valley. For the next twenty years, he designed over two hundred buildings throughout the central part of the Valley. His son, Sam Collins, joined the firm in 1903, and it became T. J. Collins & Son, a name it retained after Sam Collins took over as principal in 1911. T. J. Collins came from a long line of builder/architects. His father built the arsenals at Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, and his grandfather was awarded a second place prize for his design of the U. S. President's House in a national competition in 1791. The T. J. Collins & Son remained in operation through the end of the twentieth century.

#### Peyton's Death

Peyton died in 1847 and, while the family continued to be prominent in the Staunton area, they soon left Montgomery Hall. Perhaps the most important person among Peyton's children who had been born and raised at Montgomery Hall was son John Lewis Peyton who died at nearby Steephill in 1896 in his late seventies. He is best known as the historian for Augusta County and wrote what is still today considered a definitive history of Augusta. A lawyer like his father, he served the U.S. in the diplomatic service to France. During the Civil War he represented the Confederate government in England.<sup>10</sup>

## **Representative of Valley Agriculture**

At the time of Peyton's death, the Montgomery Hall holdings consisted of over 800 acres. By 1850, however, the mansion house and 300 acres had been sold to William J. Shumate. Over the next several years, the rest of the acreage was sold off. From 1850 until World War II, the estate went through a series of above-average landed gentry owners, all of whom had family connections in the area. The farm became a showcase of Shenandoah Valley agriculture and was still used for fine entertainment among the well-heeled members of society, but the prestige and statesmanship of the Peytons was never replicated.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

The first owner after Peyton was William J. Shumate, who owned Montgomery Hall from 1850 to 1871 when the farm was sold at public auction.<sup>11</sup> Shumate, like Peyton, relied on enslaved African Americans to perform much of the farm work. One important event that changed the farm was the coming of the railroad in the 1850s. What eventually became the Chesapeake & Ohio railroad passed through a portion of the farm and made it much easier to ship agricultural produce to market, receive goods, and enable travel. In 1871 Montgomery Hall was sold under court order. Its worth as a fine piece of agricultural land is spelled out in the newspaper advertisement:

"...that very desirable farm known as MONTGOMERY HALL, containing about 150 acres, and located immediately on the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad in the county of Augusta, one mile West of the City of Staunton. The land is fine limestone, well adapted to grass, and all the cereals...about 40 acres of this land are in *orchards* of select fruits."

The advertisement goes on to describe the mansion house and "a large Swisher barn" [bank barn]<sup>12</sup>

#### **Slavery Ends**

The Civil War occurred during the Shumate ownership of the property and there are stories of Confederate soldiers being encamped at the farm but no record of any skirmishes here. In the earliest days of the war, however, the centuries-old institution of slavery began to crumble. On May 27, 1861, Union General Benjamin F. Butler issued his "contrabands decision," which found that enslaved persons working for the Confederate cause could be confiscated as "contrabands of war." Many enslaved people in the vicinity of Fort Monroe, where Butler held command, believed that running away to Union-held territory would gain them their freedom and they soon began to arrive at Fort Monroe in growing numbers. Butler's decision was sustained by Congress in August 1861 with the First Confiscation Act, which confirmed that any enslaved person who worked for military purposes could be confiscated by Union troops. In July 1862, Congress passed the Second Confiscation Act, which broadened the definition of slaves working on behalf of the Confederacy to include any enslaved person working for any person within Confederate states. On September 22, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln issued a preliminary Emancipation Proclamation, which was followed on January 1, 1863 by the better-known Emancipation Proclamation that declared that all enslaved persons held in the eleven Confederate states were henceforth free; thus, slavery was allowed to continue in the border states, such as Maryland and Kentucky, that had not seceded. Just two years later, however, with the end of the Civil War in sight, Congress passed the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which abolished slavery in all parts of the United States. By early December 1865, three-quarters of states, including several that had seceded, had ratified the amendment, making it officially a part of the U.S. Constitution.

Information about enslaved people at Montgomery Hall during the war years is elusive, as it is for many places across Virginia. A partial list of 21 of Shumate's enslaved workers is available at a website maintained by Jane Gray Avery. The list includes some unnamed individuals as well

City of Staunton, VA County and State

as men, women, and children. To date, specific information about one enslaved family, comprised of Mary and Jesse and their children, William Henry and George has been collected. Mary died shortly after George's birth. Shortly after, Jesse, William Henry, and George, along with a woman named Eliza Ann, were gifted to Virginia A. Bower Humphreys Shumate by her father shortly after she married William Shumate in 1852. Eliza Ann had a daughter, Mary, while at Montgomery Hall. In 1860, Jesse, William Henry, and George all were sold to an unknown owner or owners and it is not known if they ever reunited. Such destruction of familial bonds was a common occurrence for the duration of slavery from the 17<sup>th</sup> century until slavery was finally abolished in the waning months of the Civil War. After the war, many of the freed families apparently remained in Montgomery Hall's vicinity, which was a not-unusual choice for people still learning the rights and privileges of citizenship. The creek at the farm was reportedly a spot where baptisms took place during religious services held by the black community.<sup>13</sup>

### More Turnover

William W. Donaghe purchased Montgomery Hall and 150 acres in 1871. Donaghe was related to the Peytons and other founders of Augusta County. He lived just two years after purchasing the farm and Henry Dwight Peck acquired the farm from Donaghe's estate. Peck continued to operate a thriving farm operation and advertised his fine livestock regularly in the Staunton newspapers. He also upgraded the mansion house, adding central heat and plumbing. That Montgomery Hall remained a prosperous farm is somewhat exceptional in Virginia, as economic difficulties and the loss of enslaved workers forced many Virginia plantation owners to subdivide and sell their properties. Into the twentieth century, the estate continued to be a showcase with grand entertainments and elaborate weddings that made the society columns of the local newspaper. To illustrate that statement, one has to look no further than the real estate sales flyer for the house that was printed about 1913, when the house was put up for sale by owner Bates Warren. It noted that Montgomery Hall had been "for a number of years, the home of cultured, refined and wealthy people, who exercised the best judgment and taste in the improvement of the property."<sup>14</sup>

## Enter T.J. Collins, Architect

In 1902, Peck sold the property to Emma and Frank Walter, who traveled in the circles of high society in Washington D.C. The Walters reconstituted some of the earlier tracts of land for Montgomery Hall and hired locally notable architect T.J. Collins to design an addition and renovate the eighty-year-old mansion house. Collins began making drawings of the house when tragedy struck. According to the local newspapers, the house was completely consumed by fire on February 11, 1906. The article went on to describe the home as "one of the finest suburban homes" in the area and estimated the damage to have been about \$20,000.<sup>15</sup>

Fortunately, the house was well insured and the Walters rented a home in Staunton while Collins designed a replacement house built over the remains of the original structure. The new mansion was completed a year later in 1907. Because Collins prepared drawings before the fire,
City of Staunton, VA County and State

interesting comparisons can be made between the original house and the new Montgomery Hall as noted in the architectural description section of this nomination.<sup>16</sup>

#### A Series of Owners

In 1911, the Walters sold the Montgomery Hall tract to Bates Warren of Washington, D.C., who only used the home as a summer retreat. Two years later he sold the property to J.S. Kennedy, "Augusta County's well-known breeder of fine horses," (according to the Staunton newspaper) for \$100,000.<sup>17</sup> The property was then sold to Davitt Chidester in 1927 and in 1932 Alexander Thomas purchased the property. During the Thomas years a dairy operated on the property.<sup>18</sup>

# An African-American Haven

Until the Civil Rights era of the 1960s, African Americans in the Jim Crow South lived under the harsh social customs and extensive legal framework that created a separate and very unequal society. That was as true for African Americans in Staunton and Augusta County as it was anywhere else. However, in 1947, thanks to the perseverance and leadership of Staunton's African-American community, a small beacon of light was created in the form of Montgomery Hall Park.

Staunton and Augusta County's white residents had enjoyed Gypsy Hill Park well before the twentieth century. By World War II the park had a swimming pool, golf course, a bandstand, and picnic areas. Black residents, however, were only allowed to visit the park one day each year. After they used the pool, the water was drained from it and it was closed for the season. Rather than submit to such humiliating rules, many area African Americans refused to step foot on the grounds of Gypsy Hill. However, shortly after World War II, leaders in the black community began asking for more use of Gypsy Hill. The Staunton City Council minutes recorded in January of 1946 the fact that Dr. C. J. Waller as well as other members of "several colored [sic] organizations" began pushing to have the opportunity to visit Gypsy Hill Park on certain days every week. Given the prevailing white supremacy of the era, this was not an option that the city council's all-white membership approved of; however, the governing body did listen when African American leaders like the Rev. T.J. Jemison of Mount Zion Baptist Church suggested the city give his community a park of their own.<sup>19</sup> That was an option the city elders might be able to accommodate.

