Nicholas L. Graf
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Department of Transportation
310 New Bern Avenue
Raleigh, N.C. 27601-1442

Re: Historic Structures Survey Report for US 501 from NC 49 to Virginia State Line, Person County, R-2241, Federal Aid MASTP-501(1), State Project 8.1380501, ER 95-9174

Dear Mr. Graf:

Thank you for your letter of June 7, 1995, transmitting the historic structures survey report by Marvin A. Brown of Greiner, Inc., concerning the above project.

The following property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places under the criterion cited:

Holloway-Jones-Day House (#86). Criterion C--The house is a vernacular Federal-style hall-parlor dwelling.

For purposes of compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, we concur that the following properties are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under the criterion cited:

Wil Walker House (#29). Criterion C--The house is one of the finest Craftsman-style bungalows in Roxboro and Person County and is especially notable in its marriage of the style to both the house and grounds.

Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-40). Criteria A and C--The district is a unique example of mill-owned housing for company executives rather than laborers, and consists of significant representatives of the Colonial Revival style in Person County.

John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84). Criterion C--The doctor's office is significant as an example of a rural professional office. Please see our comments in the attachment regarding other areas of significance and boundaries for this property.

The following properties were determined not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places:

House (#72). This house, though unusual in its overhanging front gables, lacks special historical or architectural significance.
The report in general meets our office’s guidelines and those of the Secretary of the Interior. Specific concerns and/or corrections which need to be addressed in the preparation of a final report are attached for the author’s use.

The above comments are made pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s Regulations for Compliance with Section 106 codified at 36 CFR Part 800.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration. If you have questions concerning the above comment, please contact Renee Gledhill-Earley, environmental review coordinator, at 919/733-4763.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
David Brook
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
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Dr. John H. Merritt Homeplace

Without additional information, we cannot determine whether the proposed boundaries are appropriate for this property. We believe that the office and homestead are eligible under Criterion B for their association with the medical practice of Dr. Merritt, a professional and civic leader in Person County. The complex may also be eligible under Criterion A if Dr. Merritt supplemented his professional income with small-scale farming. Please provide us with additional information about farming activities during the 1913-1944 period of significance.
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The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is proposing to improve US 501 in Person County from NC 49 in Roxboro to the Virginia state line (TIP No. R-2241, State Project No. 8.1380501). The project, as presently defined, offers two alternatives: (1) widening US 501 to a five-lane curb-and-gutter section in Roxboro and to a four-lane divided facility from Roxboro to the state line; and (2) widening NC 49, from US 501 to SR 1521, and widening SR 1521, from NC 49 to US 501, to four-lane divided facilities. The length of the project is 10.7 miles (see Figures II.1 and II.2a-b below).

Greiner, Inc. conducted a multi-phase survey of the project area under an open-end contract with NCDOT. During its Phase I reconnaissance survey of June 3, 1993, Greiner established an Area of Potential Effect (APE), located architecturally and historically notable resources, and made preliminary assessments of the eligibility of these resources for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The fieldwork during this phase consisted of driving or walking every paved road, farm lane, driveway, and path within the APE to identify and photograph all notable resources. The findings of the Phase I survey were presented to the staff of NCDOT in a visual presentation and in a Phase I report in June, 1993. In accordance with NCDOT guidelines that were newly revised after this work was completed, Greiner revisited the project area on April 25-26, 1994, and located and photographed every resource 50 years old or older within the APE. These 95 individual resources and groups of resources were reviewed at a meeting on May 26, 1994, between the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and NCDOT. At this meeting resources were designated that did not meet the Criteria for listing in the National Register and which therefore are not evaluated intensively in this report. Photographs of these non-eligible resources are included in the photographic inventory which accompanies this volume.

Greiner conducted the comprehensive Phase II field survey on June 28-29, 1994, with the goals of refining the APE established during the first phase of the project; recording the potentially eligible resources designated at the May 26 meeting; and evaluating and making recommendations of eligibility of these resources for listing in the National Register. The survey methodology consisted of historical background research into primary and secondary sources, site-specific research, and an intensive-level field survey of the APE, during which 100 percent of the APE was surveyed. The fieldwork included extensively photographing the designated resources, recording them on USGS topographical quadrangle maps and sketch maps, and completing North Carolina historic structure long (blue), short (yellow), and multiple structures (green) data sheets on those resources not previously recorded on such forms. Following the fieldwork, Greiner completed sketch maps for all of the resources within the APE recommended as potentially eligible for listing in the Register and for other resources where relevant in evaluating their potential eligibility. For all potentially Register-eligible resources within the APE, Greiner also drew boundaries on tax maps. This report records the results of the Phase II survey.

The final boundaries of the APE were determined in consultation with NCDOT. They are delineated in this report on the Roxboro and Cluster Springs USGS topographic quadrangle maps (see Figures II.1 and II.2a-b below). Within Roxboro, the project's APE was determined by the location of city streets and the Baker-Ca-Vel mill village. Outside of Roxboro, the APE was largely determined by the lay of the land, its boundary running along topographic contours and field and tree lines.
Greiner examined and recorded at the intensive level 11 individual resources and groups of resources within the APE ranging in age from the second quarter of the nineteenth century through the 1930s (see Figures VI.1a-c below). One of these resources, the Holloway-Jones-Day House (Greiner survey #86 [#86]), erected in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, is listed in the National Register. This report recommends that three additional resources within the APE are potentially eligible for listing in the National Register: the early twentieth-century Doctor’s Office of the John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84); the early 1930s Will Walker House (#29); and the mid-1930s Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32–#40). Seven other resources recorded at the intensive level are recommended as not potentially eligible for listing in the Register: the Baker–Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill (#31); House (#47); House (#72); House (#82); the Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmstead (#56); the Walker Sisters House (#30); and the Woody-Jones Store (#92).

**SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL NATIONAL REGISTER-ELIGIBLE RESOURCES EVALUATED WITHIN THE AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources Listed in the National Register:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holloway-Jones-Day House (#86) - Northwest corner of junction of US 501 and SR 1322 ... VI-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources Declared Eligible for the National Register by a Determination of Eligibility (DOE):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources on the North Carolina National Register Study List:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources Considered Potentially Eligible for the National Register:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32–#40) - Executive Lane, Roxboro .......... VI-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor’s Office of the John H. Merritt Homeplace - (#84) - East side of US 501, 0.5 miles south of SR 1512 ................................................................. VI-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Walker House (#29) - 1625 North Main Street (US 501), Roxboro ...................... VI-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources Not Considered Potentially Eligible for the National Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker–Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill (#31) - North Main Street (US 501), Sunset Drive, Turner Street, Wall Street, Forrest Street, Hicks Circle, Kerr Drive, and Edgewood Lane, Roxboro . VI-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (#47) - West side of SR 1326, opposite Wrenner Avenue ................................. VI-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (#72) - North side of NC 49, 0.1 miles east of Shelton Road ........................... VI-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (#82) - Northwest corner of junction of SR 1330 and US 501 .......................... VI-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmstead (#56) - West side of US 501, 0.1 miles south of SR 1521 . VI-68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walker Sisters House (#30) - 1632 North Main Street (US 501), Roxboro ............... VI-46
Woody-Jones Store (#92) - W side of US 501, 0.05 miles north of junction with SR 1327 .. VI-78
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II. INTRODUCTION

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is proposing to improve US 501 in Person County from NC 49 in Roxboro to the Virginia state line (TIP No. R-2241, State Project No. 8.1380501). The project, as presently defined, offers two alternatives: (1) widening US 501 to a five-lane curb-and-gutter section in Roxboro and to a four-lane divided facility from Roxboro to the state line; and (2) widening NC 49, from US 501 to SR 1521, and widening SR 1521, from NC 49 to US 501, to four-lane divided facilities. The length of the project is 10.7 miles (Figures II.1 and II.2a-b).

Greiner, Inc. conducted a multi-phase survey of the project area under an open-end contract with NCDOT. Reconnaissance-level fieldwork for the Phase I survey was conducted by architectural historian Marvin A. Brown on June 3, 1993. Mr. Brown presented the findings of the survey to the staff of NCDOT in a visual presentation and in a Phase I report in June, 1993. In accordance with NCDOT guidelines that were revised after this work was completed, Mr. Brown revisited the project area on April 25-26, 1994, and located and photographed every resource 50 years old or older within the APE. These 95 individual resources and groups of resources were reviewed at a meeting on May 26, 1994, between the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and NCDOT. At this meeting resources were designated that do not meet the Criteria for listing in the National Register and which therefore are not evaluated intensively in this report. Photographs of these non-eligible resources are included in the photographic inventory which accompanies this volume.

Mr. Brown conducted the comprehensive Phase II field survey on June 28-29, 1994. He subsequently prepared this survey report, with the assistance of graphics coordinator James R. Snodgrass and administrative assistant Brenda L. Crumpler.

The work plan of March 4, 1994, for additional survey, and the Phase II work plan of May 31, 1994, are presented in Appendix A, along with the résumé of the principal investigator. These plans superseded an earlier Phase II work plan of June 24, 1993, which had to be replaced because of changes to NCDOT's survey and report guidelines.

An architectural survey within the APE associated with the proposed improvements to US 501 was necessary for compliance with the basic requirements of: Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, as amended; the Department of Transportation regulations and procedures (23 CFR 771 and Technical Advisory T 6640.8A); the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations on the "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR 800); and revised NCDOT guidelines. In order to meet the requirements of these laws and regulations, the work plan for the Phase II survey included the following items: (1) conducting general historical and architectural background research in order to develop contexts within which to evaluate resources potentially eligible for the National Register; (2) refining the Area of Potential Effect established during the initial phases of the project; (3) specific historical and architectural research on those resources within the APE identified as potentially eligible for the National Register; (4) describing, evaluating, and proposing National Register boundaries for those resources believed to be potentially eligible for the National Register; and (5) preparation of a report developed pursuant to the above-referenced laws, regulations, and guidelines. As part of this
FIGURE II.1  Project Locator Map
FIGURE II.2a  Area of Potential Effect (Roxboro USGS quadrangle map)
Area of Potential Effect (Roxboro and Cluster Springs USGS quadrangle maps)
work effort, Greiner additionally completed North Carolina historic structure long (blue), short (yellow), and multiple structures (green) data sheets on those resources not previously recorded on such forms.

The Area of Potential Effect or APE is the area or areas within which an undertaking may cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The APE’s boundaries were preliminarily determined during the initial phases of this project, and refined and finalized, following consultation with NCDOT, during Phase II. These boundaries are delineated in this report on the Roxboro and Cluster Springs USGS topographic quadrangle maps (Figures II.1 and II.2a-b). Within Roxboro, the APE was determined by the location of city streets and the Baker—Ca-Vel mill village. Outside of Roxboro, the APE was largely determined by the lay of the land, its boundary running along topographic contours and field and tree lines. The APE’s distance from the project corridor ranges from approximately 500 feet to 3,000 feet and encompasses approximately 1,600 acres of land.
III. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Four primary factors shaped the development of the land within and around the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE): (1) arable rural terrain; (2) a major north-south road; (3) a rail line within the southern end of APE; and (4) the proximity of Roxboro. These four factors led to the development of four major defining features of the land and buildings within and around the APE: (1) farmsteads and agriculture; (2) the provision of services, such as stores and a doctor's office; (3) textile mills and mill villages; and (4) relatively dense residential development near Roxboro.

Terrain

The 20-by-20-mile square of land comprising Person County is gently undulating. Near its center several low mountain ridges of granite and slate attain heights of 1,000 feet; its general elevation, however, is about 600 to 700 feet. From these ridges rise tributaries of the Neuse, Flat, and Tar rivers, flowing south and east, as well as streams which flow northward into Virginia and the Hyco and Dan rivers. Roxboro is located at the divide between the northward and southward flowing watercourses. Oak and pine forests initially marked much of rural Person County. By 1905 they were largely exhausted and the county's lumber industry expired (Jurney et al. 1928:1, 4; State Board of Agriculture 1896:382-383; Southern 1977:22-1).

The county historically belonged to the "Golden Belt" section of North Carolina, producing high-quality bright-leaf tobacco on its light sandy soils. A late nineteenth-century state agricultural report noted that Person's "crop of tobacco is 3,000,000 pounds, when a full crop is planted and there is a good season for cultivating and harvesting. Wheat, corn, clover, oats, vegetables and all grasses thrive" (State Board of Agriculture 1896:383). Numerous farmhouses within the APE, together with tobacco barns, corn cribs, and other outbuildings, attest to the historic use of the land. Fields of tobacco and corn still flank many stretches of US 501 and SR 1521 within the APE.

US 501

By 1928 four hard-surfaced state highways led out from Roxboro to county seats in adjoining counties in North Carolina and Virginia (Jurney et al. 1928:3). The predecessor of US 501, which ran north through Roxboro and the APE to South Boston, Virginia, was hard surfaced no later than the beginning of the decade (Anonymous 1922).

The route of US 501 within the APE has changed in places since 1922. The section of the road which cuts northeast from near SR 1326 to SR 1521 was added between 1922 and 1928 (Figures III.1 and III.2). Prior to that time one traveled from the Virginia state line south to Roxboro on 501, SR 1521, and NC 49. This route lays almost entirely within the APE, following the eastern alternative (Anonymous 1922; Jurney 1928).

US 501 was shifted to a new location, probably in 1955, from just south of SR 1326 to north of the Norfolk Southern railroad tracks near Mitchell Creek. In 1955 it was straightened from the present southern outlet of Bethel Hill School Road (SR 1329) north almost to the Virginia line. The old route still survives in part as Bethel Hill School Road and Old US 501 in the community of Bethel Hill (North Carolina State Highway Commission 1989).
FIGURE III.1  Map of Person County, North Carolina, 1922
FIGURE III.2  Soil Survey of Person County, 1928
US 501 facilitated agriculture in the APE, allowing farmers to easily bring their crops, particularly tobacco, to markets in Roxboro and South Boston. It was also attractive to services such as the Woody-Jones Store (#92) in Bethel Hill and the doctor's office of John H. Merritt (#84), for it provided ready access for their rural patrons.