In June of 1946, the City of Staunton purchased 150 acres and the mansion house known as Montgomery Hall from A. C. Thomas and his wife for \$42,500. The city then turned the park over to the African-American community and put the Rev. Jemison in charge of the Negro Recreation Committee, a private organization that was made up of volunteers. George Taylor was his assistant. For the next two decades, the park was embraced by the African-American community, not just from Staunton, Augusta County, and nearby Waynesboro, but from across Virginia. It became a haven of recreation, fun, social gatherings, spiritual gatherings, and educational classes for all ages. Staunton's City Council endowed the African American community full control for the operation and maintenance of the park under the control of the

City of Staunton, VA County and State

recreation committee, in exchange for which the City offered limited public funds for its maintenance and upkeep. The recreation committee set the rules of the park, established programs, hired employees, oversaw repairs and improvements, and created budgets. Given the City's limited budget for the park, money for most improvements, equipment, and other extras came from admission fees, concession stand sales, and other fundraising activities. The park committee met regularly with City management and, on occasion, the city council expanded its coffers when additional needs arose above the allotted budget.<sup>20</sup>

From the very beginning the private community, both black and white, helped make the park a success. Initial gifts to the park during its opening season came from twenty-six different individuals and businesses and along with cash, included dishes, card tables, paint, chairs, a painting, a flower vase, records, curtains, smoking stands, magazines, books, and a piano.<sup>21</sup>

#### <u>An African-American Park Opens</u>

The formal dedication of the new "recreation center," as the Staunton newspaper called Montgomery Hall Park, took place on July 4, 1947. The autonomous recreation committee had already been in place for many months preparing for the grand opening. According to the newspaper, 1,500 persons attended the opening ceremonies, including folks from seven other states and "many white friends." The park formally opened its gates at 10 a.m. with fun and games taking place throughout the day. Activities included volleyball, ping-pong, croquet, horseshoes, bowling, and softball. An afternoon matinee was held with an admission charge of thirty-five cents. At 8 p.m. that evening, Staunton Mayor William A. Grubert officially turned the park over to the "Negro Committee," in a short ceremony and reception. In introducing Mayor Grubert, the vice-chairman of the Negro Recreation Committee, George Taylor, told the crowd that the park was a "dream realized." He urged everyone to "show the highest appreciation and the highest order of conduct, so we can maintain the place the way it should be kept."

Mayor Grubert's remarks included this:

"I deeply appreciate the privilege of participating in these dedication ceremonies. All those who have the welfare of the community at heart rejoice at the acquisition of this property and its consecration as a recreational center. We see today the fruition of many years of untiring efforts on the part of the City Council to purchase a property of a size adequate for a recreational center for the Negro population of our City. The present site was selected, not only because it is located near the majority of our colored population, but also because it offers excellent possibilities for future development."

We must realize, of course, that development of this property cannot be accomplished within a day. But it will be the policy of the Council to speed this development by making a substantial annual appropriation which – within a few years with your help – will enable us to improve the building and grounds to such

City of Staunton, VA County and State

an extent that you will have a recreational center, which not only you, but the entire community will be proud of."

The day concluded with a dance. The newspaper described the importance of the event as follows:

"Formal acceptance of the installation by the Negro population will culminate a project which began when the city purchased the property from A.C. Thomas for use as a Negro [sic] recreation area. A series of conferences between a City Council committee and a committee of Negro citizens resulted in a plan for the area's maintenance. A caretaker was installed in the large building which will serve as a recreation center, the turf was graded and sodded, and the building made ready for use."

In his dedication speech, Mayor Grubert explained that the City Council selected the Negro Recreation Committee from many names that were submitted of people willing to devote time and effort to make the park a success. Grubert also noted that he had asked the Rev. Mr. Jemison's committee to select a name for the park. The newly appointed committee chose Montgomery Hall Park.

Jemison, in accepting the park for the community, told the crowd: "Now our children have a place to play; our adults have a place to enjoy their evenings in beauty and splendor. And the beauty of it is—it's yours." After the purchase, the City placed the operations of the park in the hands of the black community. From that point, the committee ran the park with almost no support or interference from the City. That meant raising money for capital projects as well as daily operations. The committee took its job seriously and recorded everything it did in a notebook. From 1947 until the fall of 1969, when integration brought the park into the mainstream of the City system, details of the park's history were faithfully recorded in that book. Today the worn notebook represents the only written history of Montgomery Hall Park during its period as a segregated park for African Americans. It is preserved in the archives of the Augusta County Historical Society.<sup>22</sup>

#### More than Just a Park

For the African-American community, Montgomery Hall Park was more than just a recreational area. For black families in the Staunton area, the foundation of their community had three interconnected parts: Booker T. Washington School, the area's African-American churches, and Montgomery Hall Park. They were interconnected and together comprised the heart and soul of the community. It was recognized from the very beginning that the school, the churches, and the park complemented one another.

For its part, the park committee often consulted with the school's schedule before setting up its own events such as athletic tournaments or dances. In October of 1947 the park committee wanted to establish Friday night recreational activities, for instance, but hesitated to move forward until the high school had been consulted. A decade later, as the park grew and expanded,

City of Staunton, VA County and State

the park committee approached the City manager and the school board about hiring an athletic director for the school who would work at the park in the summer months. That position eventually was created.

By the same token, the school often looked to the park to expand its activities. For instance, the high school never had a football team, but students from the school began to organize at the park after school to form a competitive team. They were given space at the park to store their athletic equipment. During the summer the school majorettes used the park to practice. In the fall of 1956, high school principal A.R. Ware wrote a letter to the park committee requesting use of the mansion house for the band. He noted that his band teacher needed a place where he could teach band, give individual instruction, and rehearse the entire band from 12:30 until 4:30 each day. Further he inquired as to the possibility of the band storing instruments during the school year. The committee agreed to host the band and found space for the instruments.

Area churches as well as those from outside of the area were regulars at the park. The park had not even been open a month when three church groups from outside the area paid ten dollars each to spend a day at the park. Two Baptist churches in the area, Ebenezer and Mt. Zion, held weekly vesper services in the park every summer in July and August. Church picnics as well as Easter sunrise services were staples of the spiritual life of the park. Mt. Zion also held its Vacation Bible School at the park.<sup>23</sup>

#### Visitors from Near and Far

It didn't take long for the reputation of Montgomery Hall to spread across the state. It was not unusual for several dozen buses from the Valley of Virginia down to Roanoke and Clifton Forge and even east of the mountains from the Charlottesville and Lynchburg areas to make the day-long visit to Staunton. In some cases, groups camped overnight at the park. In a summer season that lasted from the beginning of June until Labor Day, visitation often topped out at over 18,000.

Among the examples of groups from outside the area are these. In 1953 the Baptist Bible School Union of Charlottesville arrived for its annual picnic. In that same year the First Baptist Church of Clifton Forge also planned to visit the park for an annual picnic. In 1965 the Extension Agent from Amherst County sent a note to the park committee thanking them for the hospitality shown toward the 300 4-Hers who had come to the park for a picnic. Throughout the years, a number of different groups from Rockbridge County were regular visitors to the park as well.

Many local organizations were allowed to meet in the mansion house or the bowling alley building. The VFW was given permanent space within the building over top of the bowling alley. The Girl Scouts were also provided with their own meeting space. The girls hosted a benefit social at the park so that they could equip their meeting room. Both the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts had troops that met at the park, but the park was also used as a gathering place for African-American Scouts from across the region.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

The Girl Scouts in particular were active at the park, hosting many socials and even a dance in which they crowned one young lady as Miss Girl Scout. For many years there was a two-week camp for girls that was held at the park. In May of 1958 the field director of the Augusta-Rockingham Girl Scouts wrote the park committee requesting permission to once again operate their day camp "for colored Girl Scouts" from June 16-20 from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. each day. They wanted to continue the arrangement of allowing the girls to use the pool each day for ten cents per girl.<sup>24</sup>.

The Mt. Zion Baptist Church Boy Scout Troop No. 56 spent a lot of time at the park. Former members recall camping out, hiking, and grilling hamburgers at the park. Jimmy Becks, a member of the Montgomery Hall Park committee, was also the Boy Scout Troop leader for many years. He remembers bringing the Scouts to the park for overnight or weekend camping expeditions. "We would camp anywhere that we could put a tent, but most of the time by the bowling alley," he recalled.<sup>25</sup>

# **Bowling Alley**

Despite the efforts of the committee and the City, Montgomery Hall Park was never as large or as grand as Gypsy Hill Park. However, it did have several amenities that were absent from Gypsy Hill. The whites-only park had, for instance, a large building, but it did not approach the size and grandeur of the mansion at Montgomery Hall Park. And Gypsy Hill Park did not have a bowling alley. Although small, the Montgomery Hall Park's bowling alley was a source of fun and pride for the community. It was a holdover from the days of grandeur as a mansion house for the elite of Staunton. The recreation committee poured its heart and soul into fixing up the building, learning about the sport, and operating a profitable enterprise. The committee talked of making the bowling alley "a real center of activity" and of the desire to form teams to challenge teams from other towns.

By the late 1950s the operation of the bowling alley had been placed in the hands of Dr. Chiles, who turned it into a thriving part of the park activities. He even attended out-of-town training about the operation of the business. Dr. Chiles proudly reported to the park committee that the Montgomery Hall Park bowling alley was the only "Negro owned alley in the state." Unlike many of the park facilities that were only open in the summer months, the bowling alley eventually operated year round.<sup>26</sup>

#### Swimming Pool

In the first seasons of the park, there was one glaring difference between the whites-only park in Staunton and Montgomery Hall Park —a swimming pool. Before Montgomery Hall Park's establishment, African Americans were allowed to use Gypsy Hill Park and its pool for just one day per year. Therefore, most area members of the black community who knew how to swim recalled learning in area creeks and rivers or by going to one of the few other parks set aside for African Americans in the state. Almost from opening day at Montgomery Hall Park, the recreation committee began weighing options, including obtaining a bank loan, in order to rectify

City of Staunton, VA County and State

the situation. Then Elizabeth Catlett, a member of a prominent family in Staunton, died and left \$10,000 for the "benefit of the colored people of Staunton." Catlett's sister and executor, Amy Catlett, decided to use the money to build at pool at Montgomery Hall Park. A very appreciative park committee set about getting construction bids in June of 1948.

The pool was complete sometime in July of 1949. Before the summer was out, a pool dedication was held in a ceremony that included Mayor Grubert. The addition of the pool only increased the park visitation and increased the workload of the staff. A lifeguard and swim instructor were hired and bathhouses were created in the building above the bowling alley. To swim, adults paid twenty-five cents a day and children paid twenty cents.<sup>27</sup>

Eugenia Becks Taylor was a lifeguard at the pool for about a decade. Shortly after her eighteenth birthday the athletic young lady, who played high school sports and majored in physical education in college, was sent for a two-week training course by the American Red Cross down to the A&I State College (now Tennessee State University) in Nashville, Tennessee. While there, Taylor attended National Aquatic School and earned her water safety and life-saving certificate. For ten years, even after marrying and moving out of state, Mrs. Taylor returned home to Staunton for the summer and worked at the park. To say the pool was popular is an understatement. "Sometimes we were like sardines," she said. Although she only ever had to rescue one man who tired in the deep end of the pool, she admitted to having to rescue "a lot of swimming trunks" that were made of a slippery material that sometimes came right off when boys dove off the diving board.

In addition to lifeguard duties, Mrs. Taylor taught swimming classes every morning Monday through Friday. "We had beginners class in the morning followed by intermediate. Classes were over by twelve o'clock." On her own in the evening, she taught several elderly women who had expressed a desire to learn how to swim. She also had to test the pH of the water every day and teach the Girl Scouts who had summer camp at Montgomery Hall. On some days she helped with the other activities such as horseshoes and croquet.<sup>28</sup>

#### **Constant Improvements**

Maintenance, upgrades, and improvements were always a topic to address at the park committee's regular meetings. The landscape was constantly being paved, graded, and improved upon as the committee continued to expand recreational opportunities. Picnic tables and park benches were added as was playground equipment, including large and small slides, swings, merry-go-rounds and see-saws. Ballfields were graded, backstops erected, rock blasted, and dugouts constructed. Parking areas for cars and sidewalks for people were carved out of the old dairy farm. Barbeque pits and a camping area were created.

By the summer of 1948, two tennis courts had been added to the park. Maintaining the courts and putting the chalk lines on them every few days became part of the live-in park caretaker's responsibility. A few years later, in 1956, outdoor basketball courts were added to the facilities.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Some of the work was far less glamorous, such as laying down sod, mowing the grass, putting fences around playing fields, and laying water and sewer lines. No task, no matter how small or large, got past the park committee.<sup>29</sup>

Not only did the landscape undergo a drastic transformation from a dairy farm to a community park under the African-American park committee, but the mansion house had to undergo change from private living space to public recreational space. Part of the mansion served as living space for a caretaker's family. The first family to live at Montgomery Hall as caretakers were the Johnstons. They had been living in the country as caretakers on a country estate and were ecstatic to come to a place in the city with modern indoor plumbing and radiator heat. The Johnston children also reveled in the fact that they had something to do and someone to play with every day, unlike their more isolated life in the country. One of the harder jobs for John Johnston to carry out was the cleaning of the pool. To accomplish this task, the pool had to be drained and then Johnston had to get down in the pool with a big bucket of soapy water and with a big brush to scrub the pool floor and walls from top to bottom. When he was finished, it took two days to fill the pool back up again.<sup>30</sup>

Much of the mansion house was transformed into a recreation center. In addition to special rooms for the Girl Scouts and the VFW, women's clubs like the Matron's Progressive Club and the Sunshine Circle furnished their own rooms. In addition, there was an expanded kitchen, a first aid room, a game room, a library (with 1,800 books), and a dance hall. The front stairway and a wall partition were removed in order to better accommodate people when events were held. In 1956, the committee received the endorsement of the Housekeepers Sunshine Club for the enlarging of the social hall because it would "be the means of taking care of larger crowds and thereby making more money for doing repairs." In 1959, the committee made plans to approach city council about renovating the downstairs of the mansion house.<sup>31</sup>

#### **Running the Park**

The Montgomery Hall Park Recreation Committee ran the park. This group created the rules, enforced the rules, planned activities, created a schedule of work duties for employees, approved or denied applications for park use, and were the liaison between the African-American community and city government. Decisions about coal for heating and toilet paper for the restrooms were among those items on their monthly agenda.

The group also acted as the personnel office for any park employees. At the heyday of its operation in the early 1960s, the park had seven or eight employees, most of whom were parttime. There was usually a caretaker who lived on the grounds as well. In 1962 the other employees were Mrs. Irene Givens, playground supervisor; Mrs. Catherine Jones, assistant; Earl Brown, athletic director; Mrs. Norma Brooks, ticket seller; Miss Bernice Robinson, check room; Ronald Bagley, lifeguard; and Miss Ella Rica Moats, Red Cross swim instructor.<sup>32</sup>

# **Dances**

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Dancing was probably the most popular use of the mansion house. Every group, young and old, held dances at the park. Some dances were sponsored by the park itself – community Halloween and Thanksgiving dances for instances. Others were sponsored by specific groups such as the African-American VFW group that had space at the park, or the Daughters of Ethiopia. Live bands were often hired for the dances, but the park also had a jukebox and played records.

Of all the activities held over the years at the park, the dances rank at the top of the memories. In those days the mansion had a wrap-around porch and a lot of young folks remember walking on the porch and holding hands. Inside was another story. There the park supervisor, Irene "Mom" Givens kept a sharp eye on the teenagers at the dance, monitoring behavior and making sure no one was getting too close. "She'd come right up to you and put her hand right between you," remembered Williner Crawford. Mom Givens, for whom the park building is now named, was remembered for her saying at the dances: "Let me see some light."

"It would blow your mind thinking about how many people could get in the building for the dances. There were chairs around the wall, but everyone else was standing or dancing," remembered Jimmy and Helen Becks.<sup>33</sup>

The busiest time of the dance and party season was between Christmas and New Year's Eve. "All of the various social clubs would raise money during the year in order to entertain during the holidays. Everybody started booking early for the holidays and Montgomery Hall Park would be booked every night. Different groups were fighting to be sure to have a place on the calendar during that period. Some of the events were quite formal. That was our social life," explained Helen Becks.<sup>34</sup>

# **Other Activities**

The high season of the park was the summer time. A formal activity-filled day always opened the park in June and closed it after Labor Day. The Staunton newspaper described the 1951 opening of the park with this note: "This year marks the fourth season. Since the beginning it has been operated by a committee of Negro citizens, now headed by John T. Miller." On June 11 of that year opening day included softball, swimming, and playground activities.<sup>35</sup>

Throughout the summer there were Red Cross-sponsored swimming classes. A recreation supervisor at the park hosted daily organized activities. During one summer, that meant croquet on Monday, horseshoes on Tuesday, basketball on Wednesday, dancing on Thursday, ping pong on Friday, and softball on Saturday. Use of the playground and swimming pool was available every day. Indoor activities included checkers, dominoes, cards, and dancing.

Another popular activity for several summers was the Benevolent Club's flower show that included exhibitors showing off their flowers and the visitors listening to several speakers. Cookies, candies and flowers were always sold at the show as a fundraiser.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Beauty pageants were also popular and for many years a Miss Montgomery Hall Park was crowned every year. Family reunions were popular and club and church wiener roasts drew large crowds. There were also private parties and a number of weddings and receptions took place at the park. There was always a flag raising ceremony in the park every summer.

The Labor Day celebration that marked the close of the summer season often included a horseshoe pitching contest, running events, as well as competitions in ping pong, tennis, croquet, swimming, volleyball, and softball. Prizes were awarded. There were also pony rides, fun on the playground equipment, and indoor games. The day concluded with a dance that lasted until midnight. Although the pool closed and formal outdoor activities ceased after Labor Day, the park held inside dances and dinners throughout the year.