Durham and Lynchburg Railroad

The Durham and Lynchburg (later the Norfolk and Western and now the Norfolk Southern) Railroad was erected through Roxboro in 1890 (Wright 1974:142-143). It parallels the lower section of US 501 until the route turns northeast at SR 1326, at which point the rail line continues north. Due to the presence of the railroad the Jalong or Longhurst Cotton Mill and the Baker–Ca-Vel velvet mill, along with their mill villages, were established within the APE.

Roxboro

The presence of Roxboro, initially south of the APE and now within its southern section, led to more dense development within the lower part of the alignment than elsewhere in rural Person County. The large number of modest bungalows and other houses erected during the first third of the twentieth century along the rough diamond formed by US 501, NC 49, and SR 1521 attest to the jobs available in Roxboro. During the early twentieth century, the majority of the growth within the county occurred in the town and its surrounding township (Bureau of the Census 1931; Bureau of the Census 1942). Growth has continued apace around the edges of the diamond, particularly along US 501 and NC 49, and many modern houses now stand between the scattered bungalows.
IV. METHODOLOGY

The survey methodology for this project consisted of historical background research, site-specific research, and a reconnaissance-level, intermediate, and intensive-level field survey of the Area of Potential Effect (APE). The main primary sources of historical information were deeds, tax maps, census records, county maps, newspapers, and local authorities and personal interviews. The main secondary sources were genealogies and county and state histories. A search of the files of North Carolina’s State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in Raleigh yielded only the National Register nomination form for the Holloway-Jones-Day House (#1), for the county has never been inventoried. The Person County section of the Tar-Neuse River Basin study (Southern 1977), on file at the SHPO, provided a useful if abbreviated discussion and inventory of the county’s historical and architectural resources.

The purpose of the research and the field survey was to understand the historical and architectural contexts of the APE and to develop specific genealogical, developmental, and architectural histories of individual resources. Such knowledge was crucial in determining which resources within the APE were potentially eligible for listing in the National Register.

The survey was necessary for compliance with, and conducted according to standards established by: Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, as amended; the Department of Transportation regulations and procedures (23 CFR 771 and Technical Advisory T 6640.8A); the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations on the "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR 800); and revised NCDOT guidelines.

During the fieldwork, every paved road, farm lane, driveway, and path within the APE was driven or walked so that each resource could be viewed, assessed, and, if potentially eligible for listing in the National Register or otherwise historically or architecturally notable, recorded. Notable resources were identified and preliminarily recorded during the first phase of the project on June 3, 1993. All resources 50 years or older were subsequently photographed when Greiner revisited the APE, as required by revised NCDOT guidelines, on April 25-26, 1994. These photographs were reviewed by SHPO and NCDOT on May 26, 1994, at a meeting in which the SHPO concurred with NCDOT’s findings that certain resources were not eligible for listing in the National Register and were not worthy of further evaluation in the Phase II survey report. All other properties 50 years old and older in the APE were subsequently evaluated in the survey report. The fieldwork for this intensive-level survey was conducted on June 28-29, 1994. The exteriors and grounds of all potentially Register-eligible resources were extensively studied at this time. Only a limited number of interiors were accessible for viewing, some only through windows.

Resources not eliminated at the May 26 meeting were extensively photographed and carefully mapped. Multiple photographs were taken of principal and associated resources. North Carolina historic structure long (blue), short (yellow), and multiple structures (green) data sheets were completed for those resources not previously recorded on such forms. The resources were keyed to the USGS topographical maps which cover the APE. Preliminary sketch maps, which were later put into final form, were drawn for each resource believed to be potentially eligible for National Register listing and for other resources where relevant in evaluating their National Register eligibility. Upon completion of fieldwork, tax maps were obtained to assist in determining the potential boundaries for resources considered potentially eligible for the National Register. The boundaries of potentially eligible resources were then drawn on these maps.
The final stage of Phase II of this project consisted of reviewing all of the materials gathered during research and fieldwork, making final assessments of the potential National Register-eligibility of the resources within the APE on the basis of this information, and summarizing all of this work, along with accompanying maps and photographs, in the present report.
V. BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND HISTORIC CONTEXTS

A. Introduction

The earliest standing resource within the project’s Area of Potential Effect (APE) was erected in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Therefore, the historic contexts outlined below effectively begin in 1825; references to the earlier history of the county are made to provide a general background to the contexts. Only certain architectural types and styles are present within the APE. The architectural historical sections are accordingly limited to developing contexts for them. In short, the historic and architectural contexts are not inclusive, but were selected with the ages and types and styles of resources within the APE in mind.

B. Rural Person County

1. Agriculture, 1825-1945

Person County was first settled in the mid-eighteenth century by English from Virginia and Granville County, and Scotch-Irish and Germans from Pennsylvania. Between 1789 and 1792, the county was created from Caswell County (Southern 1977:22-1; Eaker 1981:1; Wright 1974:24).

From its formation through the Civil War, the county’s economy was largely based upon diversified agriculture. In the years prior to the Civil War, “large plantations were the exceptions, with most of the inhabitants engaged on independent small farms. Between 1820 and 1860 a plantation economy supported by slave labor thrived to some degree, with tobacco being the chief crop and corn, cotton, wool, wheat, and oats also produced in substantial amounts” (Southern 1977:22-1).

Growth in this agricultural society was much stronger in the first three decades of the nineteenth century than the second three. The county’s population of 6,402 in 1800 climbed to just over 10,000 in 1830 and then rose by only about 1,200 more in the next 30 years, reaching 11,221 in 1860 (Bureau of the Census 1901).

On the eve of the War, almost half of the county’s farms were between 100 and 500 acres, larger than the average farm size in the rest of North Carolina. About one quarter were between 50 and 100 acres, and about one fifth between 20 and 50 acres (Wright 1974:81). These farms produced one-eighth of the state’s tobacco crop, making Person the fourth most productive tobacco county in the state (Wright 1974:76-77).

Person County’s larger holdings were broken up following the Civil War, replaced by smaller farms and tenancy (Southern 1977:22-1). In 1879 its most important crops, at least in terms of the amount of acreage planted, were corn, oats, wheat, and then tobacco. In 1889, corn led in acreage again, followed by wheat and tobacco. Tobacco swapped positions with wheat in 1909, a position it retained in 1924 (Jurney et al. 1928:4-5).

Acreage figures are deceptive, however, failing to provide a picture of the relative value of these different crops. From 1889 to 1924 the acreage of corn planted in the county decreased by about ten percent, though its yield increased by almost a third. Wheat acreage during the period decreased by about two-thirds and oats by about 95 percent. Tobacco acreage, however, more than doubled.
from 7,100 to 14,700 during the period and tobacco yield more than tripled from 2.3 to 7.5 million pounds. Throughout much of the last half of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, tobacco was the county's only strictly cash crop and was the primary source of income on its farms (Jurney et al. 1928:4-5; Southern 1977:22-1).

Increasing tobacco yield did not lead to any more than modest increases in Person County's rural population from the late nineteenth century through World War II. The county's population rose from 15,151 in 1890 to 17,356 in 1910 (Bureau of the Census 1931). It increased by about 1,600 during the teens and another 2,000 during the twenties. Between 1930 and 1940 it climbed from just over 22,000 to just over 25,000 (Bureau of the Census 1942). Most of this growth took place in the county seat of Roxboro, the county's only town, and its surrounding township, however. Subtracting the township's population from these figures, rural Person County's population grew by only 2,175 during the 50 years between 1890 and 1940, or only by an average of 435 persons per decade.

Stagnant population growth may have been due to restricted farm size and limited opportunity in the county's fields. Most Person County farms in 1925 were between 20 and 175 acres in size. The average farm contained 76 acres (Jurney et al. 1928:8). About 38 percent of farms were operated by owners and 62 percent by tenants. This was a reversal of the 1880 figures, when owner- rather than tenant-operated farms exceeded 62 percent (Jurney et al. 1928:8).

2. Commerce and Professions, 1875-1945

Activities not directly related to agriculture in rural Person County in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were fueled by agricultural dollars and the needs of farmers. A small cadre of storekeepers, doctors, and other professionals and businessmen served farmers during the period from stores and offices located in the countryside, rather than in Roxboro.

Stores were located at many rural crossroads. A number of these, from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, remain scattered throughout the county. Smaller than their counterparts in Roxboro and in surrounding county seats, they nonetheless met a variety of their patrons' needs, from the agricultural to the domestic. In Bethel Hill, located on US 501 between Roxboro and South Boston, Virginia, two stores served the rural community. Although no longer in operation or standing in its original location, the deteriorated Woody-Jones Store (#92) still survives in the community (Anonymous 1922; Woody 1994).

A small number of doctors also maintained offices in the countryside (Foushee 1921:52-53). Among these were William Merritt (1824-1904), who practiced medicine in northern Person County for 51 years, and his son, John Hamlett Merritt (1881-1944), who took up and continued his father's practice for 35 years (Watkins 1941).

Only one doctor's office has been identified in rural Person County, that of John H. Merritt on US 501 north of Roxboro (#84). A small, four-room office, it was erected for Merritt about 1913 adjacent to the family homeplace (Winstead 1993; Eaker 1981:308). The office had few visitors—"except on Sunday, when often there were more there than at Bethel Hill Church"—for Merritt generally visited his patients at their homes. Conducted on horseback and later in one of the county's first Model T's, his house calls began about 11:30 am and usually extended well into the night (Eaker 1981:308-309).
A courthouse was first erected in Roxboro at Person County’s center in 1793. The town was not incorporated, however, until 1854, at which time its population stood between about 225 and 250 (Eaker 1981:1; Foushee 1921:25). Although relatively small to the present, Roxboro has always been the only community larger than an extended crossroads in the county and Person’s commercial and industrial hub.

By the mid-1850s, a stage line ran southeast through Roxboro from Danville, Virginia, to a connection with the Raleigh and Gaston Railroad in Henderson, North Carolina (Foushee 1921:26-27). At that time the town contained narrow streets and practically no sidewalks. "Town lots were enclosed with rail fences," early resident and historian Alexander Foushee (1921:37) recalled, "except that some of them had a plank fence or paling to the front yards. Very few of the houses had ever been painted and there was only one brick house in town."

In 1870 Roxboro's population was 375 and the township's, including the town, was 1,117. In 1890, when the community was poised on the edge of a miniature industrial revolution, the figures were 421 and 2,626, respectively (Wright 1974:221; Bureau of the Census 1901).

In May, 1890—due largely to the efforts of pioneer Person County industrialist James Alexander Long, Sr.—Roxboro received its first rail line, a branch of the Durham and Lynchburg Railroad. In the railroad's wake came tobacco warehouses, banks, cotton mills, and increased population (Wright 1974:142-143; Foushee 1921:75; Ashe 1905:231-236).

In the late nineteenth century, according to Foushee (1921:76), "the town took on a pronounced air of growth. Carpenters, brick layers and painters were busy providing houses to shelter the new citizens; the saw, hammer and trowel made music on every side in a way unknown before. Quite a lot of property changed hands; a number of brick stores and shops were constructed to take the place of the old wooden houses...." An 1896 report stated that the town's "beautiful residences, mammoth warehouses, tobacco factories and stores and other buildings, numbers of which are brick, attest the enterprise and progress of the people" (State Board of Agriculture 1896:383). It further noted that the town was a major tobacco market selling from five to six million pounds annually from North Carolina and Virginia farms. By 1900 the town's population had eclipsed 1,000 and the township's population, including the town, exceeded 3,600 (Bureau of the Census 1901).

About 1901 the Roxboro Cotton Mill, the town's first textile mill, was opened. Its president and chief shareholder was J.A. Long, Sr., who had previously brought Roxboro its railroad and first bank (Wright 1974:157; Foushee 1921:77). The mill was erected along the railroad tracks a few blocks east of courthouse square.

The success of the mill prompted Long to open a second cotton yarn mill in 1906 on about 130 acres north of downtown, also on the railroad tracks, in the eponymously named community of Jalong. Later renamed Longhurst, the community is now within Roxboro city limits (Wright 1974:157; Foushee 1921:77). About 45 houses were erected with the mill on the dirt road, now US 501, that ran past it (Eaker 1981:87). The mill and some of these mill houses, almost all much altered, survive in part within the APE.
Both mills were quite successful and continue in operation to the present. In 1914 Long extended the mill in Jalong. "Quite a village has sprung up around the new mill," Foushee (1921:77) noted, "with a church, school and stores. The price of land near the mill had advanced from $10.00 to $50.00 or more per acre." In 1923 Long doubled the size of the downtown mill, adding about 25 houses to the village in the process (Roxboro Courier 1923a). "Not only the mill and machinery," the Roxboro Courier reported (1923b), "but everything connected with the mill is in model order. The Company provides houses for its hands which is creditable to any town, and at such prices as would make a real estate man go crazy. They also furnish a nine months graded school with teachers who are intensely interested not only in the education of the boys and girls, but in the general sanitary condition of everything up the hill. Truly the lives of these operatives have fallen in good hands."

In 1923 A.T. Baker and Company, velvet manufacturers, opened greater Roxboro's third textile plant. Located north of Roxboro Cotton Mills' Jalong facility, on the west side of US 501, the plant initially produced automobile upholstery. J.A. Long, Jr., following in his father's footsteps, was instrumental in bringing the plant to town (Wright 1974:184). By 1925, according to a Sanborn Company map, the mill included a village to its south (Figure V.1). In 1927 the Collins & Aikman Company of Philadelphia acquired Baker and took over the plant. The community around the mill subsequently acquired the name CaVel or Ca-Vel, short for Collins & Aikman Velvets. The plant became the foundation of the Cavel Division of the company (Wright 1974:184; Eaker 1981:53). The mill was reportedly the largest velour manufactory in the country in 1927, a position it held in 1940 as well (Durham Morning Herald 1927; Roxboro Courier 1940). The much-altered and expanded mill is still in operation. By 1969 Collins & Aikman had expanded the original plant 12 times and was constructing a 100,000 square-foot addition. This increased the plant's size to nearly 500,000 square feet. Part of the expansion included relocating and refurbishing dyeing operations and providing additional storage space. Another part involved construction of a new plant to the rear of the old one (Slaughter 1969). About 1951 the company sold off the house's of the mill village (Person County Plat Maps).

As a result of the textile industry and other activities in the town, the population of Roxboro topped 1,600 in 1920 and that of the township, including the town, exceeded 5,400 in the same year. By 1930 these numbers had climbed to 3,657 and 8,146, respectively, and even the Depression only slowed the growth. In 1940 the town's population stood at just under 4,600 and the township, including the town, had more than 10,300 residents (Bureau of the Census 1942).

D. Residential Architecture

1. Traditional Forms, 1825-1930

Traditional forms dominated the residential architecture of rural Person County—and to a lesser extent the houses of Roxboro and its immediate vicinity—from the eighteenth century through the 1920s. According to Southern, a small number of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century, vernacular frame dwellings survive in the county. They are generally small, altered, one-story-and-loft buildings with gable-end roofs, enclosed stairs, two-room plans and, in a few instances, Georgian-style decorative elements (Southern 1977:22-1).

Related to these dwellings are a somewhat larger group of modest, one-story, two-room-plan dwellings with simple, Federal-style, vernacular moldings. The finest of these, standing two stories
FIGURE V.1  Roxboro Including Jalong, Sanborn Map Company, 1925
tall, is the landmark Federal-style Waverly Plantation (1825-1835) near the Virginia border (Southern 1977:22-2).

A larger number of two-story dwellings, displaying Greek Revival-style finishes, survive in the county from between about 1840 and 1860. They are generally larger than their predecessors, often either two rooms deep or retaining their original ells, and pierced by an added center hallway. Some are topped by hipped rather than gable-end roofs (Southern 1977:22-2).

Probably the majority of surviving rural Person County dwellings from the late eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century do not display any notable stylistic elements, whether Georgian, Federal, or Greek Revival. Most of these vernacular structures are plain, one- or two-story, frame dwellings with traditional plans and simple moldings, and often large, exterior-end, stone chimneys (Southern 1977:22-2).

Generally even more modest, and built throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century, are vernacular, one-story dwellings of log. Most utilize one-room plans and are served by crude stone chimneys (Southern 1977:22-2).

In the last half of the nineteenth century, and into the early twentieth century, basic traditionally fashioned houses continued to be erected in the county. These are generally one or two stories tall and one-room deep, with gable-end roofs, exterior-end chimneys, and weatherboard cladding. A small number in the western half of the county were built two stories high with hipped roofs, full-facade or wraparound porches, and second-story entry balconies. Reflecting popular late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Victorian conceits, their porches and cornices are decorated with brackets and other fancy items of millwork (Southern 1977:22-3).

This summary of Person County's residential resources, based upon a survey of the county conducted 20 years ago, could largely apply to other border-belt North Carolina counties, although Person may have fewer stylish pre-Civil War dwellings than its neighbors. Six of the resources within the APE evaluated in this volume generally fit within the above summary of traditional residential forms.

The most notable vernacular resource within the APE is the Holloway-Jones-Day House (#86) (Plate V.1). A two-story, single-pile, hall-parlor-plan dwelling, it is believed to have been constructed in the second quarter of the nineteenth century by the Holloway family. Still clad in weatherboards and flanked by brick chimneys laid partially in Flemish bond, the house is much less altered than most of its antebellum contemporaries. In 1988 it was listed in the National Register (Francis 1988).

The larger, center-hall plan version of this two-story, single-pile form is represented within the APE by the Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmhouse (#56) and the Walker Sisters House (#30). The Walker-Long-Shotwell House apparently started out as a one-room-plan dwelling in the late nineteenth century. Physical evidence and statements of its present owner (Shotwell 1994) suggest that its central hallway and the bay to the south were added in the early twentieth century, giving the main block of the house its present form. The Walker Sisters House indicates the continuing popularity of the form throughout the county into the twentieth century. It was erected as a town residence, not a farmhouse, for the sisters just north of Roxboro in the 1920s (Long 1994). While its form is traditional, its finish, particularly its windows and porch, are influenced by the Craftsman-style so popular during the decade.
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Traditional, one-story, single-pile dwellings also survive within the APE. A turn-of-the-century house (#82) at the corner of US 501 and SR 1330 is a two-room version of the form, with a one-story ell and loft providing additional living space (Plate V.2). Like the Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmhouse, this dwelling was once smaller. Its south room, built of narrow logs clad in weatherboards, probably preceded its frame north room. Its final story-and-loft, gable-end, single-pile form is common to many tenant houses and small farm dwellings located throughout the county. Many late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century residences in Roxboro utilize the same form. One of these is a house (#72) on NC 49 a half-mile east of US 501. Though its front facade is surprisingly marked by two pedimented facade gables pierced by exterior/interior brick chimney stacks, it is at heart a modest one-story, single-pile, gable-end, frame residence. A late nineteenth-century/early twentieth-century house (#47) on the west side of SR 1326 just west of US 501 also appears to utilize this form. Its multiple entrances, however, located on its two long sides and at one gable end, make it unclear what was originally its principal facade.

2. National Styles and Forms, 1875-1945

"The architecture of Roxboro," according to Southern (1977:22-3), "reflects the prosperity of that town around the turn of the century; a large number of excellent late nineteenth and early twentieth century frame residences of various eclectic styles line Main Street." With the exception of central Roxboro, however, styles and forms popular nationally from the late nineteenth century into the middle of the twentieth are represented in a limited fashion within the APE and elsewhere in Person County. The most common national styles outside of downtown are the Queen Anne, the Craftsman, and Colonial Revival. The latter two are well represented within the APE, the first is largely only hinted at.

Victorian-era houses featuring a variety of elements of the Queen Anne style are found in Roxboro and, to a lesser extent, in western Person County (Southern 1977:22-3). Some of these houses, particularly those in downtown Roxboro, are good representatives of the Queen Anne style. At most of the houses of the era in the county, however, Queen Anne elements are generally limited to porches and cornices, and to varied rooflines and wall planes. Among the residences considered for Register eligibility in this report, the influence of the Queen Anne style was slight. The house (#72) on NC 49 east of US 501, discussed above, features a slightly varied front wall plan and a somewhat picturesque roofline created by multiple if symmetrically placed gables. Turned posts bracketed by pierced spandrels support its wraparound porch. Some of the mid-1920s houses at the Baker–Ca-Vel Mill Village (#31) also display late remnants of the Queen Anne style, with recessed entry bays varying their wall planes and turned posts in a few instances edging their porches. The Queen Anne elements at these dwellings are not particularly noteworthy when compared to other late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century residences in the county, however.

The early twentieth-century Craftsman style is more evident throughout the county and within the APE than the Queen Anne. Many examples of the style are largely unaltered. A number of large, handsome, one- and two-story representatives of the style survive in downtown Roxboro. One-story examples of the style, generally bungalows, are found throughout the remainder of the town and the county. The Walker Sisters House (#30) at the northern edge of Roxboro, discussed above, is a traditionally formed two-story dwelling with such Craftsman-style decorative elements as multi-paned upper sash and tapered porch posts on stone piers. The Will Walker House (#29) across the street from it is a match for the large Craftsman-style dwellings of downtown Roxboro in finish, form, and integrity (Plate V.3). A comprehensively conceived Craftsman-style bungalow—from its sweeping
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The Colonial Revival style is evident, through the use of symmetry, columns, and other basic classical devices, at numerous residences in Roxboro and throughout the county. Within the APE it is strongly represented at the c.1934 Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32–#40). The crescent of nine two-story houses erected on Executive Lane for executives of the neighboring Ca-Vel textile mill are all Colonial Revival in style. They utilize two basic plans, rotated or reversed for variety, with additional variation provided by different applications of colonial details (Plate V.4). These include overshot second stories, pilasters, and entries topped by lunette windows and triangular pediments. Because of their intact representation of the Colonial Revival style and their unusual position as executive mill housing, the nine houses and their subsidiary, contemporary garages and street fixtures are recommended in this report as potentially eligible for National Register listing.

E. Mill Village Form and Design, 1900-1945

Four mill villages erected for textile operatives during the first three decades of the twentieth century survive in Roxboro in form and plan, though their individual resources have been altered to such an extent that none are believed to retain integrity sufficient for listing in the National Register. All four villages consist of small, one-story, single- and two-family dwellings laid out in a regular grid of roads, with minimal support facilities, such as churches or schools. All are adjacent to the three mills they served.

The first village was presumably built shortly after the 1901 construction of the first Roxboro Cotton Mill in downtown Roxboro, southeast of the Norfolk and Western railroad tracks. In 1923 the mill was doubled in size and about 25 houses were added to the village (Roxboro Courier 1923a). Much of the housing surviving in the village probably dates from the 1920s, for the houses look much like those at the Baker-Ca-Vel Mill Village, described further below. Also during this period, the school and church buildings remaining in the village were likely erected.

The second village, which may contain the county’s earliest surviving mill housing, was erected starting in 1906 with the Roxboro Cotton Mills’ Jalong or Longhurst plant. The mill and village were located on about 130 acres north of Roxboro, the former on the east side of the Norfolk and Western tracks, the latter to the west of the tracks along the dirt predecessor of US 501 and a few parallel streets to its west. About 45 houses were reportedly initially erected (Wright 1974:157; Foushee 1921:77; Eaker 1981:87). The earliest houses appear to have used a traditional form popular throughout the county: they are small, one-story, one-room-deep structures with gable-end roofs, facade gables, and central interior chimney stacks. One-story, gabled, L-shaped houses also likely date from the initial construction of the village. Small, one-story, hip-roofed houses in the village appear to have been added later, perhaps in the teens or twenties. A much-altered, Gothic Revival-style Baptist church, now part of a funeral home complex, survives within the community.

A mill village to the east of the railroad tracks was probably erected after a 1914 extension of the Longhurst plant. Its houses look much like those at the Baker-Ca-Vel Mill Village and perhaps therefore also date from the 1920s.
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The Baker—Ca-Vel Mill Village was erected all or in part between 1923, when A.T. Baker and Company opened the mill, and 1925, when the mill and a section of the village appear on a Sanborn map. The completed village probably contained about 111 small, hip-roofed, one-story houses, 107 of which still stand (Plate V.5) (Person County Tax Maps). A church and store were part of the village as well. The much-altered, functional, brick mill, with many modern additions, stands to the north. There are three types of houses in the village. Types one and three, which comprise more than 80 percent of the houses, are single-family dwellings; type two was designed to hold two families. Originally the houses were sided with weatherboards, topped by interlocking asphalt-shingle roofs and simply corbeled chimney stacks, and marked by two-over-two sash and turned porch posts. Alterations have stripped the integrity from most of them. Most of the houses at the downtown Roxboro Cotton Mill village and at the second Jalong village appear to be basically cut from the same mold as the Baker—Ca-Vel houses, as do some of the dwellings at the original Jalong village. They too have in great part been altered.

A fifth mill village, the Ca-Vel Executive Village, was erected just north of the Baker—Ca-Vel plant in 1934. Although not a mill village within the common understanding of the term—it housed executives of the mill, rather than laborers—it nonetheless was built by the company in a regular crescent all at once and remained within company ownership until sold, with the main mill village, about 1963. It utilized two basic house plans, rotated or flipped for variety; one plan for its six garages; and one design for its four classical street lights. It also included an undeveloped crescent of land between Executive Lane and US 501, which is now designated a park.

F. Non-residential Architecture, 1875-1945

Non-residential resources in the APE evaluated within this volume for potential National Register eligibility are limited to a small number of outbuildings, a rural store, a rural doctor’s office, and a textile mill. This brief discussion is therefore limited to these types of resources, which form only a small part of the county’s total historic stock of non-residential resources.

Outbuildings are clustered to the rears of the Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmhouse (#56) and John H. Merritt House (#84). Those at the Shotwell farmstead include an open wellhouse, a frame kitchen/dining room once attached to the rear of the house, two frame laying houses, a log brooder house, a frame wheat house, a frame stable, a frame house erected in 1949, two log tobacco barns, a former log dwelling, and modern bulk barns and silos. With the exception of the modern buildings, these resources probably date from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They are fairly typical of outbuildings found at farms of this period, which included buildings to serve domestic needs, livestock, and the storage of grain and tobacco. Many similar assemblages survive throughout the county, some in use or at least associated with intact farmhouses. Because the Shotwell outbuildings are vacant and deteriorated, and the farmhouse around which they are anchored is greatly altered, they are not believed to lift the farmstead to a level of integrity sufficient to recommend it as eligible for listing in the National Register.

The outbuildings at the Merritt house include a hog-killing shed of thin vertical logs, a small frame barn, an open frame carport, a brick garage, a frame chicken coop, a frame crib, a frame tenant house, a collapsing log tobacco barn, a drained in-ground pool, and a brick and concrete block pumphouse. Reflecting Merritt’s position as a doctor, rather than a full-time farmer, they are more domestic- and leisure-related than agricultural. As at the Shotwell farmstead, the buildings are
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vacant and deteriorated, the house is altered, and the resource is therefore not recommended for Register listing.

A reconnaissance survey of all major intersections known to exist in the county in the 1930s, conducted by Greiner as part of its Phase I efforts on the project, located more than 15 stores outside of downtown Roxboro. All appear to date from the late nineteenth and the first third of the twentieth centuries. Most are one- or one-and-a-half-story, frame structures with gable-front or, occasionally, gable-end roofs. Some have stepped, parapet-front gables. Although a number are abandoned and deteriorated, the majority are relatively little altered. The prominent crossroads locations of the majority of the stores suggests that they tend to stand at their original locations. The Woody-Jones Store (#92) in Bethel Hill—a story-and-a-half tall with a stepped, parapet-front gable—is one of the larger rural stores in the county. It appears to date from around the turn of the century. Because of its deteriorated condition, the loss of its interior fixtures and, most importantly, its having been moved about a quarter-mile to a site away from the road which was its lifeblood, it is not recommended for inclusion in the National Register (Woody 1994).