The variety of groups that used the park as a social gathering place is impressive. A typical summer saw the park host forty or fifty lawn parties and group picnics from the Staunton area as well as from farther afield. Youth and adult softball and baseball teams came to the park to compete. An undated list from just one year included the Elks, Masons, Eastern Star, Onyx Club, Daughters of Ethiopia, Matrons Progressive Club, Les Filles Armourettas, Young Men's Progressive Club, VFW, VFW Auxiliary, Club 14, Inc., Hi-Fis, YLDA, Housekeepers Sunshine Circle, two cosmetology groups, the Congenial Thirteen, The Informals, the Benevolent Club, Rose Hill Garden Club, NAACP, six different church groups, and four private individuals.<sup>36</sup>

Within the larger context of similar segregated facilities in Virginia, Montgomery Hall Park was one of the largest such facilities and served a regional African American population. For instance, Montgomery Hall Park was 150 acres and had a broad array of amenities. By contrast, the 9.5-acre Washington Park in Charlottesville had no pool, bowling alley, or camping space, and very limited picnic facilities. It did have an athletic field, a wooden gymnasium referred to as a barn, a wading pool, two clay tennis courts, and some playground equipment by 1954, but all of that on less than ten acres. Other facilities in the state included the token state park, Prince Edward Lake, which was opened in 1950 beside the whites-only Goodwin Lake. Today the two are combined as Twin Lakes State Park. In Shenandoah National Park, there was the Lewis Mountain Negro area for camping and Buckroe Beach in Hampton had a segregated resort area called Bayshore Beach for African Americans. Two other segregated parks were remembered by Staunton African-Americans. Green Pastures Recreation Area, located in the U.S. National Forest near Clifton Forge; opened in 1940 and, supported by the local NAACP, became Longdale Recreation Area in 1963. Happyland Lake in Lynchburg was a privately owned reservoir open to the black population for swimming, boating, and fishing. The facility also had a dance hall, bar, and restaurant.

# After Desegregation

Desegregation in Staunton came in 1966, two years after passage of the U. S. Civil Rights Act. The park committee continued until 1969, but by then all recreational facilities in the city were open to people of all races. Montgomery Hall Park fell off the radar screen for a few years as attention turned toward Gypsy Hill. As with public schools, the previously whites-only park

City of Staunton, VA County and State

facilities were generally far better equipped and maintained than those designated for African Americans, which was why many formerly African Americans-only schools and parks across Virginia were closed after desegregation. Additionally, early in the days of desegregation, many whites simply refused to go to a place that was historically set aside for African Americans. As a result, many of Montgomery Hall Park's facilities fell into disrepair.

In 1974, the Booker T. Washington Alumni Committee (with Willie S. Washington as President, and Patsye B. Robinson as spokesperson for the group) petitioned city council to restore and upgrade Montgomery Hall Park in order that the park be turned into something useful for the community.<sup>37</sup> Funding soon became the limiting factor in what could be done to the park. The city government agreed to put \$25,000 toward renovations, but this fell far short of the City's master plan estimate of \$75,000 that was needed.<sup>38</sup> According to Patsye B. Robinson, who was involved in bringing the park back into operation after several years of little use, the city was asked to provide additional financial support because it had failed to use budgeted maintenance funds from the previous ten years "(no caretaker on the grounds and not even the grass was being cut)." She explained that "This request was not received favorably and it took many appearances at council meetings before we convinced them to investigate the possibility of renovating and reopening Montgomery Hall Park."<sup>39</sup>

In the meantime, in June of 1975, the City received a grant of more than \$400,000 through federal funding to undertake a comprehensive upgrade to the park. Included in the plans would be upgrading the ball fields, nature trails, tennis courts, bike trails and picnic areas in order to accommodate more than five thousand visitors yearly. Lighting and parking improvements were also slated. Part of the local match for the grant was the accumulated backlog of unspent maintenance monies. As a result of the efforts of the Booker T. Washington alumni committee and City planners, the park was reopened to the public in 1975.<sup>40</sup>

The reopening of Montgomery Hall Park was important, but it did not solve the problem of what to do with the aging mansion house. Some wanted to tear it down, while others argued that the building was worth saving. In October of 1977 Staunton Mayor Michael E. Kivlighan appointed a committee to study the issue and report back in six months with a recommendation. On the committee were William T. Frazier, executive director of Historic Staunton Foundation; Mrs. Ruth W. Waller, former high school counselor; John D. Lancaster, director of Staunton's Parks and Recreation Department; Kenneth A. Bosserman, science teacher at Shelburne Junior High School; Mrs. Karen F. Painter, real estate saleswoman; Mrs. Patsye B. Robinson, secretary at General Electric; and Mrs. Jane S. Holt, member of the Staunton Recreational Advisory Commission.<sup>41</sup>

Mayor Kivlighan warned the committee that "It's do or die this time," citing the fact that three previous attempts to reopen the building had failed. The committee was charged with weighing the cost of razing – estimated to be about 44,000 – against the cost of renovation – estimated at about 190,000. Included in the committee's final report were to be recommendations on how the building, if saved, could be used.<sup>42</sup>

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Six months later, the committee, chaired by Lancaster, recommended that the city access the \$250,000 available under a federal Community Redevelopment grant to renovate the house. The findings and recommendations of the committee were

- 1. Montgomery Hall Building has state and local significance historically, and local significance architecturally.
- 2. Montgomery Hall was found to be structurally sound, and it would prove to be less expensive to renovate the existing structure than to build the same amount of new space.

While some members on city council balked at the estimated annual maintenance cost of \$21,000 a year, the City agreed to move forward with renovations. Former city official Frank Pancake celebrated the decision noting, "Gypsy Hill Park is crowded. We have already spent about \$450,000 to improve Montgomery Hall Park and make it a companion park to Gypsy Hill."<sup>43</sup>

After the renovation was complete, the park building was reopened and dedicated in a special ceremony. The headquarters of the Staunton Parks and Recreation Department is now housed in the former mansion. In 2002, the renovated building was named the Irene Givens Administration Building (posthumously) after "Mom" Givens who had been in charge of the programs at the park during its years as a segregated African-American facility. The Montgomery Hall Park proclamation honoring the sixtieth anniversary of the park was signed by Major Lacy B. King, Jr., on June 17, 2006, and called Givens "a beloved community member who dutifully and carefully guided, directed, and mentored the youth of the area"

In 2015, a Virginia Historical Highway marker was erected at the park entrance to provide a factual summary of the property's history. Today the 148-acre facility has been upgraded to include walking trails, a disc golf course, picnic shelters, soccer fields, and mountain bike trails. Many of the amenities developed by the Montgomery Hall Park committee continue today including barbeque areas, softball fields, basketball courts, horseshoes, playgrounds, tennis courts and, of course, the pool, which has been restored and reopened.<sup>44</sup>

# **Architectural Significance**

Montgomery Hall itself is locally significant under Criterion C in the area of Architecture. After the U.S. centennial celebration in 1876, a new interest in the country's colonial-era architectural heritage grew. Expressions and forms of Georgian and Federal architecture became more popular around the turn of the century and began to replace the excesses and romanticisms of the Victorian era. The new style that emerged became known as Colonial Revival and freely mixed the elements of Georgian, Federal and Greek Revival architecture. While T. J. Collins came out of the Victorian era, he noticed these changes in American architectural tastes and adapted his practice to the new idiom. In addition, his son, Sam Collins, who joined the practice in 1903 and became the principal in 1911, strongly preferred the Colonial Revival in his designs.<sup>45</sup>

In the case of Montgomery Hall, the 1907 building was built on top of the foundation of the antebellum, classically-inspired dwelling built by John Peyton Howe. The Collins' father-and-

City of Staunton, VA County and State

son team retained the massing and forms of the 1822 dwelling while adding many Colonial Revival features in their new design. As one of the area's largest and most impressive country residences, the 1907 Montgomery Hall is significant in local architectural history. The Collins firm continued to design their larger residences in the Colonial Revival style, including the Loth House in Waynesboro and the Kelly residence in Staunton.

# Archaeological Significance

# Information Yielded to Date

Montgomery Hall Park is locally significant under Criterion D in the area of Archaeology – Historic – Non-Aboriginal. As explained in Blanton et al., thorough survey of the portions of Montgomery Hall Park with high archaeological-probability was completed in 2015-2016. Four archaeological sites have been identified and subjected to basic evaluation-level investigation. Three of the sites contribute to knowledge of the early nineteenth-century Montgomery Hall plantation established by John Howe Peyton. A fourth site, together with evidence at the barn complex site, contributes information about twentieth-century activity, including in association with the period the property was utilized as an African American park.<sup>46</sup>

Although none of these four sites have been spared from impacts associated with park-related development and looting, reasonable integrity and information potential has been assessed to remains at all of them. Findings regarding each site are summarized as follows.

*Montgomery Hall Yard Site*. The archaeological evidence for a "cottage" built by John Howe Peyton in front of the main plantation residence has potential to contribute significantly to interpretation of the nineteenth-century plantation property, including the lives of Peyton family members. Intact, plantation-era deposits and features survive in the front yard of the main house that are considered quite unique both in terms of region-wide plantation architecture and relative to other archaeological resources on the current park property.

*Spring House Site*. Architectural remains at this site represent an important vestige of the Peyton planation era and associated archaeological evidence informs on activity tied to both residents of the Peyton household and to their enslaved laborers. With respect to the latter population, the site was located relatively close to the plantation's slave quarters and, thus, was probably a focal point of slave-related activity.