Only one rural doctor’s office is known to survive in Person County. Located at the John H. Merritt property (#84) on the east side of US 501, it is a small, frame, hip-roofed structure with four tiny rooms: a library and waiting room, a consultation and examining room, a private room, and a medicine room. It was erected about 1913 to serve Dr. Merritt’s rural practice (Winstead 1993; Eaker 1981:308). No other rural professional offices have been identified in the county, so no generalizations can be drawn about their appearances. The John H. Merritt Office is recommended as potentially eligible for listing in the Register, however, because of its intact condition and rarity.

Roxboro contains three large, early textile mills: the Roxboro Cotton Mill (c.1901 and later); the Jalong or Longhurst Cotton Mill (c.1906 and later); and the Baker—Ca-Vel Mill (c.1923 and later). The first two mills began as two- and three-story, functional brick buildings with numerous windows and gable roofs. Their appearance has been greatly changed through additions and the bricking over of most of their windows. The original appearance of the Baker—Ca-Vel mill is difficult to determine, because of the many additions and modernizations to the still functioning factory complex. All three of the mills have lost their integrity and are therefore not recommended as potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register.
VI. PROPERTY INVENTORY AND EVALUATIONS

Greiner, Inc. examined and recorded at the intensive level 11 individual resources and groups of resources within the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) ranging in age from the second quarter of the nineteenth century through the 1930s (Figures VI.1a-c). One of these resources, the Holloway-Jones-Day House (#86), erected in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, is listed in the National Register. This report recommends that three additional resources within the APE are potentially eligible for listing in the National Register: the early 1930s Will Walker House (#29); the mid-1930s Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32–#40); and the early twentieth-century Doctor's Office of the John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84). Seven other resources recorded at the intensive level are recommended as not potentially eligible for listing in the Register: House (#72); the Walker Sisters House (#30); the Baker-Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill (#31); House (#47); the Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmstead (#56); House (#82); and the Woody-Jones Store (#92). All 11 of these resources are evaluated below. Other resources evaluated during the multi-phase survey of the APE—which were designated at the meeting of May 26, 1994, between the North Carolina Department of Transportation and the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, as not meeting the Criteria for listing in the National Register—are pictured in the photographic inventory accompanying this volume.
FIGURE VI.1b  Area of Potential Effect and Property Inventory Map
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FIGURE VI.1c  Area of Potential Effect and Property Inventory Map
A. RESOURCES LISTED IN, DECLARED ELIGIBLE FOR, OR CONSIDERED POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER

1. Resources Listed in the National Register

HOLLOWAY-JONES-DAY HOUSE (#86)
Northwest corner of junction of US 501 and SR 1322

The Holloway-Jones-Day House was listed in the National Register in 1988 under the Architecture area of significance (Figure VI.2). A vernacular- and nominally Federal-style, two-story, hall-parlor-plan, frame dwelling, it was erected in the second quarter of the nineteenth century by the Holloway family (Plates VI.1 and VI.2). In 1848 the house was purchased by Moses Jones, who added the rear ell and replaced the porch and some of the mantels. Jones' son-in-law, John Bryce Day, acquired the house in 1883. The dwelling is now owned by his great-grandson, Donald G. Day, who returned it to its current mid-nineteenth-century appearance between 1977 and 1979 (Francis 1988).

The house was included in the Register with three outbuildings and an 8.59-acre tract of land. This land, which comprises Lots 91, 107, and 131 of Person County Tax Map A-67, extends west along SR 1322 and north along US 501 (Figure VI.3) (Francis 1988). A log outbuilding included in the nomination could not be located in the woods west of the house during the re-inventory of the property associated with this project, although it may still be extant. (Its presence or absence would not affect the eligibility of the property to the National Register.) The two frame outbuildings, however, were located (Plates VI.3 and VI.4). The house and the two outbuildings do not appear to have been altered since the property was listed in the National Register and the property retains its architectural significance and integrity in terms of the National Register Criteria. The National Register boundaries of the resource were reviewed and found to be appropriate. Overviews of the historic contexts within which the property can be placed are found above at Sections V.B.1. (Rural Person County, Agriculture 1825-1945) and V.D.1. (Residential Architecture, Traditional Forms, 1825-1930).
FIGURE VI.2 Sketch map of Holloway-Jones-Day House (#86)
PLATE VI.1
Holloway-Jones-Day
House (#86), south
front elevation

PLATE VI.2
Holloway-Jones-Day
House (#86), east side
and north rear
elevations
PLATE VI.3
Shed to northeast of Holloway-Jones-Day House (#86)

PLATE VI.4
Shed to northwest of Holloway-Jones-Day House (#86)
FIGURE VI.3 National Register boundary map of Holloway-Jones-Day House (#86)

VI-9
The Will Walker House was erected about 1932 (Figure VI.4). Walker worked at the Longhurst (or Jalong) plant of the Roxboro Cotton Mills and reportedly patented machinery connected with the textile industry. The size and quality of his house and its grounds, and the early-Depression date of its construction, indicate that Walker was successful at his endeavors (Plate VI.5). A long-time neighbor recalls that when the house was constructed it was one of the most handsome bungalows in Roxboro (Long 1994). The house remains in Walker's family. It is now owned by his grandson, Buckley W. Cozart (Person County Deed Book 171, Page 151 (1982)).

The main, one-and-a-half-story, three-bay-wide block of the bungalow is clad in brick veneer edged with concrete coping at the front porch and two side (north) chimney stacks (Plate VI.6). Brick-veneered walls with concrete coping are utilized throughout the grounds. The house's windows, underpinned by concrete lintels and topped by soldier courses of brick, are double hung with multiple lights at the top and single sheets of glass beneath. A wide, overhanging gable-end roof tops the main block, sweeping forward over a deep porch. The roof and porch, coupled with two large, gabled, front and rear dormers, create a sense of interpenetration of interior and exterior space popular in bungalows. Another sweeping gabled roof extends to the north side of the block over a wing room and a wide porte cochere (Plate VI.7). Brackets of built-up rafter ends extend beneath all of the bungalow's roofs. Popular Craftsman-style features adorn the prominent porch and porte cochere. Two massive, battered, Craftsman-style columns on brick piers support the front corners of the porch roof. Matching piers and columns support the porte cochere as well.

The south side and west rear of the bungalow are more simply finished than the other two elevations. A one-story square bay projects from the south side, topped by a plainly finished shed roof. The rear elevation is marked only by a plain screened porch, also beneath a shed roof (Plate VI.8). The bungalow's interior was not available for viewing.

The most striking aspect of the property is the intimate connection of the finish of the house and the grounds. Brick retaining walls coped with concrete and swept down at the center, identical in finish and material to those of the front porch, extend across the front of the property along North Main Street (US 501). They continue along the sides of the front lawn, flanking the twin concrete-paved drives until tapering into the ground at the sides of the house (Plate VI.9). The same treatment marks the brick entry walk, which begins at the retaining wall steps and extends, up two intermediate pairs of steps flanked by concrete-coped walls, to the curved wing walls of the porch stairs. The north lawn, beyond the north entry drive, is not formally finished. Neither is the back yard, which holds a tiny frame shed, perhaps contemporary with the house, near the rear porch.
PLATE VI.5
Will Walker House (#29), east front and south side elevations, and grounds

PLATE VI.6
Will Walker House (#29), east front and south side elevations
PLATE VI.7
Will Walker House (#29), north side elevation

PLATE VI.8
Will Walker House (#29), west rear and north side elevations
PLATE VI.9
Will Walker House (#29), east front elevation and grounds

PLATE VI.10
Will Walker House (#29), shed to rear of west elevation
FIGURE VI.5 Proposed National Register Boundary map for Will Walker House (#29)

VI-15
The Will Walker House is recommended as individually eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C for embodying the distinctive characteristics of a Craftsman-style bungalow. It is one of the finest Craftsman-style bungalows in Roxboro and Person County, displaying in little-altered fashion all of the decorative features and uses of space which define the style and form. While a small number of Craftsman-style dwellings in downtown Roxboro are larger and finished in an equally handsome fashion, none exceed the Walker bungalow in the marriage of the style to both the house and its grounds. The brick and concrete-coped walls which edge the front lawn and the paired drives are among the most notable residential landscape features in Roxboro and the county from the teens through the 1930s. Unaltered and in its original location, with its grounds intact, the house retains its integrity in terms of the National Register Criteria. The bungalow is not believed to be eligible under Criterion A, however, for it did not make a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Research did not determine what textile machinery Will Walker may have patented and sufficient information is therefore not available to evaluate the house under Criterion B or to state that it is associated with the life of a significant person. The resource is also not believed to be eligible under Criterion D, for it is not likely to yield information important in history. The resource is further not eligible for Register listing as part of a district. Its stretch of US 501 and adjoining streets are marked by a mix of modern houses, mill houses, and other early twentieth-century houses which do not constitute a significant and distinguishable entity. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts which illuminate the house's significance are found above at Section V.C. (Industrial Roxboro and Vicinity, 1890-1945) and Section V.D.2. (Residential Architecture, National Styles and Forms, 1875-1945).

The suggested boundaries for the property include approximately 4 acres historically and at present associated with the house (Figure VI.5). They are coterminous with the house's lot (Person County Tax Map 53, Lot 2). The land within the boundaries includes the house, the shed, the landscaped area of the lot, and open grounds beyond the retaining walls.
The Ca-Vel Executive Village was erected about 1934 by the Collins & Aikman Company, just north of its velvet plant on the west side of US 501 (Person County Tax Books) (Figure VI.6). It originally included ten houses. Nine were single-family dwellings for the plant's executives. The tenth—1875 Executive Lane—served as a company guest house (Person County Tax Maps). Six garages, shared among the ten houses, were built with the dwellings, along with four street lights. All but one of these resources, the house which stood at the northern end of the village past 1893 Executive Lane, are still extant. The resources were erected on the west side of crescent-shaped Executive Lane and a short tendril which extends to its west. From the east side of the lane to US 501, a large lot of land was left undeveloped to serve as a park. The village remained under company ownership until about 1963, when it was subdivided and sold to private individuals (Person County Tax Maps). No other mill villages built for white-collar workers, rather than laborers, exist in Person County, and it is believed that company-owned executive villages were rarely erected elsewhere in North Carolina as well.

Two basic plans were utilized at the village's ten Colonial Revival-style houses (the plan of the no-longer-extant house can be ascertained from tax maps). 1859 (#33), 1863 (#34), 1881 (#37), 1885 (#38), and 1893 Executive Lane (#40) utilize the first basic plan, as did the demolished house. This plan is two stories tall, three bays wide, and two rooms deep, with gable-end roofs and one-story side wings. Two of the front bays project forward beneath a gable, giving this house plan a nominally L-shaped appearance, and a shed-roofed dormer crosses the second floor of the rear facade. Shutters frame the windows and a single exterior-end brick chimney marks one gable end. Variations are introduced at the houses through reversing their plans or rotating them 90 degrees. The houses are additionally differentiated through varied classical treatments at their entries, wings, and gable ventilators, and the presence or absence of second-story overhangs.

The second basic plan was utilized at 1855 (#32), 1869 (#35), 1875 (#36), and 1889 (#39) Executive Lane. The main blocks of these houses are more strictly symmetrical than those of the other plan. They are two stories tall, three bays wide, and two rooms deep, with gable-end roofs, a single exterior-end brick chimney, and one-story, gable-end, side wings. As with the other plan, they are varied through flipping of their plans, differing classical details, and the use of second-story overhangs.

Six garages serve Executive Lane's houses. 1875 and 1881 Executive Lane have their own garages. The other four garages stand between and are (or were) shared by 1855 and 1859 Executive Lane, 1863 and 1869 Executive Lane, 1885 and 1889 Executive Lane, and 1893 Executive Lane and the no-longer-extant corner house. Originally they were all identical, two-car, frame buildings with circular windows in their front gables and two pairs of double wooden doors with six-light windows. Changes have been made to the doors of some, but they are all basically intact.

Located along the curb and in an island in Executive Lane, the village's four metal street lights are also identical. They consist of classical lanterns supported by fluted, columnar lampposts.
The village's 20 individual resources are described and assessed in the following inventory:

1855 Executive Lane (#32) (c.1934)

Intact, two-story, three-bay, double-pile, gable-end, weatherboarded, Colonial Revival-style house with exterior-end brick chimney; semicircular transom over central entry; and one-story, gable-end, side wings (Plate VI.11). Basically the same as 1869 Executive Lane reversed, and 1889 Executive Lane reversed without entry hood and second-story overhang. Similar to 1875 Executive Lane.

Street Light A (c.1934)

Located in grass at edge of curb in front of 1855 Executive Lane; tall, metal, original light fixture with slender, fluted, columnar lamppost topped by delicate classical lantern (Plate VI.11); largely intact, although tilted and has lost lantern glass; identical to lights B, C, and D.

Garage A (c.1934)

Intact, frame, weatherboarded, two-car garage with circular window in front gable and two pairs of double wooden doors with six-light windows (Plate VI.12); stands between and to the rear of 1855 and 1859 Executive Lane—built to be shared by them; originally identical to other five garages in village.

1859 Executive Lane (#33) (c.1934)

Intact, two-story, double-pile, gable-front, weatherboarded, Colonial Revival-style house with offset gabled front porch; exterior-front brick chimney; second-story shed dormer at south side; and gabled projecting bay at north side (Plate VI.13). Basically the same as 1863 Executive Lane rotated 90 degrees without overhang, 1885 Executive Lane rotated and reversed without the overhang, and 1893 Executive Lane rotated 90 degrees. Almost identical to 1881 Executive Lane.