*Barn Complex Site*. Archaeological and architectural remains at the barn complex site provide compelling material evidence of the shifting history of agricultural economy both on the Montgomery Hall property and in the upper Shenandoah Valley in general. Evidence spans the period from that of the Peyton plantation through to that of mid-twentieth century park usage.

*Dump Site*. Archaeological evidence at this location is reflective of early to mid-twentiethcentury activity on the Montgomery Hall property. The preliminary interpretation of the site is that it most likely was the location for disposal of debris from the barn area or a nearby

City of Staunton, VA County and State

farmhouse, or both. Potentially it represents clean-up associated with the "repurposing" of the property in the 1940s so that it could serve as an African American park.

# Potential for Additional Information

*Montgomery Hall Yard Site:* Expansion of the systematic shovel testing program to untested portions of the yard, particularly south and west of the structure, could be combined with a geophysical survey of the rear parking lot, ideally with use of ground-penetrating radar, could lead to identification of locations for a range of outbuildings that were almost certainly located in this area.

*Barn Complex Site:* Future investigation could result in full penetration of the clay layer beneath the site's dark A-horizon to determine the nature of underlying, first-generation deposits. Complete excavation of additional, small test units, both inside and outside the barn ruin, along with wider range, systematic shovel testing, also are important for definitively evaluating the overall potential of this area, while a detailed architectural documentation of the extant foundation would contribute to the site's information potential. Additional research may reveal the historical connection between this site and the Staunton Military Academy, which closed in 1976.

*Spring House Site:* Excavation of a series of controlled units in and around the spring house will add to the existing information about the historic uses at this site. Limited shovel testing and test unit excavation are feasible here but the saturated soils are an important consideration to timing of the investigations. Potentially, geophysical survey, such as by ground-penetrating radar, would also be instructive and efficient.

*Dump Site:* Additional research may provide documentary evidence of the origins of the dump and its original purpose. Local informants have reported other small dumping areas exist on the park property, mainly dating to the mid- to late twentieth century, and identification of these places may provide further information about this pattern of activity.

*Other Investigations*. To date, no evidence has been found of the primary slave quarter area for Montgomery Hall during the plantation era. It may be that sites of slave quarters are not within the boundaries of Montgomery Hall Park as currently defined. Given the pivotal importance of the enslaved workforce to the plantation's success, further investigations are warranted to attempt to identify the sites of quarters or other resources associated with everyday life of enslaved persons. Consultation with the local African American community and nearby landowners may provide leads for future investigations.

City of Staunton, VA County and State

#### 9. Major Bibliographical References

**Bibliography** (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form.) **Publications** 

- Blanton, Dennis B., Principal Investigator, Report on Results of Archaeological Survey and Evaluation of Portions of Montgomery Hall Park in Staunton, Virginia. 2017, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.
- Brown, Bill, "Mayor names group to decide fate of Montgomery Hall mansion," Staunton *News-Leader*, October 31, 1977.
- Drawings of Montgomery Hall before and after the fire by T.J. Collins, Historic Staunton Foundation archives, Drawer 28 – File 20-36 & Drawer 26 - File 20-36.
- Frazier, William T., 1976. T. J. Collins: A Local Virginia Architect and His Practice at the Turn of the Century. Master of Architectural History Thesis, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
- "History of Montgomery Hall Park," by Patsye Brent Robinson, Augusta Historical Bulletin, 2015.
- Hotchkiss, Jedediah, 1876 Map of Augusta County, Virginia. Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Montgomery Hall real estate sales booklet, c. 1913. Document on file. Augusta County Historical Society, Staunton, VA.
- Montgomery Hall Park Committee minutes book, 1946-1966, Augusta County Historical Society archives.
- "MONTGOMERY HALL PARK." Historic Marker, Virginia Department of Historic Resources. 2015.
- "Montgomery Hall Park turns sixty years old" by News Leader writers, *Augusta Historical Bulletin*, 2006, pg. 50-79.
- Numerous newspaper articles from the 1840s-1980s
- Peyton, John Lewis, History of Augusta County, Virginia, 1882, Yost, Staunton.
- Peyton, John Lewis, *Memoir of John Howe Peyton In Sketches by His Contemporaries* (Staunton, Va.: A.B. Blackburn & Co., 1894)

City of Staunton, VA County and State

"Recreation Dept. needs Montgomery Hall," Editorial, Staunton News-Leader, May 21, 1978.

Research paper by Rick Chittum for Historic Staunton Foundation, no date, circa late 1970s.

Staunton News-Leader July 3 and 4, 1947.

Staunton Parks and Recreation. "The History of Montgomery Hall Park." *Staunton Parks and Recreation*, 2013, 14-16.

#### **Government Records**

Architectural Survey Form. *Irene Givens Administration Building*. DHR ID: 132-0020. V-CRIS. Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, VA Accessed 2017.

Augusta County records (in the Augusta County courthouse) such as deeds, wills, etc.

John Howe Peyton plantation plat. Will Book 30, page 327. Augusta County Courthouse, Staunton, VA.

John Howe Peyton will and probate inventory. Will Book 28, pages 415-419, Will Book 30, pages 488-496. Augusta County Courthouse, Staunton, VA.

Proclamation by the City of Staunton on the occasion of Montgomery Hall Park's sixtieth anniversary, June 17, 2006.

U.S. Census records including population schedules, agricultural census, and slave schedules

#### Websites

Avery, Jane Gray website John Howe Peyton's Montgomery Hall Estate. http://johnhowepeytonsmontgomeryhall.com. Website accessed Summer 2015 and 2016.

City of Staunton 2015 Montgomery Hall Park. <u>http://www.staunton.va.us/directory/departments-h-z/recreation-parks/parks/montgomery-hall-park</u>. Web page accessed December 2015 and 2016 and February 2017.

#### Interviews

Interview with Helen and Jimmy Becks of Staunton, March 30, 2017.

Interview with MHP employee Eugenia Becks Taylor, March 4, 2017.

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service / National Register of Historic Places Registration Form NPS Form 10-900 OMB No. 1024-0018

Montgomery Hall Park Name of Property City of Staunton, VA County and State

- \_\_\_\_\_ 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:

- <u>X</u> State Historic Preservation Office
- \_\_\_\_ Other State agency
- \_\_\_\_\_ Federal agency
- Local government
- \_\_\_\_ University
- X Other

Name of repository: <u>Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, VA;</u> <u>Historic Staunton Foundation, Staunton, VA</u>

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned): DHR No. 132-5023

City of Staunton, VA County and State

#### **10. Geographical Data**

Acreage of Property <u>148</u>

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

#### Latitude/Longitude Coordinates

Datum if other than WGS84:					
	nates to 6 decimal places)				
1. Latitude:	38.146950	Longitude: -79.100610			
2. Latitude:	38.146270	Longitude: -79.089280			
		8			
3. Latitude:	38 1/1670	Longitude: -79.092850			
J. Lamude.	58.141070	Longitude: -79.092850			
1 I atituda.	28 142220	Langituda, 70.004120			
4. Latitude:	38.142220	Longitude: -79.094130			
5. Latitude:	38.141310	Longitude: -79.096000			
6. Latitude:	38.140200	Longitude: -79.094130			
7. Latitude:	38.139220	Longitude: -79.094820			
		8			
8. Latitude:	38 141580	Longitude: -79.100030			
0. Lutitude.	30.171300	Longhude/7.100050			

# Or

# **UTM References**

Datum (indicated on USGS map):

or

NAD 1927
----------

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.)

City of Staunton, VA County and State

The property at Montgomery Hall Park includes the area within tax parcel #9116 in Staunton, Virginia (obtained from Staunton City's ArcGIS and tax assessment record). The property is located within the southwestern portion of Staunton's city limits and is bound by Montgomery Avenue to the southeast, the CSX Railroad to the north, residential areas and green space to the west, and farmland to the southwest.

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The chosen boundaries are consistent with the existing boundaries of the park and legal tax parcel (#9116), which have been associated with the property throughout its period of significance. The boundaries encompass the property's historic setting as well as all known historic resources.