1863 Executive Lane (#34) (c.1934)

Intact, two-story, double-pile, gable-end, aluminum-sided, Colonial Revival-style house with projecting, gabled, front bay; front second-story overhang; one-story gable-end wing at north side; exterior-end brick chimney and one-story, flat-roofed, columned porch with balustraded deck at south side; and second-story shed dormer at rear (Plate VI.14). Basically the same as 1859 and 1881 Executive Lane rotated 90 degrees with an overhang, 1885 Executive Lane reversed, and 1893 Executive Lane with addition of overhang.

Street Light B (c.1934)

Located in grass at edge of curb between 1863 and 1869 Executive Lane; tall, metal, original light fixture with slender, fluted, columnar lamppost topped by delicate classical lantern; intact although tilted; identical to lights A, C, and D.
PLATE VI.11
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - 1855 Executive Lane (#32) and Street Light A, east front and south side elevations

PLATE VI.12
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - Garage A, east front elevation
PLATE VI.13
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - 1859 Executive Lane (#33), east front elevation

PLATE VI.14
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - 1863 Executive Lane (#34), east front and south side elevations
Garage B (c.1934)

Intact, frame, weatherboarded, two-car garage with circular window in front gable and two pairs of double wooden doors with six-light windows (Plate VI.15); stands between and to rear of 1863 and 1869 Executive Lane—built to be shared by them; originally identical to other five garages in village.

1869 Executive Lane (#35) (c.1934)

Intact, two-story, three-bay, double-pile, gable-end, weatherboarded, Colonial Revival-style house with exterior-end brick chimney; semicircular transom over central entry; and one-story, gable-end, side wings (Plate VI.16). Basically the same as 1855 Executive Lane reversed, and 1889 Executive Lane without entry hood and second-story overhang. Similar to 1875 Executive Lane.

1875 Executive Lane (#36) (c.1934)

Intact, two-story, three-bay, double-pile, gable-end, weatherboarded, Colonial Revival-style house with exterior-end brick chimney; pilasters, rectangular transom, and triangular pediment at central entry; four pilasters and plain friezeboards at front facade; a one-story, flat-roofed, open side wing with large semicircular openings at the southeast side; and a similar enclosed wing at the northwest side (Plate VI.17). Basically the same as 1855, 1869, and 1889 Executive Lane with different treatment at front facade and entry and at side wings.

Garage C (c.1934)

Intact, frame, weatherboarded, two-car garage with circular window in front gable and two pairs of double wooden doors with six-light windows (Plate VI.17); stands to the side and rear of 1881 Executive Lane, which had exclusive use of it from beginning; originally identical to other five garages in village.

1881 Executive Lane (#37) (c.1934)

Intact, two-story, double-pile, gable-front, weatherboarded, Colonial Revival-style house with offset gabled front porch; exterior-front brick chimney; second-story shed dormer at south side; and gabled projecting bay at east side (Plate VI.18). Basically the same as 1863 Executive Lane rotated 90 degrees without overhang, 1885 Executive Lane rotated and reversed without the overhang, and 1893 Executive Lane rotated 90 degrees. Almost identical to 1859 Executive Lane.

Garage D (c.1934)

Intact, frame, weatherboarded, two-car garage with circular window in front gable and two pairs of double wooden doors with six-light windows (Plate VI.18); stands to the side and rear of 1881 Executive Lane, which had exclusive use of it from beginning; originally identical to other five garages in village.
PLATE VI.15
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - Garage B, east front elevation

PLATE VI.16
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - 1869 Executive Lane (#35), east front and south side elevations
PLATE VI.17
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - 1875 Executive Lane (#36) and Garage C, east front and south side elevations

PLATE VI.18
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - 1881 Executive Lane (#37) and Garage D, south front and west side elevations
1885 Executive Lane (#38) (c.1934)

Intact, two-story, double-pile, gable-end, aluminum-sided, Colonial Revival-style house with projecting, gabled, front bay; front second-story overhang; one-story gable-end wing at west side; exterior-end brick chimney and one-story, flat-roofed porch at east side; and second-story shed dormer at rear (Plate VI.19). Basically the same as 1859 and 1881 Executive Lane rotated 90 degrees with an overhang, 1863 Executive Lane reversed, and 1893 Executive Lane reversed with an overhang.

Garage E (c.1934)

Intact, frame, weatherboarded, two-car garage with circular window in front gable and two pairs of double wooden doors with six-light windows; stands between and to the rear of 1885 and 1889 Executive Lane—built to be shared by them; originally identical to other five garages in village.

Street Light C (c.1934)

Located in green traffic island in street in front of 1875 and 1885 Executive Lane; intact, tall, metal, original light fixture with slender, fluted, columnar lamppost topped by delicate classical lantern (Plate VI.20); identical to lights A, B, and D.

1889 Executive Lane (#39) (c.1934)

Intact, two-story, three-bay, double-pile, gable-end, aluminum-sided, Colonial Revival-style house with exterior-end brick chimney; front second-story overhang; semicircular transom and gabled hood over central entry; and one-story, gable-end, side wings (Plate VI.21). Basically the same as 1855 Executive Lane reversed with addition of entry hood and overhang, and 1869 Executive Lane with entry hood and second-story overhang. Similar to 1875 Executive Lane.

Street Light D (c.1934)

Located in grass at edge of curb between 1889 and 1893 Executive Lane; tall, metal, original light fixture with slender, fluted, columnar lamppost topped by delicate classical lantern; identical to lights B, C, and D.

1893 Executive Lane (#40) (c.1934)

Two-story, double-pile, gable-end, Colonial Revival-style house with projecting, gabled, front bay; one-story gable-end wing at northeast side; exterior-end brick chimney and one-story, brick-veneered, shed-roofed wing at southwest side; and second-story shed dormer at rear (Plate VI.22). Basically the same as 1859 and 1881 Executive Lane rotated 90 degrees without an overhang, 1863 Executive Lane without an overhang, and 1885 Executive Lane reversed without an overhang. Has lost integrity through alteration of front entry to sliding glass door; addition of shed-roofed brick-veneered wing; and re-siding in aluminum. This is the only resource within the proposed district which is believed to be non-contributing.
PLATE VI.19
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - 1885 Executive Lane (#38), south front and east side elevations

PLATE VI.20
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - Street Light C from northeast
PLATE VI.21
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - 1889 Executive Lane (#39), south front and east side elevations

PLATE VI.22
Ca-Vel Executive Village Historic District (#32-#40) - 1893 Executive Lane (#40), south front and west side elevations
**Garage F (c.1934)**

Frame, weatherboarded, two-car garage with circular window in front gable; largely intact although paired double doors which presumably originally faced street are no longer in place; stands between and to the rear of 1893 Executive Lane and the no-longer-extant house which stood to the northeast—built to be shared by them; originally identical to other five garages in village.

**Park (c.1934)**

Undeveloped lot located between US 501 and crescent of Executive Lane; partially wooded, partially grassy and open (Plate VI.23); believed to have been created along with houses and other elements of village; labeled "Park" on city tax maps.

The Ca-Vel Executive Village is recommended as eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C as a historic district. Its 20 resources—19 of which are believed to contribute to the district—lack individual distinction, but represent a significant and distinguishable entity. They are an intact representative of an early twentieth-century, company-owned, North Carolina mill village constructed for executives, rather than laborers. No other examples of executive village's survive in Person County and it is believed that the type was always rare throughout the state. Further, the village's resources, as a group, are significant representatives of the Colonial Revival style in Person County. The extension of the style to the garages and street lights, as well as the houses, adds to the village's significance as a notable representative of the style. Intact, on its original location, with its parent mill still operating just to the south, the village retains all seven National Register attributes of integrity. The Ca-Vel Executive Village is also believed to be eligible for National Register listing under Criterion A in the area of significance of Community Planning and Development. It has its own identity and was developed as a separate area strictly for the executives of the mill. Its qualities as an executive village set it apart from the more typical modest village constructed for mill operatives. The socioeconomic status of the executives is readily apparent in the overall planning and development of the village, including the layout of its street, which is curved and lit by matching street lights, its park, the size of its lots, the Colonial Revival-style detailing and dimensions of its houses, and the provision of garages. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts which illuminate the village's significance are found above at Section V.C. (Industrial Roxboro and Vicinity, 1890-1945) and Section V.D.2. (Residential Architecture, National Styles and Forms, 1875-1945). The village is not believed to be eligible under Criteria B or D, for it is not associated with the lives of significant people and it is not likely to yield information important in history.

The suggested boundaries for the district include approximately seven acres historically associated with the property (Figure VI.7). They encompass the lots upon which the nine houses stand, Executive Lane, and the park located between Executive Lane and US 501. The lots within the district are Lots 4, 5, 6, 1A, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of Person County Tax Map 55. The only property historically associated with the village not included within the district is the lot upon which the no-longer-extant, tenth village house stood. This lot is now associated with a neighboring church.
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This resource is divided, physically and by an order of significance, by US 501. On the west side of the road is the house of John H. Merritt and associated outbuildings. On the east side of the road is Dr. Merritt’s office (Figure VI.8). As discussed below, the office is recommended as eligible for listing in the National Register and the house and outbuildings are not.

Merritt’s father, William Merritt (1824-1904), built a house and established a medical practice at this location about 1853. A large landowner, state senator, and physician, William Merritt practiced medicine in northern Person County for 51 years. Merritt’s first wife, C. Eglentine Long, died in 1864. He subsequently married Mary Catherine Hamlett, the mother of John Hamlett Merritt, their fifth son (Watkins 1941; Eaker 1981:307).

John H. Merritt (1881-1944) was first educated at Bethel Hill Institute in the Bethel Hill community to the north on US 501. He graduated from the University of North Carolina with a bachelor of science degree in 1902 and from the university’s medical school in 1906. He then commenced a practice at the family homeplace which continued for 35 years (Eaker 1981:308). Between 1853 and 1941, there was only a gap of 2 years during which the residents of northern Person County were not served by a Dr. Merritt.

In addition to his practice, Merritt was president of the Person County Medical Society from 1916 to 1918, and 1923 to 1934; a member of the County Board of Health for 25 years; a bank director; and a member of the school board (Eaker 1981:309).

Merritt initially lived in the house his father had built, which was located on the east side of US 501. In 1913 he built a brick-veneered dwelling across the road. Also in that year he erected an office on the east side of the road, just south of his father’s house and in front of a small family burial ground (Winstead 1993; Eaker 1981:309). His father’s house burned in 1970, but the office survived (Eaker 1981:308).

Initially Merritt made his rounds on horseback. To facilitate his travels, he purchased one of the first Model T’s in the county early in the century (Eaker 1981:308). In 1915 he married Ellen Belle Coxe (d. 1972), who assisted him in his practice, acting as his nurse and receptionist, and giving typhoid and smallpox shots throughout the county (Eaker 1981:309). Even with an office, a nurse/receptionist, and a car, Merritt still practiced most of his medicine through house calls. According to an account written by his daughter, Mary E. Winstead, Merritt "would generally start out [on his rounds of house calls] around 11:30 AM after office hours—not many patients came to the office except on Sunday, when often there were more there than at Bethel Hill Church. By going to see all the patients he had to see that day, it was generally quite late at night before he would get home." (Eaker 1981:309)

Merritt died in 1944 after 35 years of general practice in Person County. According to his daughter, "He asked that all bills be burned so no one would be harassed to pay, because he felt like if they could pay they would" (Eaker 1981:309).
FIGURE VI.8 Sketch map of John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84)
The resources on the west side of US 501 associated with the John H. Merritt Homeplace were all erected during or after 1913 (Winstead 1993). Merritt began development of the land in 1913, with the construction of his house. The L-shaped dwelling is two-and-a-half stories tall and clad in brick veneer (Plates VI.24 and VI.25). Its minimal Colonial Revival style finish includes a triangular pediment across the three bays of its front facade and a later-added pedimented entry bay. Remodeled in 1935 and again in 1950, the house is now occupied by Merritt's daughter, Mary E. Winstead (Eaker 1981:309). To the house's rear (west) are a hog-killing shed constructed of vertical logs (Plate VI.26) and a frame barn (Plate VI.27). To its side (south) are an open frame carport, a brick garage, a frame chicken coop (Plate VI.28), a frame crib, a frame tenant house (Plate VI.29), a collapsing diamond-notched log tobacco barn (Plate VI.30), a brick and concrete block pumphouse, and a drained in-ground pool. Once careful landscaping of the grounds, including stone walls, brick paths, and ornamental plantings, has largely been overtaken by overgrown trees and shrubs.

Across the road to the south of the Merritt House is the small, boxy, three-bay, one-story building which served as Dr. Merritt's office (Plates VI.31 and VI.32). Little altered since its construction in 1913, it retains weatherboard cladding, six-over-six windows (where not boarded over), two exterior five-panel doors, and a seam metal roof pierced by a tiny front dormer and a central corbeled chimney stack. The investigator did not have access to the building, but views through some windows suggest that it retains much of its original finish, including baseboards, doors, and plaster walls, as well as some of its original or early furnishings. John H. Merritt's daughter described the office, and its activity, as follows:

He [Dr. Merritt] built a small four room office on the north side of his family home which is still standing, although the home was destroyed by fire January 23, 1970. One room is a library and waiting room, one a consultation and examining room, a little private room in the back and a medicine room. He furnished the medicine to the patients both on office visits as well as house calls, feeling that the people were not able to go to Roxboro or South Boston, Va., to get the medicine they would need. Often he would be paid for neither the visit nor the medicine sometime--50 cents for both (Eaker 1981:308).

Immediately to the rear (east) of the office is the grave of C. Eglantine Long (died 1864), enclosed by a rusting cast-iron fence (Plate VI.33). The first wife of William Merritt, she is buried there with an infant son. The cemetery stands to the north of the site of the burned William Merritt House, at the edge of the yard (Eaker 1981:307). To the north of the office and cemetery is a modern ranch house which was built by John H. Merritt, Jr. (Winstead 1993).

No other rural professional offices have been identified in Person County and generalizations about the appearance of these types of resources are therefore difficult to make. In Pitt County in eastern North Carolina, five rural, late nineteenth-century doctor's offices have been inventoried. Four are plainly finished, one-story, two-room, weatherboarded structures. The fifth, the Penny Hill Doctor's Office, is also a small frame building, though with an ornate Italianate-style finish (Power and Boat 1991:116, see also cover). The rural Brunswick County office of Dr. E.G. Goodman, Sr. is also a small, one-story, weatherboarded building with a handsome Queen Anne/Colonial Revival-style finish (Brown et al. 1994:VII-13, IX-15). Small, weatherboarded, one-story tall, and rural, John H. Merritt, Jr.'s office appears to fit within the type of rural North Carolina professional offices.
PLATE VI.24
Main house of the John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84), east front elevation

PLATE VI.25
Main house of the John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84), south side elevation
PLATE VI.26
Hog-killing shed to west of John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84)

PLATE VI.27
Barn to west of John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84)
PLATE VI.28
Chicken coop to southwest of John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84) main house

PLATE VI.29
Tenant house to southwest of John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84) main house
PLATE VI.30
Tobacco barn to southwest of John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84) main house

PLATE VI.31
Doctor's Office of the John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84), west front and north side elevation
PLATE VI.32
Doctor's Office of the John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84), west front and south side elevation

PLATE VI.33
Doctor's Office of the John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84), east rear elevation, and family cemetery with marker of C. Eglentine Long
The house and outbuildings of the John H. Merritt Homeplace, which are located on the west side of US 501, are not believed to be eligible for listing in the National Register under any of its Criteria. The house does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. It is a simply finished, undistinguished representative of the Colonial Revival style, the front elevation of which was negatively affected by the removal of its porch. Better, more intact examples of the style can be found in Roxboro and elsewhere in rural Person County. It is therefore not believed to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion C. Further, the outbuildings associated with the house are vacant and deteriorated and are only a partial assemblage of typical domestic and leisure-related outbuildings. There are numerous other contemporary rural properties in the county with main houses and more complete associated assemblages of outbuildings, which retain much higher degrees of integrity. The resources associated with the homeplace on the west side of US 501 therefore are not believed to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion C as a significant and distinguishable entity. These resources are also not believed to be eligible under Criterion A, for they have not made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Nor are they believed to be eligible under Criteria B or D, for they are not associated with the lives of significant people and are not likely to yield information important in history. Although Dr. Merritt was a notable local citizen, he does not meet the standard of Criterion B for a person significant in our past. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts within which the house and outbuildings fall are found at Section V.B.2. (Rural Person County, Commerce and Professions, 1875-1945), Section V.D.2. (Residential Architecture, National Styles and Forms, 1875-1945), and Section V.F. (Non-residential Architecture, 1875-1945).

The doctor's office of the John H. Merritt Homeplace on the east side of US 501 is recommended as individually eligible for listing in the National Register under Criteria C for embodying the distinctive characteristics of a particular building type—the rural professional's office in Person County. It is the only known early doctor's or other professional's office surviving in rural Person County. Although it has no known local counterparts, it utilizes the modest, one-story, weatherboarded form common to contemporary rural doctor's offices in eastern North Carolina. Located on the homeplace next to US 501, which brought Dr. Merritt's patients to him and the doctor to his patients, and little altered, it retains its integrity in terms of the National Register Criteria. The office is not believed to be eligible under Criterion A, however, for it did not make a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Nor is it believed to be eligible under Criteria B or D, for it is not associated with the lives of significant people and is not likely to yield information important in history. As stated above, Dr. Merritt does not meet the standard of Criterion B for a person significant in our past. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts which illuminate the office's significance are found above at Section V.B.2. (Rural Person County, Commerce and Professions, 1875-1945) and Section V.F. (Non-residential Architecture, 1875-1945).

The buildings associated with the John H. Merritt Homeplace, located on the west side of US 501, stand on a 500-acre tract owned by Merritt's daughter, Mary E. Winstead (Person County Tax Map A-68, Lot 9). The doctor's office, cemetery, and ranch house on the opposite side of the road stand on a 42-acre lot owned, but not occupied, by Merritt's grandson, John H. Merritt, III (Person County Tax Map A-68, Lot 9). Only a small portion of this lot, less than one-quarter of an acre, is included within the suggested National Register boundaries for the office (Figure VI.9). The boundaries are drawn to exclude the cemetery to the office's rear and the ranch house to its north, which are not associated with its period or area of significance. They are also drawn tightly to its south to exclude property which had little connection with the building's function as an office. The boundaries do extend up to US 501 which, as noted above, played an important part in the office's history.
FIGURE VI.9 Proposed National Register boundary map, Doctor's Office of the John H. Merritt Homeplace (#84)
B. RESOURCES NOT CONSIDERED POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER

HOUSE (#72)
North side of NC 49, 0.1 miles east of Shelton Road

This house appears to have been constructed in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century (Figure VI.10). It stands about a half-mile east of the junction of NC 49 and US 501. When it was constructed, NC 49 served as the connecting leg of US 501 north of Roxboro with the center of the town. The property, which extends to NC 49, includes two small outbuildings to the rear of the house.

At its heart, the main block of the house is a one-and-a-half-story, single-pile, gable-end, frame building similar to many tenant houses and other small dwellings erected in Person County in the latter part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries. It is topped by an asphalt-shingled roof and clad in weatherboards. The finish of the two-bay front (south) facade is unusual, however. It features two pedimented gables which project out over the first story of the elevation (Plate VI.34). Because of the projection, the interior brick chimney stacks which pierce the gables are exposed at the first story. Between the exposed stacks is a centered, double-door entry. The elevation's other bay contains a six-over-six, double-hung window. A wraparound porch supported by turned posts and sawn brackets shades the front elevation and continues along the east side elevation as well. This elevation, and the west side elevation, are marked by cornice returns and two six-over-six windows, one at the first story and one in the half-story above.

Extending to the rear (north) of the main block is a one-story, gable-end, weatherboarded, frame ell (Plate VI.35). It once contained a porch at its east side, which has since been enclosed. A small additional ell room is attached to the back of the main block. The ells may be later additions to the house. It was not possible to examine the interior of the house.

A small, altered, gable-end, frame outbuilding stands to the northeast rear of the house. It appears to be contemporary with the building (Plate VI.36). A rough stone chimney affixed to its east gable end suggests that it may have been used originally as a kitchen. To the north rear of the house stands a tiny, weatherboarded, frame, gable-front shed which appears to have been constructed in the early twentieth century (Plate VI.37).

The house is not believed to be eligible for listing in the National Register under any of its Criteria. It does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. It represents a building type common in Person County during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and better, more intact examples of the type, with associated agriculture-related outbuildings, can be found throughout the county. Its paired overhanging front gables are unusual, but are not sufficient to lend high artistic values to the house. The house is therefore not believed to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion C. The house is also not believed to be eligible under Criterion A, for it has not made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Nor is it believed to be eligible under Criteria B or D, for it is not known to have been associated with the lives of significant people and is not likely to yield information important in history. The house is also not believed to be eligible for the Register as part of a historic district. Its stretch of NC 49 and adjoining roads are marked by a mix of modern houses and early twentieth-century developments.
FIGURE VI.10   Sketch map of House (#72)

VI-42
PLATE VI.34
House (#72) - south front and west side elevations

PLATE VI.35
House (#72) - east side and north rear elevations
PLATE VI.36
House (#72) - south front elevation of house at right, outbuilding at right, shed visible behind porch at right center

PLATE VI.37
House (#72) - south front elevation of shed
century houses which do not constitute a significant and distinguishable entity. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts within which the house falls are found at Section V.B.1. (Rural Person County, Agriculture, 1835-1945) and Section V.D.1. (Residential Architecture, Traditional Forms, 1825-1930).
WALKER SISTERS HOUSE (#30)
1632 North Main Street (US 501), Roxboro

This residence was erected in the 1920s for the sisters of Will Walker, whose bungalow (#29) stands across the street (Long 1984). A frame, weatherboarded building, it utilizes a traditional I-house form coupled with Craftsman-style adornment (Plate VI.38). Little altered, it is in fair condition. The house’s main block is two stories tall, one room deep, and topped by a hipped roof and hip-roofed front dormer. Its front (west) elevation is three bays wide, with a central entry flanked by paired four-over-one windows. A Craftsman-style porch of squat, battered columns on stone piers crosses the elevation’s first floor. The side elevations feature paired four-over-one windows (Plate VI.39). The rear elevation is marked by an interior and exterior chimney stack, the latter with stone facing; a long, hip-roofed, one-story ell; and a small hip-roofed ell (Plate VI.40). Such common features as identical window treatments, weatherboards, hipped roofs, and stone foundations throughout indicate that the main block and ells were erected at the same time.

The Walker Sisters House is not believed to be eligible for listing in the National Register under any of its Criteria. It does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. Numerous other early twentieth-century I-houses and Craftsman-style houses survive in the county, a number of which mix the form and the style (see for example resources #45 and #81 in the photographic inventory which accompanies this volume). The house is therefore not believed to be individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion C. It is also not recommended as eligible to the Register as part of a district. Its stretch of US 501 and adjoining streets are marked by a mix of modern houses, mill houses, and other early twentieth-century houses which do not constitute a significant and distinguishable entity. The house is further not believed to be eligible under Criterion A, for it has not made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Nor is it believed to be eligible under Criteria B or D, for it is not associated with the lives of significant people and is not likely to yield information important in history. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts within which the house falls are found at Section V.C. (Industrial Roxboro and Vicinity, 1890-1945), Section V.D.1. (Residential Architecture, Traditional Forms, 1825-1930), and Section V.D.2. (Residential Architecture, National Styles and Forms, 1875-1945).
PLATE VI.38
Walker Sisters House (#30) - west front and south side elevations

PLATE VI.39
Walker Sisters House (#30) - north side and east rear elevations
PLATE VI.40
WalkerSisters House (#30) - east rear and south side elevations
In 1923 A.T. Baker and Company, velvet manufacturers, opened a plant for producing automobile upholstery on the west side of US 501 north of Roxboro's city limits (Figure VI.11). The plant was in part established through the efforts of J.A. Long, Jr., whose father had established Roxboro Cotton Mills in the community at the opening of the century (Wright 1974:184). By 1925 the company had established a village immediately to the plant's south (Sanborn Map Company 1925). In 1927 Collins & Aikman Company, a textile concern based in Philadelphia, acquired the Baker Company and took over the plant and the village. The name CaVel or Ca-Vel, short for Collins & Aikman Velvets, was soon applied to the community around the mill, as well as the mill, which was to become the foundation of the Cavel Division of the concern (Wright 1974:184; Eaker 1981:53).

In 1927, and again in 1940, the mill was the country's largest velour manufactory (Durham Morning Herald 1927; Roxboro Courier 1940). The original appearance and extent of the mill is difficult to discern, although it apparently began as a functional, rectangular, multi-story, brick building (Sanborn Map Company 1925). Still in operation, the plant has been much-altered over time (Plate VI.41). By 1969 Collins & Aikman had expanded it 12 times and was constructing a 100,000 square-foot addition, bringing the facility's size to nearly a half-million square feet. The additions and alterations have included relocating and refurbishing the dyeing operations, adding warehouse space, and erecting a new plant off the rear of the old one (Slaughter 1969).

The original extent of the Baker—Ca-Vel mill village has not definitively been determined. The Sanborn map of 1925 pictures the mill, labeled "A.T. Baker & Co., Mfr's of Plushes and Velours," a rail spur line entering it from the Norfolk and Western line across County Road, and 17 houses to the west and south of the mill, all of which appear to survive (Figure V.1 above). Four of the houses are pictured on County Road, now North Main Street or US 501; six on Rollinson Boulevard, later Baker Street and now Kerr Drive; four on Baker Street, later Second Street and now Hicks Circle; and three on Astrid Street, later A or B Street and now Sunset or Wall Street. The map was primarily intended to cover the industrial facility and appears to only include parts of these streets. Considering the uniformity of its design, discussed further below, all of the village's houses had probably been erected by around 1925.

The completed Baker—Ca-Vel village probably contained about 111 houses, 107 of which still stand (Person County Plat Maps). (The four houses demolished since 1951 were those at 1712 Forrest, replaced by a mobile home; 230 Kerr Drive replaced by newer house; and opposite 1811 and 1815 Hicks Circle, which were not rebuilt.) A church and store were part of the village as well, at least by 1951. CaVel Methodist Church, probably erected in the 1930s, stands at 1703 West Main Street. The store, near the junction of West Main and Kerr streets, has apparently been replaced by a small, concrete-block, company building. All of these buildings were arranged on small lots in a regular grid of streets to the west and south of the mill, on the west side of US 501. Because of the rolling terrain of the village, some of their small front yards terminate at stone retaining walls. Virtually all have a clear view of the smokestacks of the mill.
PLATE VI.41
Baker–Ca-Vel
Mill Village
and Mill
(#31) - south
and east
elevations of
Ca-Vel Mill,
1803 North
Main Street
The village presently contains 111 buildings—the 107 original houses, the two new houses, the new store, and the church—with the mill to the north and east. The 107 surviving original houses are all small, hip-roofed, one-story buildings. Originally they were sided with weatherboards and topped by interlocking asphalt-shingle roofs pierced by two simply corbeled chimney stacks. Their windows were two-over-two sash and their porch posts were turned. Most of the houses do not retain their integrity. Few of the original roofs remain; much of the weatherboarding has been hidden behind modern materials or removed; and many windows, porch posts, porches, and chimney stacks have been altered or obscured.

There are three types of houses in the village. Type one is a square, three-bay, single-family house, with an engaged recessed porch and entry (Plate VI.42). It comprises more than 50 percent of the village’s houses. Type two is a larger square structure with an engaged shed roof sheltering its two front windows and two front entries (Plate VI.43). Originally a two-family house—some of the units have been converted to single-family use—type two was the least popular, comprising about a sixth of the village’s houses. Type three houses make up the remaining third of the houses in the village (Plate VI.44). They are wide, rectangular, single-family structures with an engaged shed porch roof extended over the central three of their five front bays.