# **11. Form Prepared By**

name/title: <u>William T. Frazier & Victoria Leonard (architecture & submission), Nancy</u> <u>Sorrells (history & significance), Dennis Blanton (archaeology report)</u> organization: <u>Frazier Associates</u> street & number: <u>213 North Augusta Street</u> city or town: <u>Staunton</u> state: <u>VA</u> zip code: <u>24401</u> e-mail: <u>vleonard@frazierassociates.com</u> telephone: <u>540-886-6230</u> date: <u>February 28, 2017</u>

name/title: Dennis B. Blanton et al.				
organization: James Madison University				
street & number: 71 Alumnae Drive, MSC 7501				
city or town: <u>Staunton</u> state: <u>VA</u> zip code: <u>22807</u>				
e-mail: <u>blantodb@jmu.edu</u>				
telephone: <u>540-568-7390</u>				
date: February 2017				

# **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.

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service / National Register of Historic Places Registration Form NPS Form 10-900 OMB No. 1024-0018

Montgomery Hall Park Name of Property City of Staunton, VA County and State

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

#### LIST OF FIGURES

- 1. Location of Montgomery Hall Park
- 2. Locations of identified sites
- 3. Project area topography, LIDAR
- 4. Plat of Montgomery Hall plantation, 1850
- 5. Project area topography with 1850 plat overlay
- 6. Portion of Hotchkiss (1876) Augusta County map
- 7. Project area topography with Hotchkiss map overlay
- 8. 1954 aerial photograph with historic feature overlay
- 9. 2015 satellite image with historic feature overlay
- 10. Main House, Plan of investigation
- 11. Main House, Depiction of house and cottage on 1850 plat
- 12. Main House, Trench units, plan view
- 13. Main House, Trench units 3 and 4, west profile
- 14. Main House, Trench units 1 and 2, west profile
- 15. Main House, Feature 2 plan view
- 16. Barn Site, plan view of barn ruin
- 17. Barn Site, Front (east) side elevation of barn ruin
- 18. Barn Site, Brick and mortar-filled opening in front (east) wall
- 19. Barn Site, Plan view showing sample locations
- 20. Barn Site, Shovel Test 8 profile
- 21. Barn Site, Shovel Test 14 profile
- 22. Barn Site, Unit 1, south profile drawing
- 23. Barn Site, Unit 1, Stratigraphic distribution of architectural material
- 24. Barn Site, Unit 1, Stratigraphic distribution of non-architectural material
- 25. Spring House, Plan of investigation
- 26. Spring House, Masonry walls
- 27. Spring House, Plan view of structure
- 28. Spring House, Trench excavation, plan view
- 29. Spring House, Trench excavation, north profile and plan view
- 30. Spring House, Shovel Test 3 profile
- 31. Spring House, Shovel Test 7 profile
- 32. Dump Site, Plan of investigation
- 33. Spring House, Shovel Test 1 profile
- 34. Spring House, Shovel Test 3 profile

#### **List of Tables**

- A1. Main House ceramic artifacts
- A2. Spring House, Ceramic artifacts
- A3. Barn Site, Ceramic artifacts
- A4. Dump Site, Ceramic artifacts
- A5. All sites, summary of predominant refined earthenware categories
- A6. All sites, summary of predominant refined earthenware categories (chart)

A7. All sites, summary of container glass by color
A8. All sites, summary of container glass by color (chart)
A9. All sites, summary of nail types
A10. All sites, summary of nail types (chart)
A11. All sites, summary of utilitarian ceramics
A12. All sites, summary of utilitarian ceramics (chart)
A13. All sites, summary of animal bone (total weight)

#### 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: Montgomery Hall Park

City or Vicinity: Staunton

County:

State: Virginia

Photographer: Victoria Leonard

Date Photographed:

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

Photo 1 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Entrance to park, view west Date: 6/20/16

Photo 2 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), east elevation, view west Date: 6/19/16

Photo 3

City of Staunton, VA County and State

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), north elevation, view south Date: 6/19/16 Photo 4 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), corner of north and we

View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), corner of north and west elevations, view southeast Date: 6/19/16

Photo 5

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), section of west elevation, view northeast Date: 6/19/16

Photo 6 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), west elevation, view northeast Date: 2/23/17

Photo 7 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), corner of west and south elevations, view northeast Date: 6/19/16

Photo 8 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, original section of the basement, main room, brick arch supports, view northeast Date: 2/23/17

Photo 9 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, original section of the basement, main room, reused door from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, view east Date: 2/23/17

Photo 10 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA

City of Staunton, VA County and State

View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, original section of the basement, east room, original wood lintel, view east Date: 2/23/17

Photo 11

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA

View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, original section of the basement, southwest room, junction of brick and stone walls, view southeast Date: 2/23/17

Photo 12

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, first floor, north entry lobby, view northwest Date: 6/30/16

Photo 13 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, first floor, hallway, view northeast Date: 6/30/16

Photo 14 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, first floor, hallway, local African American Heritage display case, view east Date: 2/23/17

Photo 15 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, first floor, conference room, view east Date: 6/30/16

Photo 16 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, first floor, conference room, mantel detail, view southeast Date: 6/30/16

Photo 17 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, service staircase of dogleg design, view east United States Department of the Interior National Park Service / National Register of Historic Places Registration Form NPS Form 10-900 OMB No. 1024-0018

Montgomery Hall Park Name of Property

Date: 6/30/16

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Photo 18 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, main staircase of dogleg design, view southwest Date: 2/23/17

Photo 19 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, second floor, main hallway and maple floors, north end, view north Date: 6/30/16

Photo 20

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, second floor, office, earlier mantel relocated from another structure, view southwest Date: 2/23/17

Photo 21

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, second floor, office on west side, view west Date: 6/30/16

Photo 22 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, second floor, office and mantel detail, view west Date: 6/30/16

Photo 23 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, second floor, office, Colonial Revival era mantel, view south Date: 2/23/17

Photo 24 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Springhouse Ruins, northeast side, view southeast Date: 2/23/17

Photo 25

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Barn Site Ruins, north section, foundation of "Bank Barn", view west Date: 2/23/17

Photo 26

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Barn Site Ruins, south section, series of concrete masonry walls, view southwest Date: 2/23/17

Photo 27 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Bathhouse, north elevation, view southeast Date: 2/23/17

Photo 28 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Pool, view northeast Date: 6/20/16

Photo 29 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Mechanical Room at Pool, east elevation, view west Date: 2/23/17

Photo 30 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Main Playground, view east Date: 6/20/16

Photo 31 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Horseshoe Pit, view northeast Date: 6/20/16

Photo 32 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Lancaster Girls' Softball Field, view south Date: 2/23/17

Photo 33 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Frank L. Hamilton Basketball Courts, view northeast Date: 2/23/17

City of Staunton, VA County and State

Photo 34 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Restroom facility by basketball courts, corner of west and south elevations, view northeast Date: 2/23/17

Photo 35 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Tennis courts, view east Date: 6/20/16

Photo 36 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Upper restroom facility near shelters, southeast elevation, view northwest Date: 2/23/17

Photo 37 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Shelter #1, south and east sides, view northwest Date: 2/23/17

Photo 38 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Shelter #2, south and west sides, view north Date: 2/23/17

Photo 39 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Shelter #3, north and east sides, view south Date: 2/23/17

Photo 40 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Harold V. Harlow Softball Field, view north Date: 6/20/16

Photo 41 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Springel Softball Field, view west Date: 2/23/17

Photo 42 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA

City of Staunton, VA County and State

View: Temporary Garage/Shed Near Flag Football Field, corner of north and west elevations, view south Date: 2/23/17

Photo 43 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Kiwanis Disc Golf Course pavilion, west side, view east Date: 2/23/17

Photo 44 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: MHP Soccer Complex, view east Date: 6/20/17

Photo 45 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Soccer Pavilion and Restroom Facility, corner of south and west elevations, view northeast Date: 2/23/17

Photo 46 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Second playground, view east Date: 6/20/16

Photo 47 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Temporary Shed at Pool, corner of north and west elevations, view southeast Date: 2/23/17

Photo 48 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Handicap ramp from parking lot to pool, view north Date: 2/23/17

Photo 49 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Concession Building by Lancaster Girls' Softball Field, corner of northwest and northeast elevations, view south Date: 2/23/17

Photo 50 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA

City of Staunton, VA County and State

View: Historic photograph, Montgomery Hall (now the Irene Givens Administration Building), corner of north and east elevations, view southwest Date: c. 1915

#### HISTORIC PHOTOGRAPHS (photo locations are also shown on Photo Key) Photo 51

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Historic photograph, Montgomery Hall (now the Irene Givens Administration Building) and main driveway, south elevation, view north Date: c. 1915

Photo 52

Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Manager's Cottage (moved to Steephill in ca. 1935), front and side elevations Date: c. 1915

Photo 53 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (now the Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, first floor, reception hall Date: c. 1915

Photo 54 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (now the Irene Givens Administration Building), interior, first floor, dining room Date: c. 1915

Photo 55 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Montgomery Hall (now the Irene Givens Administration Building), front pediment and entrance, north elevation, view south Date: 1950s

Photo 56Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VAView: Montgomery Hall (now the Irene Givens Administration Building), east elevation, east gallery porch prior to added stair enclosure on the south end, view westDate: 1950s

Photo 57 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA

City of Staunton, VA County and State

View: African American period playground, southeast section of main park area (site of present-day tennis courts), view east Date: 1950s

Photo 58 Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, VA View: Plat of Montgomery Hall plantation Date: 1850 (Augusta County 2016)

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** This information is being collected for applications 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.).

**Estimated Burden Statement**: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 100 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.

# **ENDNOTES**

<sup>1</sup> Dennis B. Blanton, Delaney Hunter, Jakob Lyman, Katie Brauckmann, Catherine Grimes, and Christopher DiMaiolo, *Report on the Results of Archaeological Survey and Evaluation of Portions of Montgomery Hall Park in Staunton, Virginia*, prepared for the City of Staunton, Planning Department, February 2017. A copy of the report is available at the Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, VA. <sup>2</sup> Evaluation of each site individually for listing in the NRHP and VLR has not been completed. The sites

are recommended as contributing to Montgomery Hall Park as secondary resources.