The following inventory provides brief descriptions and assessments of the location, type, use, cladding, porch integrity, and overall integrity of the resources within the village, as well as brief additional comments, where relevant.
PLATE VI.42
Baker—Ca-Vel Mill
Village and Mill (#31)
- east front and south side elevations of Type
One house at 1817 Hicks Circle

PLATE VI.43
Baker—Ca-Vel Mill
Village and Mill (#31)
- west front and north side elevations of Type
Two house at 1128-1130 Turner Street
PLATE VI.44
Baker–Ca-Vel
Mill Village and Mill (#31) - east front and south side elevations of Type Three house at 1707 North Main Street
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Original Porch Posts</th>
<th>Retains Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Main Street (Plate VI.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803 West Main Street</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Textile mill</td>
<td>Aluminum &amp; brick</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Expansive, largely modern mill; mid-1920s–1980s; little orig fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727 West Main Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729 West Main Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719 West Main Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715 West Main Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Brick-veneer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711 West Main Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707 West Main Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703 West Main Street</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Brick-veneer</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr Drive (Plates VI.46 and VI.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Non-residential</td>
<td>Brick-veneer</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Small, 1-story, flat-roofed, modern building connected with mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Brick-veneer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Vertical boards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weathersboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Modern, 1-sty, gable-end dwelling on site of earlier mill house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Kerr Drive</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks Circle (Plates VI.48 and VI.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Originally a 2-family dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Originally a 2-family dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI-55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Original Porch Posts</th>
<th>Retains Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1806A-B Hicks Circle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Originally a 2-family dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Brick-veneer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Brick-veneer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Hicks Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sunset Street (Plates VI.50 and VI.51)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Original Porch Posts</th>
<th>Retains Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1729 Sunset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721 Sunset Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725 Sunset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Note: 1721 is numbered out of sequence on street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717 Sunset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713 Sunset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709 Sunset Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705 Sunset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 Sunset Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728-30 Sunset Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724 Sunset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Alum &amp; asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720 Sunset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716 Sunset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712 Sunset Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708 Sunset Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Brick-veneer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704 Sunset Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 Sunset Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Brick-veneer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wall Street (Plate VI.52)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Original Porch Posts</th>
<th>Retains Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1731-33 Wall Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725 Wall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721 Wall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717 Wall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713 Wall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709 Wall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 Wall Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728 Wall Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724 Wall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722 Wall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716 Wall Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712 Wall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708 Wall Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704 Wall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 Wall Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Turner Street (Plate VI.53)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Original Porch Posts</th>
<th>Retains Integrity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1729 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Replaced wthrbd</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717 Turner Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Retains</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Brick-veneer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 Turner Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729-30 Turner Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704 Turner Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 Turner Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forrest Street (Plate VI.54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Retains</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1724 Forrest Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720 Forrest Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716 Forrest Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712 Forrest Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Small modern mobile home on site of earlier mill house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708 Forrest Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704 Forrest Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Corner porch enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 Forrest Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Edgewood Street (Plate VI.55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Siding</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Retains</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>226-28 Edgewood Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220-22 Edgewood Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Edgewood Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-family house</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Originally a 2-family dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206-04 Edgewood Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family house</td>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114A-B Edgewood Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112A-B Edgewood Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-family house</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY:

1 = one-story, square, three-bay, one-family, hip-roofed house with engaged recessed porch and entry and two off-center interior chimney stacks

2 = one-story, square, four-bay (two entries), two-family, hip-roofed house with engaged shed porch roof extending across all four front bays and two interior chimney stacks, one at front center

3 = one-story, wide, five-bay (central entry), one-family, hip-roofed house with engaged shed porch extending over across three central bays and two off-center interior chimney stacks
PLATE VI.45
Baker—Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill (#31)
- west side of North Main Street facing north from Edgewood Street

PLATE VI.46
Baker—Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill (#31)
- south side of 100 block of Kerr Drive, facing southwest from North Main Street
PLATE VI.47
Baker—Ca-Vel Mill
Village and Mill (#31)
- south and north sides of 100 block of Kerr Drive, facing west from Wall Street

PLATE VI.48
Baker—Ca-Vel Mill
Village and Mill (#31)
- north side of 200 block of Hicks Circle, facing northeast from bend in street
PLATE VI.49
Baker–Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill (#31)
- west side of 1800 block of Hicks Circle, facing northwest from Kerr Drive

PLATE VI.50
Baker–Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill (#31)
- east side of Sunset Street, facing southeast from Kerr Drive
PLATE VI.51
Baker–Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill (#31)
- rear of east side of Sunset Street, facing north from Edgewood Street

PLATE VI.52
Baker–Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill (#31)
- west side of Wall Street, facing northwest towards Kerr Drive
PLATE VI.53
Baker–Ca-Vel Mill
Village and Mill (#31)
- east and west sides of Turner Street, facing south towards Edgewood Street

PLATE VI.54
Baker–Ca-Vel Mill
Village and Mill (#31)
- east side of Forrest Street, facing northeast from Edgewood Street
PLATE VI.55
Baker–Ca-Vel
Mill Village
and Mill
(#31) - south
front and east
side elevations
of 220-222 and
2 2 6 - 2 2 8
Edgewood
Street
The Baker–Ca-Vel Mill Village and Mill are not believed to be eligible for listing in the National Register, either individually or as a historic district, because they have lost their integrity of design, material, and workmanship. The mill has been dramatically altered through repeated changes and additions. Little of its original fabric is known to survive intact. The village as a whole, including the mill, has also lost its integrity through numerous alterations. Only 31 of its 112 resources, approximately 28 percent, retain their integrity. Only 30 of its 107 original mill houses—the heart of the village—retain their integrity, also 28 percent. Changes to roofs, siding, windows, and porches have taken their toll. Because the resources do not meet the qualifying integrity standards of the National Register, they are not addressed here in terms of specific National Register Criteria A through D.
HOUSE (#47)
West side of SR 1326, opposite Wrenner Avenue

This house appears to have been erected in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century. Its early history could not be determined and its original use is therefore not certain. In form it looks much like many tenant houses or other modest dwellings constructed during the period. Its multiple entrances, however, make it unclear whether its original front elevation was at its west gable end or its long, north, side elevation: a gable-front elevation might suggest an initial non-residential use, perhaps as a store. The house is no longer occupied and access to its interior could not be obtained.

The house is one-story tall, clad in worn weatherboards, and raised on stone footings. It is topped by a seam-metal, gabled roof pierced at the center by a chimney flue. Viewed as a gable-end building, the house is a single room deep. The west gabled elevation is three bays wide, with a door at the center and a window to either side (Plate VI.56). The north elevation includes two doors and three windows (Plate VI.57). Paired windows mark the east gabled elevation. Two windows and two doors, one shaded by a tiny shed-roofed ell, pierce the south elevation (Plate VI.58). A variety of doors—seven-panel, five-panel, three-panel, three-panel with window—fill the entries. The double-hung sash windows are also varied; perhaps the original windows were six-over-six. Some of the windows are covered with wire mesh or boarded over. All of the window and door surrounds are plain. No longer occupied, the house is only in fair condition. With its weatherboards worn and many of its windows and doors altered or replaced, its integrity is marginal.

The house is not believed to be eligible for listing in the National Register under any of its Criteria. It does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. It represents a building type common in Person County during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and better, more intact examples of the type, with associated outbuildings, can be found throughout the county. It is therefore not believed to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion C. The house is also not believed to be eligible under Criterion A, for it has not made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Nor is it believed to be eligible under Criteria B or D, for it is not known to have been associated with the lives of significant people and is not likely to yield information important in history. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts within which the house falls are found at Section V.B.1. (Rural Person County, Agriculture, 1835-1945) and Section V.D.1. (Residential Architecture, Traditional Forms, 1825-1930).
PLATE VI.56
House (#47) - west and south elevations

PLATE VI.57
House (#47) - north and east elevations

VI-66
PLATE VI.58
House (#47) -
east and south
elevations
The owner of the Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmstead (Figure VI.12), Ann Shotwell, moved to this resource in 1938. At that time it was owned by her father-in-law, J. Hubert Shotwell. Prior to Shotwell it was owned by Louis Long, whose name appears at its site on a 1922 county map. Prior to Long, according to Mrs. Shotwell, it was owned by Buckley Walker. Any owners prior to Walker are not known by Mrs. Shotwell and have not been identified (Shotwell 1994; Anonymous 1922).

The main block of the farmhouse is three bays wide, two stories tall, and one room deep (Plate VI.59). It is topped by a gable-end roof with a broad facade gable and shielded by an altered one-story porch supported by heavy square columns. It was erected in three sections, according to Mrs. Shotwell and physical evidence. Its final form is a three-bay, center-hall-plan I-house. The bay to the northeast of the center hall appears to date from the late nineteenth century. The other two bays, which include the hall and the room to its southwest, appear to have been added in the early twentieth century. A brick chimney is affixed to the northeast gable end of the newer section of the house. The house's rear ell was added by the Shotwells in 1938 and later extended by a long, open carport (Plate VI.60). The addition of modern siding, modern one-over-one windows, and the carport, alterations to the porch, and extensive modernization of the interior, have had a negative impact on the house's integrity. It is, however, maintained in excellent condition.

Outbuildings are strung out to the rear of the farmhouse along a dirt lane. On the west side of the lane are an open latticed wellhouse; a gable-end frame building with a seam-metal roof and aluminum siding, which once served as the farmhouse's dining room and kitchen (Plate VI.61); and a frame wheat house (Plate VI.62). On the east side of the lane are a frame, shed-roofed laying house; a diamond-notched log, shed-roofed brooder house (Plate VI.63); and a tilted, gable-front, frame stable with vertical board siding (Plate VI.64). Also on the east side of the lane, beyond these outbuildings, are a small, frame, gable-end house erected in 1949; two diamond-notched log tobacco barns (Plate VI.65); a deteriorated, diamond-notched log, one-room house with a collapsing exterior-end stone chimney (Plate VI.66); a frame laying house; and modern bulk barns and metal silos. With the exception of the modern buildings, these outbuildings probably date from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They are fairly typical of outbuildings found at farms of this period throughout the county.

The Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmstead is not believed to be eligible for listing in the National Register under any of its Criteria. The many alterations and additions to the farmhouse have destroyed its integrity of design, material, and workmanship. Because of these alterations, and because many other more intact, similarly fashioned farmhouses survive in the county, the house no longer embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. It is therefore not believed to be individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion C. Even though the farmstead retains a number of outbuildings, their overall lack of integrity, and the lack of integrity of the farmhouse, prevent the farmstead as a whole from being eligible to the Register as a historic district. The outbuildings are largely vacant and not used for their original functions, and there are numerous other contemporary rural properties in the county with main houses and associated assemblages of outbuildings which retain higher degrees of integrity. The farmstead is therefore not believed to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion C as a significant and distinguishable entity. The farmstead is also not believed to be eligible under Criterion A, for it has
PLATE VI.59
Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmstead (#56) - southeast front and northeast side elevations

PLATE VI.60
Walker-Long-Shotwell Farmstead (#56) - northwest rear elevation, ell and carport, and wellhouse

VI-70
PLATE VI.61
Former dining room and kitchen to west of Walker-Long-Shotwell farmhouse (#56)

PLATE VI.62
Wheat house to west of Walker-Long-Shotwell farmhouse (#56)
PLATE VI.63
Brooder house, at left, and laying house, at right, to north of Walker-Long-Shotwell farmhouse (#56)

PLATE VI.64
Stable to north of Walker-Long-Shotwell farmhouse (#56)
PLATE VI.65
Log tobacco barns to northwest of Walker-Long-Shotwell farmhouse (#56)

PLATE VI.66
Vacant log house to northwest of Walker-Long-Shotwell farmhouse (#56)
not made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Nor is it believed to be eligible under Criteria B or D, for it is not associated with the lives of significant people and is not likely to yield information important in history. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts within which the house and outbuildings fall are found at Section V.B.1. (Rural Person County, Agriculture, 1835-1945) and Section V.D.1. (Residential Architecture, Traditional Forms, 1825-1930).
This house appears to have been built in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century. It was likely originally the house of a tenant or other small farmer. No longer associated with an active farm, it is still occupied and well maintained.

The main block of the house is one-and-a-half stories tall, two rooms wide, and one room deep. Its gable-end roof is of seam metal broken at the center by a chimney flue. The four bays of the east-facing front elevation—two side doors and two central six-over-six windows—are shaded by an attached, shed-roofed porch (Plate VI.67). Both of the side elevations are pierced by two windows, one above the other (Plate VI.68). A door opens from the rear elevation onto the porch of the one-story, gabled, German-sided ell (Plate VI.69). Stone piers supplemented with concrete block support both the main block and the ell. Rafter ends are visible beneath the roofs of the front porch, main block, and ell.

The house was likely built in three sections. The southern half of its main block, probably its original section, is constructed of small logs. A tight corner stair leads from the single downstairs room of this section to the half story above. The northern half of the block is of frame rather than log construction. It may have been added not long after the log section was built, for it is almost identical to it. The German-sided rear ell, probably erected in the early twentieth century, appears to be the most recently constructed section of the house.

The house is not believed to be eligible for listing in the National Register under any of its Criteria. It does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. It represents a building type common in Person County during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and better examples of the type, with associated outbuildings, can be found throughout the county. Its partial log construction is not a notable method or material of construction, for log was utilized, particularly at modest rural dwellings, throughout the county well into the twentieth century. The house is therefore not believed to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion C. The house is also not believed to be eligible under Criterion A, for it has not made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Nor is it believed to be eligible under Criteria B or D, for it is not known to have been associated with the lives of significant people and is not likely to yield information important in history. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts within which the house falls are found at Section V.B.1. (Rural Person County, Agriculture, 1835-1945) and Section V.D.1. (Residential Architecture, Traditional Forms, 1825-1930).
PLATE VI.67
House (#82) - east front elevation

PLATE VI.68
House (#82) - south side and west rear elevations
PLATE VI.69
House (#82) - west rear and north side elevations
The Woody-Jones Store in the Bethel Hill community is one of Person County's larger early store buildings. It was erected around the turn of the century on Old US 501, about a quarter-mile to the east of its present location. In 1922 Bethel Hill had two stores, a store to the south of its crossroads owned by W.A. Woody and this building, which was called Wood's Store. This store, like the lower one, was likely owned by a Woody rather than a Wood, for by the mid-1940s it was being operated as a general store by Howard Woody. Last operated by D. Jones, it had already long been closed up when Pat Woody, its present owner, acquired it and moved it to its present site to serve as a storage building in the early 1980s (Woody 1994; Anonymous 1922).

The weatherboarded former store building is one-and-a-half stories tall, with a seam-metal roof hidden from the front by a stepped wooden parapet. Three bays mark the first floor of the front (east) elevation (Plate VI.70). The boarded up central entry is flanked by two windows with upper sash perhaps salvaged from another building and lower sash boarded over. A shed roofed porch at the elevation is supported by later added saplings. A single two-over-two window marks the center of the parapet above the porch. The side elevations are plainly finished and pierced by an irregular pattern of windows (Plate VI.71). A door and two windows mark the rear (west) elevation (Plate VI.72). The interior of the store could not be viewed. The owner, however, reports that the original fixtures no longer survive (Woody 1994).

The store is not believed to be eligible for listing in the National Register under any of its Criteria. It does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. Deterioration and the removal of its interior fixtures have diminished its integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. Numerous other late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century store buildings survive in the county, some in much better condition. Further, the store has lost its integrity of location and setting through having been moved from its original site to a location away from the road which was its lifeblood. The store is therefore not believed to be individually eligible for the National Register under Criterion C. The store is further not believed to be eligible under Criterion A, for it has not made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Nor is it believed to be eligible under Criteria B or D, for it is not associated with the lives of significant people and is not likely to yield information important in history. Overviews of the historic and architectural contexts within which the house and outbuildings fall are found at Section V.B.2 (Rural Person County, Commerce and Professions, 1875-1945) and Section V.F. (Non-residential Architecture, 1875-1945).
PLATE VI.70
Woody-Jones Store (#92) - east front and north side elevations

PLATE VI.71
Woody-Jones Store (#92) - south side and west rear elevations
PLATE VI.72
Woody-Jones
Store (#92) -
west rear and
north side
elevations
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1992 to Present

*Architectural Historian, Archaeology and Historic Architectural Group, Greiner, Inc.

Key projects include:

Architectural Historian and Historian for Phase I and II historic architectural surveys of Guess Road, Durham County, North Carolina, for the North Carolina Department of Transportation. Project involved identification and evaluation of historic properties to be affected by roadway widening.

Architectural Historian and Historian for Phase I and II historic architectural surveys of North Carolina Highway 11, Duplin and Lenoir Counties, North Carolina, for the North Carolina Department of Transportation. Project involved identification and evaluation of historic properties to be affected by roadway widening.

Architectural Historian and Historian for historic architectural survey of site of proposed new Tallahassee, Florida, federal courthouse. Project for the General Services Administration.

Architectural Historian and Historian for historic architectural survey of twelve-square-block study area for the Ellis Street Bridge Replacement project in Salisbury, North Carolina. Project for the City of Salisbury.

Historian for Phase II archaeological investigation of proposed runway improvement sites at the Baltimore/Washington International Airport. Project for the Maryland Aviation Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration.
Historian for Phase I archaeological investigation of Parking Lot–Hiker/Biker Trail at the Baltimore/Washington International Airport. Project for the Maryland Aviation Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration.

Historian for Phase I archaeological survey for a bridge replacement at Larrys Creek, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania. Project for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation.

Historian for historic architectural survey of Wissahickon Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. Project involved identification and evaluation of historic properties to be affected by roadway widening.

Historian for historic architectural survey for replacement of Old Betzwood Bridge, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. Project for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation.

Architectural Historian and Historian for Phase I and II historic architectural surveys of United States Highway 221, McDowell, Burke, and Avery Counties, North Carolina, for the North Carolina Department of Transportation. Project involved identification and evaluation of historic properties to be affected by roadway widening.

Historian for Historic Preservation Plan for the Baltimore/Washington International Airport. Project for the Maryland Aviation Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration.

Historian for archaeological investigations at Biles Island Wetland Mitigation Site, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Project for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation.

Architectural Historian and Historian for Level of Action Assessment surveys of five intersection projects in Burlington, Cape May, Middlesex, and Monmouth Counties, New Jersey. Project for the New Jersey Department of Transportation.

Architectural Historian and Historian for historic architectural surveys of intersection projects in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. Project for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation.

Architectural Historian and Historian for Phase I and II historic architectural surveys of State Route 1503, Henderson County, North Carolina, for the North Carolina Department of Transportation. Project involved identification and evaluation of individual historic properties and neighborhoods to be affected by roadway widening.

Architectural Historian and Historian for Phase II historic architectural survey of Wilmington Bypass Project, New Hanover and Brunswick Counties, North Carolina, for the North Carolina Department of Transportation. Project involved identification and evaluation of historic properties to be affected by construction of new highway.

Architectural Historian and Historian for Phase I and II historic architectural surveys of United States Highway 501, Person County, North Carolina, for the North Carolina Department of Transportation. Project involved identification and evaluation of individual historic properties and neighborhoods to be affected by roadway widening.
Architectural Historian and Historian for the historical architectural review and impact assessment of the East Jersey State Prison TDWR tower site in Woodbridge, New Jersey. Project for the Federal Aviation Administration.

Wrote individual, district, and multiple property National Register nominations and listings, for private and public entities, for residential properties, bridges, synagogues, and churches throughout New Jersey.
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II. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the Phase II historic architectural survey is to more closely examine and evaluate those 11 resources within the APE designated by SHPO and NCDOT at the meeting of May 26, 1994, as potentially eligible for the National Register or architecturally or historically noteworthy. The evaluations will be used by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to determine the potential effect of the improvements upon National Register-eligible resources within the APE. The survey will be accomplished through the following tasks.

1. General historical research will be conducted to determine the overall development of the project area and the significance of certain architectural types, textile-industry-related resources, and rural commercial resources. From this research, historic and architectural contexts that illumine the project area will be developed. Specific historical research will be conducted on the 11 designated resources.

2. A thorough intensive-level field survey will be conducted of all portions of the APE which are accessible by car or by foot. The APE previously established during the first phase of the project will be refined while conducting this survey if necessary.

3. The 11 resources designated as potentially eligible for the National Register or architecturally or historically noteworthy will be described and evaluated. These resources will be photographed, delineated on sketch maps, and keyed to USGS and other appropriate maps. For those resources which appear to have potential for listing in the National Register, proposed Register boundaries will also be delineated.

4. The results of this work effort will be submitted to FHWA and NCDOT in a draft and final Phase II historic architectural survey report prepared in accordance with NCDOT's Guidelines.

Upon agreement between FHWA, NCDOT, and SHPO on the eligibility of resources, Greiner will submit a separate work plan and budget for producing a document that will evaluate the effects the project will have on National Register-eligible resources. This evaluation of effects will be developed in consultation with NCDOT and FHWA.
III. DELIVERABLES

The following is a list of the deliverables for this second component of the work plan.

1. High-quality reproductions of USGS or other appropriate maps locating the APE and the resources 50 years or older within it; sketch maps for the 11 designated resources evaluated in the report; maps of proposed National Register boundaries where appropriate.

2. High quality reproductions of 3-1/2 x 5 black and white photographs in sufficient quantity to convey the appearance, potential significance, and eligibility of the resources within the APE.

3. A draft Phase II historic architectural survey report, in final form, prepared in accordance with NCDOT’s revised Guidelines.

4. A revised Phase II historic architectural survey report incorporating NCDOT’s and FHWA’s comments.

5. A final Phase II historic architectural survey report incorporating the SHPO’s comments.

It should be noted that the work plan does not include the preparation of Requests for Determination of Eligibility; 4(f) statements on historic properties; or Memoranda of Agreement. The plan also does not include providing National Register-level documentation for any resources.
IV. PROJECT SCHEDULING, COORDINATION, AND PERSONNEL

Fieldwork and research will begin on the Phase II historic architectural survey upon receipt of written Notice to Proceed from NCDOT. Following completion of this work, a draft Phase II survey report prepared in accordance with NCDOT’s revised guidelines will be submitted to NCDOT, along with all required maps and photographic reproductions. After Greiner receives written comments on the draft report from NCDOT and FHWA, a revised report will be submitted to NCDOT. Following receipt of comments from SHPO, a final report incorporating those comments will be submitted to NCDOT.

Once the eligibility of resources is agreed upon by FHWA, NCDOT, and SHPO, Greiner will submit a work plan for the effects documentation.

Greiner will not be responsible for coordinating any consultation efforts with FHWA or SHPO. Such consultation will be handled by NCDOT. However, with the approval of NCDOT, Greiner will attend one consultation meeting with these agencies in Raleigh.

Staffing under this work plan will include Mr. Terry Klein, Project Manager; Mr. Marvin Brown, Architectural Historian; Ms. Suzanne Pickens, Senior Architectural Historian; Mr. James Snodgrass, Historic Architectural Survey Assistant; and Ms. Brenda Crumpler, Clerical and Report Production.
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Prepared For:
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I. INTRODUCTION

The following is a work plan for conducting an additional survey to supplement the first phase of an historic architectural survey in support of the improvements to US 501 in Person County from NC 49 in Roxboro to the Virginia state line (TIP No. R-2241). This work plan is submitted to the Planning and Environmental Branch, North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) by Greiner, Inc. Its scope of work and appended work hour estimate were devised after consultation with Ms. Barbara Church, Architectural Historian, NCDOT.

This work plan consists of an additional survey to supplement the first phase of an historical architectural survey which Greiner has already completed and presented to the staff of NCDOT. It also includes limited research on individual resources within the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) and on the county's mills, mill villages, crossroads communities, and rural commercial buildings, and a countywide field survey of these resource types. This research and survey will allow Greiner to place the resources within the APE into general and countywide historical and architectural contexts.

The additional survey will provide photographs and map locations of every resource within the APE which appears to be 50 years old or older. This additional work is required because NCDOT's guidelines and the level of documentation requested for Phase I historic architectural surveys have changed since Greiner completed the first phase of the survey.

The photographs and map locations of the resources covered by this additional survey and the initial phase of the survey will be presented at a preliminary meeting with NCDOT. They will then be presented at a meeting to be held between NCDOT, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and Greiner. At these meetings Greiner will also present the preliminary results of its research into individual resources and the county's mills, mill villages, crossroads communities, and rural commercial buildings. At the meeting with NCDOT, FHWA, and SHPO, it will be determined which resources will be surveyed at the intensive level and included in the Phase II survey report.

The work plan for this project will follow the basic requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, as amended; the Department of Transportation regulations and procedures (23 CFR 771 and Technical Advisory T 6640.8A); the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations on the "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR 800); and NCDOT's newly revised guidelines.

Deliverables under this work plan will include a verbal presentation accompanied by: (a) USGS topographical quadrangle maps or other appropriate maps locating the study area, National Register and Study List properties, and all other resources 50 years old or older; and (b) photographs of these resources. These deliverables will be developed pursuant to the above-referenced laws, regulations, and guidelines.
II. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the additional survey is to provide information now required by NCDOT for all historic architectural surveys and reports. It will be necessary to travel to the project area and conduct additional fieldwork and research to provide this information. The survey will be accomplished by the completion of the following tasks.

1. The APE will be surveyed by car or by foot and all resources within it which appear to be 50 years old or older will be photographed and mapped on USGS or other appropriate maps.

2. The county’s pre-1945 roads will be driven and its historic mills, mill villages, crossroads communities, and rural commercial buildings will be examined. This will help Greiner place examples of these resource types located within the APE into preliminary historical and architectural contexts.

3. Preliminary historical research will be conducted to further assist Greiner in placing the resources within the APE into general and countywide contexts.

4. Greiner will meet with NCDOT to present the results of its fieldwork and research, and to develop recommendations of which resources within the APE should be inventoried at the intensive level and included in the Phase II survey report.

5. Greiner will attend a meeting with NCDOT, FHWA, and SHPO, at which Greiner will present the photographs, maps, and preliminary results of its research, and at which Greiner will make recommendations of which resources within the APE should be inventoried at the intensive level and included in the Phase II survey report.
III. DELIVERABLES

The following is a list of the deliverables for this additional survey.

1. USGS topographical quadrangle maps or other appropriate maps locating the study area, National Register and Study List properties, and all other resources 50 years old or older.

2. 3 x 5 black and white photographs of these resources in sufficient quantity to convey their integrity and potential architectural significance.

3. The above information—along with the results of Greiner’s preliminary research into individual buildings and the county’s mills, mill villages, crossroads communities, and rural commercial buildings—will be presented at a preliminary meeting with NCDOT.

4. The above information—along with the results of Greiner’s preliminary research into individual buildings and the county’s mills, mill villages, crossroads communities, and rural commercial buildings—will be presented at a meeting between NCDOT, FHWA, SHPO, and Greiner.
IV. PROJECT SCHEDULING, COORDINATION AND PERSONNEL

Fieldwork and research will begin on this additional survey upon receipt of written Notice to Proceed from NCDOT. The preliminary meeting with NCDOT, and the meeting between NCDOT, FHWA, SHPO, and Greiner, will be held following completion of this survey. Following the meeting with NCDOT, FHWA, and SHPO, at which it will be determined which resources will be surveyed at the intensive level and included in the Phase II survey report, Greiner will submit a work plan for the Phase II survey and report.

Staffing under this work plan will include Mr. Terry Klein, Project Manager; Mr. Marvin Brown, Architectural Historian; Mr. James Snodgrass, Historic Architectural Survey Assistant; and Ms. Brenda Laney, Clerical and Report Production.