<sup>3</sup> Frazier, William T., 1976. *T. J. Collins: A Local Virginia Architect and His Practice at the Turn of the Century*. Master of Architectural History Thesis, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

<sup>4</sup> Peyton, Memoir of John Howe Peyton.

- <sup>5</sup> Rick Chittum, undated research paper for Historic Staunton Foundation.
- <sup>6</sup> Peyton, *Memoir of John Howe Peyton*, 9.

<sup>7</sup>. Ibid., 9-10.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>10</sup> Staunton Spectator and General Advertiser, May 27, 1896.

<sup>11</sup> Alexandria Gazette, Nov. 1, 1871.

<sup>12</sup> Staunton Spectator and General Advertiser, October 24, 1871.

<sup>13</sup> Avery, Jane Gray website John Howe Peyton's Montgomery Hall Estate.

<sup>14</sup> http://johnhowepeytonsmontgomeryhall.com.

<sup>15</sup> Montgomery Hall sales booklet, c. 1913, archives Augusta County Historical Society.

<sup>16</sup> Staunton newspaper article, February 16, 1906.

<sup>17</sup> Montgomery Hall Drawings, Historic Staunton Foundation archives.

<sup>18</sup> Richmond Times Dispatch, July 1, 1913.

<sup>19</sup> Avery, Jane Gray website John Howe Peyton's Montgomery Hall Estate.

<sup>20</sup> http://johnhowepeytonsmontgomeryhall.com.

<sup>21</sup> "Montgomery Hall Park turns sixty years old" by *News Leader* writers, *Augusta Historical Bulletin*, 2006, pg. 50-79.

Montgomery Hall Park	
Name of Property	

City of Staunton, VA County and State

<sup>22</sup> Montgomery Hall Park Committee (MHPC) minutes book, 1946-1966, Augusta County Historical Society archives.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> The opening of Montgomery Hall Park comes from a compilation of information in the MHCP minutes notebook and *Staunton News-Leader* newspapers July 3 and July 4 of 1947.

<sup>25</sup> MHPC minutes book.

<sup>26</sup> MHPC minutes book (entire section).

<sup>27</sup> Interview with Helen and Jimmy Becks of Staunton, March 30, 2017.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., and "The History of Montgomery Hall Park," flyer produced by the Staunton Parks and Recreation Department, date unknown.

<sup>30</sup> Interview with Eugenia Becks Taylor, March 4, 2017.

<sup>31</sup> MHPC minutes book.

<sup>32</sup> Interview with Eugenia Becks Taylor.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Interview with Helen and Jimmy Becks of Staunton.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Staunton News-Leader, June 13, 1951.

<sup>38</sup> MHPC minutes.

<sup>39</sup> "History of Montgomery Hall Park," by Patsye Brent Robinson, Augusta Historical Bulletin, 2015.

<sup>40</sup> Brown, Bill, "Mayor names group to decide fate of Montgomery Hall mansion," *Staunton News-Leader*, October 31, 1977.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> "The History of Montgomery Hall Park," flyer and "History of Montgomery Hall Park," by Robinson
 <sup>43</sup> "Recreation Dept. needs Montgomery Hall," Editorial, *Staunton News-Leader*, May 21, 1978.

<sup>44</sup> City of Staunton 2015Montgomery Hall Park. <u>http://www.staunton.va.us/directory/departments-h-</u> z/recreation-parks/parks/montgomery-hall-park.

<sup>45</sup> Frazier, William T., 1976. *T. J. Collins: A Local Virginia Architect and His Practice at the Turn of the Century*. Master of Architectural History Thesis, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

<sup>46</sup> Blanton et al., *Report on Results of Archaeological Survey and Evaluation of Portions of Montgomery Hall Park in Staunton, Virginia.* 

# Virginia Dept. of Historic Resources

Virginia Cultural Resource Information System

LOCATION MAP **Montgomery Hall Park City of Staunton, VA** DHR No. 132-5023 Latitude/Longitude Coordinates 1. Latitude: 38.146950 Longitude: -79.100610 2. Latitude: 38.146270 Longitude: -79.089280 3. Latitude: 38.141670 Longitude: -79.092850 4. Latitude: 38.142220 Longitude: -79.094130 5. Latitude: 38.141310 Longitude: -79.096000 6. Latitude: 38.140200 Longitude: -79.094130 7. Latitude: 38.139220 Longitude: -79.094820 8. Latitude: 38.141580 Longitude: -79.100030

Feet

1:18,056 / 1"=1,505 Feet

1000 1500 2000

500



Title:

# Date: 5/2/2017

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.

# SKETCH MAP

# Historic Boundary

Recreational Areas and Facilities

# Roads

- Primary Entrance
- Secondary Entrance

# Contributing Resources:

- 1 Irene Givens Administration Building (formerly Montgomery Hall)
- 2 Bathhouse
- 3 Pool
- 4 Mechanical Room at Pool
- 5 Horseshoe Pit
- 6 Montgomery Hall Yard Site
- 7 Barn Complex Site
- 28 Spring House Site
- 29 Dump Site
- Non-contributing Resources:
- 8 Main Playground
- 9 Lancaster Girl's Softball Field
- 10 Frank L. Hamilton Basketball Courts
- 11 Restroom Facility by Basketball Courts
- 12 Tennis Courts
- 13 Upper Restroom Facility Near Shelters
- 14 Shelter #1
- 15 Shelter #2
- 16 Shelter #3
- 17 Harold V. Harlow Softball Field Springel
- 18 Softball Field
- 19 Temporary Garage/Shed Near Flag Football Field
- 20 Kiwanis Disc Golf Course
- 21 MHP Soccer Complex
- 22 Soccer Pavilion & Restroom Facility
- 23 Second Playground
- 24 Flag Football Field
- 25 Temporary Shed at Pool
- 26 Handicap Ramp from Parking Lot to Pool
- 27 Concession Building By Lancaster Girl's Softball Field



FRAZIER ASSOCIATES



DHR #132-5023



ARCHITECTURE COMMUNITY DESIGN WAYFINDING

Staunton, Virginia



Figure 1. Location of Montgomery Hall Park (USGS).



Figure 2. Locations of identified sites.



Figure 3. Project area topography, LIDAR.



Figure 4 Plat of Montgomery Hall plantation, 1850 (Augusta County 2016).


Figure 5. Project area topography with 1850 plat overlay.



Figure 6. Portion of Hotchkiss (1876) Augusta County map.



Figure 7. Project area topography with Hotchkiss 1876 map overlay.



Figure 8. 1954 aerial photograph with historic feature overlay.



Figure 9. 2015 satellite image with historic feature overlay.



Montgomery Hall Park Archaeology



Figure 11. Main House, Depiction of house and cottage on 1850 plat (Augusta County 2016).















Figure 15. Main House, Feature 2 plan view.





Figure 17. Barn Site, Front (east) side elevation of barn ruin.



Figure 18. Barn Site, Brick and mortar-filled opening in front (east) wall (scale = 1 meter).



Figure 19. Barn Site, Plan view showing sample locations.



- Figure 20 (left). Barn Site, Shovel Test 8 profile.
- Figure 21 (right). Barn Site, Shovel Test 14 profile.



Figure 22. Barn Site, Unit 1, south profile drawing.



Figure 23. Barn Site, Unit 1, Stratigraphic distribution of architectural material.



Figure 24. Barn Site, Unit 1, Stratigraphic distribution of non-architectural material.



Figure 25. Spring House, Plan of investigation.



Figure 26. Spring House, Masonry walls.



Figure 27. Spring House, Plan view of structure.



Figure 28. Spring House, Trench excavation, plan view.







- Figure 30 (left). Spring House, Shovel Test 3 profile.
- Figure 31 (right). Spring House, Shovel Test 7 profile.



Figure 32. Dump Site, Plan of investigation.



- Figure 33 (left). Spring House, Shovel Test 1 profile.
- Figure 34 (right). Spring House, Shovel Test 3 profile.

Ware	Decorative Type	Description	Totals
Creamware			8
Creamware	Molded	Green	1
E'ware, Coarse, Unid.			8
E'ware, Redware			20
E'ware, Redware	FLOWER POT		3
Ironstone/Granite			1
Pearlware			39
Pearlware	Printed, under	Blue	8
Pearlware	Molded	Dark Blue	7
Pearlware	Painted, under free	Yellow-Red	4
Pearlware	Molded	Green, Intense Med.	3
Pearlware	Painted, under free	Green	3
Pearlware	Painted, under free	Neutrals, Dark	3
Pearlware	Painted, under free	Blue-Green, Intense Med.	2
Pearlware	Painted, under free	Green, Muted Light	1
Porcelain, Chinese			2
Porcelain, English Soft Paste			1
Porcelain, other			1
Porcelain, unidentifiable			4
Slipware, North Mid./Stafford.			3
St'ware, Albany slip			1
St'ware, American	UNIDENTIFIED?		1
St'ware, German	POSSIBLE		1
Stware, unidentifiable			1
Unidentified	Refined earthenware		12
Unidentified			3
Unidentified	Pearlware?	Annular banded	1
Unidentified	Porcelain tile		1
Unidentified	Refined earthenware	Painted, intense blue	1
Unidentified		Painted, green	1
Whiteware	Printed, under	Blue	27
Whiteware	Sponge		20
Whiteware	Molded		18
Whiteware			9
Whiteware	Printed, under	Neutrals, Dark	3
Whiteware	Painted, under free	Green, Muted	1
		TOTALS	223

Table A1.Main House ceramic artifacts.

Ware	<b>Decorative Type</b>	Description	Totals
Whiteware		_	7
Whiteware	Transfer Print	Polychrome	2
Whiteware	Gilded		1
Whiteware	Sponge	Blue	1
Whiteware	Linear		1
	Indentations		
WHITEWARE			12
TOTAL			
Creamware			1
CREAMWARE			1
TOTAL			
Pearlware			2
Pearlware	Molded		1
Pearlware		Green Edged	1
Pearlware	Handpainted	Polychrome	1
Pearlware		Blue Glaze	1
Pearlware	Atypical	Green	1
PEARLWARE			7
TOTAL			
Redware			16
Redware		Green Slip	1
Redware		Clear Lead	20
		Glaze	
Redware		Albany Slip	4
REDWARE TOTAL			41
Stoneware		Albany Slip	2
STONEWARE			2
TOTAL			
British Brown			2
Stoneware			-
Porcelain	TT. 11.		2
Porcelain	Utilitarian		1
PORCELAIN TOTAL			3
Staffordshire	Slipware		1
STAFFORDSHIRE			1
TOTAL			
Unidentified			1
UNIDENTIFIED			1
TOTAL		TOTAL	70
T-11- A2 Contract		TOTAL	70

Table A2.Spring House, Ceramic artifacts.

Ware Type	Description	Totals
Ironstone	SMA Logo	15
Ironstone	Oth. Decor.	1
Ironstone	Undecor.	10
Whiteware	Undecor.	1
Porcelain	Utilitar.	6
Porcelain	Tableware, Undecor.	11
Porcelain	Tableware, Decor.	1
Other Ceramics	Bristol/Alby.	11
Other Ceramics	Spongeware, Blue	1
Other Ceramics	Albany Slip	1
Other Ceramics	Terra cotta, Industr.	1
Other Ceramics	Unident.	3

Table A3.Barn Site, Ceramic artifacts.

Ware	Decorative Type	Description	Totals
Whiteware			45
Whiteware	Transfer Print	Polychrome	1
Whiteware	Transfer Print, Gilded	Polychrome	1
Whiteware	Gilded		2
Whiteware	Transfer Print	Blue	6
Whiteware	Decalcomania	Polychrome	1
Whiteware		Pink Glaze	1
WHITEWARE TOTAL			57
Creamware			8
Creamware	Transfer Print	Polychrome	1
CREAMWARE		<u>y</u>	9
TOTAL			
Pearlware			1
PEARLWARE TOTAL			1
Redware			3
Redware		Albany Slip	3
REDWARE TOTAL			6
Stoneware			3
Stoneware	Salt Glazed		1
Stoneware		Albany Slip	2
Stoneware	Bristol		26
STONEWARE TOTAL			32
Porcelain			13
Porcelain	Transfer Print	Polychrome	1
Porcelain	Utilitarian	-	3
PORCELAIN TOTAL			17
Yellowware			1
YELLOWARE TOTAL			1
Unidentified			3
Unidentified, Heat			2
Altered			
Unidentified			1
Earthenware			
Unidentified, Grape	Molded		70
Motif			45
Unidentified, < 1.5 cm			45
UNIDENTIFIED TOTAL			121
		TOTAL	244

Table A4.Dump Site, Ceramic artifacts.

	Pearlware	Whiteware	Ironstone	TOTAL
Main	70	78	0	148
House				
Spring House	7	12	0	19
House				
Barn	0	1	26	27
Trash Pit	1	57	0	58

 Table A5.
 All sites, summary of predominant refined earthenware categories.



Table figure A6.All sites, summary of predominant refined earthenware categories.

Black / olive green Green	רפידם ר	Blue - green	Aqua	Aqua Magnesium Clear Blue Brown	Clear	Blue	Brown	Milk glass	Yellow	Rose	Unspecified	Yellow Rose Unspecified CONTAINER	TOTAL WINDOW
	9	ß	2	0	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	35	81
9	2	0	0	2	11	0	m	0	0	0	ŝ	27	œ
0	2	0	0	0	21	0	33	0	0	0	0	56	7
2	23	ŝ	∞	2	945	127	18	47	1	1	642	1819	282

Table A7.All sites, summary of container glass by color.



All sites, summary of container glass by color.

62

	Hand	Machine	Wire	Unidentified	TOTAL
	Wrought	Cut			
Main	5	67	4	18	94
House					
Spring House	1	9	2	26	38
House					
Barn	0	4	5	75	84
Trash Pit	0	1	10	93	104

Table A9.All sites, summary of nail types.



Table figure A10.All sites, summary of nail types.

	Redware	British brown stoneware	Salt glaze stoneware	Albany slip stoneware	Bristol slip stoneware	Other stoneware	TOTAL
Main House	31	0	1	1	0	0	33
Spring House	41	2	0	2	0	0	45
Barn	0	0	0	1	11	0	12
Trash Pit	6	0	1	2	26	3	38

Table A11.All sites, utilitarian ceramic summary.



Table figure A12.All sites, utilitarian ceramic summary.

	Weight (Oz.)
Main House	8.0435
Spring House	0.16
Barn	17.5
Trash Pit	18

Table A13.All sites, summary of animal bone (total weight).

















































































































### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

#### NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES EVALUATION/RETURN SHEET

Requested Action:	Nomination				
Property Name:	Montgomery Hall Park				
Multiple Name:					
State & County:	VIRGINIA, Staunton				
Date Rece 1/8/201			of 16th Day: [ 13/2018	Date of 45th Day: 2/22/2018	Date of Weekly List:
Reference number:	SG100002139				
Nominator:	State				
Reason For Review					
Appeal		PDIL		Text/Data Issue	
SHPO Request		Landscape		Photo	
Waiver		National		Map/Boundary	
Resubmission		Mobile Resource		Period	
X Other		TCP		Less than 50 years	
		CLG			
X Accept	Return	Reject	2/15/	2018 Date	
Abstract/Summary Comments:					
Recommendation/ Criteria	Accept, National Regis	ster Criteria A, C,	and D.		
Reviewer Patrick	Andrus Patic	Andres	Discipline	Historian	
Telephone (202)354-2218			Date	2/15/2	-018
DOCUMENTATION	see attached comr	ments : No se	e attached SL	R : No	

If a nomination is returned to the nomination authority, the nomination is no longer under consideration by the National Park Service.



2

June 1, 2017

Julie Langan, Director Virginia Department of Historic Resources 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, Virginia 23221

Dear Ms. Langan:

## RE: Nomination of Montgomery Hall Park, Staunton, Virginia, for Recommendation to the National Register of Historic Places and for Inclusion in the Virginia Landmarks Register.

The City of Staunton Historic Preservation Commission, which serves as the City's Architectural Review Board, reviewed the above referenced nomination at its' May 23, 2017 meeting. At that meeting the Commission unanimously voted to endorse Montgomery Hall Park's nomination for the National Register of Historic Places based on the documentation provided that the park is full of history and architectural significance. The Commission further directed staff to transmit these comments to the Virginia State Review Board and the Virginia Board of Historic Resources for consideration during their review of the nomination.

Thank you for providing the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions, please contact me. We look forward to the successful completion of this effort to document and highlight this significant element of our City's history.

Sincerely,

Byl Alle

Rodney S. Rhodes Senior Planner/Zoning Administrator

Cc: Stephen F. Owen, City Manager

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION OF PLANNING & ZONING 116 W. BEVERLEY STREET | P.O. BOX 58 | STAUNTON, VA 24402 540.332.3862 (OFFICE) 540.332.3807 (FAX)



# **COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA**

## **Department of Historic Resources**

2801 Kensington Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23221

January 3, 2018

Julie V. Langan Director

Tel: (804) 367-2323 Fax: (804) 367-2391 www.dhr.virginia.gov

Mr. Paul Loether Chief, National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmarks Programs National Park Service 2280 National Register of Historic Places Mail Stop 7228 1849 C St., NW Washington, D.C. 20240

### Re: Montgomery Hall Park, City of Staunton, Virginia

Dear Mr. Loether:

Molly Joseph Ward

Secretary of Natural Resources

The enclosed disk contains the true and correct copy of the nomination for the **Montgomery Hall Park** to the National Register of Historic Places. Submitted for your review, the nomination has been considered, and approved, by the State Review Board and the Virginia SHPO has recommended it for listing. Any letters of comment or objection have been copied at the end of the nomination material, along with any FPO notification letters.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. My direct phone line is 804-482-6439.

Sincerely,

Lena Sweeten McDonald National/State Register Historian

Enclosures

Western Region Office 962 Kime Lane Salem, VA 24153 Tel: (540) 387-5443 Fax: (540) 387-5446 Northern Region Office 5357 Main Street PO Box 519 Stephens City, VA 22655 Tel: (540) 868-7029 Fax: (540) 868-7033 Eastern Region Office 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221 Tel: (804) 367-2323 Fax: (804) 367-2391