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This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "X" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

1. Name of Property

   historic name  Parker, James H. House
   other names/site number

2. Location

   street & number  307 West Franklin Street
   city or town  Enfield
   state North Carolina  code NC  county Halifax  code 083  zip code 27823

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this X nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property _X_ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant __
   nationally _X_ statewide _X_ locally. (___ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

   ____________________________  ____________________________
   Date  Signature of certifying official

   State or Federal agency and bureau

   In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria. (___ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

   ____________________________  ____________________________
   Date  Signature of commenting or other official

   State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

   I hereby certify that this property is:
   ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________
   ___ entered in the National Register  Signature of the Keeper  Date of Action
   ___ See continuation sheet.
   ___ determined eligible for the National Register
   ___ See continuation sheet.
   ___ determined not eligible for the National Register
   ___ removed from the National Register
   ___ other (explain): ____________________________
5. Classification of Property

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply)

X private
___ public-local
___ public-State
___ public-Federal

Category of Property (Check only one box)

X building(s)
___ district
___ site
___ structure
___ object

Number of Resources within Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Total</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register \( \_ \) 0

Name of related multiple property listing (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.) N/A

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions)
Cat: DOMESTIC  Sub: Single Dwelling
        DOMESTIC  Secondary Structure

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions)
Cat: DOMESTIC  Sub: Single Dwelling

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions)
Italianate

Materials
(Enter categories from instructions)
Foundation: BRICK
Roof: METAL/Steel
Walls: WOOD
Other: GLASS

Narrative Description (Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets)
8. Statement of Significance

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria Considerations
(Mark "X" in all the boxes that apply.)

A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.

B removed from its original location.

C a birthplace or a grave.

D a cemetery.

E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.

F a commemoratve property.

G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions)

Architecture

Period of Significance
1882

Significant Dates
1882

Significant Person (Complete if Criterion B is marked above)

Cultural Affiliation N/A

Architect/Builder Unknown

Narrative Statement of Significance
(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography
(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

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

Primary Location of Additional Data:
State Historic Preservation Office X
Other State agency
Federal agency
Local government
University
Other

Name of repository: __________________________
Parker, James H. House
Halifax County, North Carolina

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property  Less than 1 acre

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet)

Zone  Easting  Northing
18  260040  4007440

Verbal Boundary Description
(see continuation sheet)

Boundary Justification
(see continuation sheet)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title  Allison H. and David R. Black/Architectural Historians
organization  Black & Black, Preservation Consultants  date  February 1994
street & number  620 Wills Forest Street  telephone  (919) 828-4616
city or town  Raleigh  state  NC  zip code  27605

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps
A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
A sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs
Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional items (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner

(Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

name______________________________

street & number____________________ telephone____________________
city or town______________________ state___ zip code ___________

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service. P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.
7. Description

The 1882 James H. Parker House is a handsome, two-story frame Italianate style residence, currently being rehabilitated. Its interior has modest, well-crafted Italianate woodwork with extensive, intact graining and marbleizing as well as an elegant, curved walnut staircase. Located on a rectangular, sandy lot on the south side of Franklin Street on the west side of Enfield, in Halifax County, the house sits back from the street in line with adjacent dwellings in a neighborhood built up with mostly late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century residences. In the front yard of the house are two large magnolia trees and along the sides and at the rear are cedars and other trees of a variety of species. Sited on the rear property line are two small, gabled-roofed frame buildings, one a smokehouse that probably predates the main house, the other an early-twentieth-century storage building. To the east of the Parker House lot is a small, one-story dwelling that was originally the rear wing of the Parker House. To the west of the Parker House is the ample side yard of the Romulus Parker House, while to the south is the rear yard of an early twentieth century house facing Batchelor Street.

(C) Parker House. 1882.

The side-gabled, single-pile front section of the Parker House is two stories tall, while to the rear are an original, one-story, full-width wing and a modern, one-story kitchen addition. A one-story transverse wing was removed from the rear of the house in 1935 and converted into a small dwelling located next door to the east.

Across the front of the symmetrically-arranged, three-bay main (north) elevation of the residence is a one-story porch whose low-hipped roof is supported by paired (tripled at the corners), chamfered columns topped by built-up and scroll-sawn brackets. Both the porch and the main portion of the house are supported on low brick piers with pierced brick panels between them. The overhanging eaves of the standing-seam tin main roof extend into returns at the gable ends, which are carried by smaller built-up brackets.
Corner boards with capitals mark the exterior corners of the house. A pair of interior chimneys with decoratively-corbelled caps rise above the ridge line of the roof.

Windows on the exterior of the house have six-over-six sash set in flat-architraved frames topped by projecting, low-gabled pediments. The windows on the front elevation also have movable-louver exterior blinds. The central doorway to the house has the same pedimented surround as the windows, its broad arch sheltering a double-leafed entrance with sidelights and a transom. The two-panel leaves of the doors have round-arched upper panels.

The original rear wing extends to the south of the front section, spanning the full width of the house under a very low-sloped, gabled tin roof. Rising above this roof on one side is a corbelled-capped original chimney whose stack has been added-to several feet, while on the other side of the rear roof is a smaller, early-twentieth-century chimney. Along the east side of the rear wing runs a shed-roofed porch that projects from the side plane of the house and which has the same detailing as the front porch. Recessed into the west side of the rear wing is a smaller shed porch, also with the same detailing. An original transverse hallway at the back of the rear wing was restored to its former configuration during the recent construction. This hallway is expressed on the exterior at each side as opposed pairs of double-leafed doors with sidelights and transoms.

Extending from the southwest corner of the rear wing, separated from the main house by the transverse hallway, is a modern, low-gable-roofed kitchen wing that is about half as wide as the rear wing. This new addition has been detailed to match the adjacent original materials. Across the rest of the south elevation of the rear wing, the scar from the removal of the original transverse wing has been filled in with clapboards and windows of a style typical to the building.

On the interior, the front section of the house has a central stair hall flanked by a downstairs bedroom on the east and a parlor on the west. On the second level the plan
was originally the same, with two bedrooms flanking a stair hall, but a bathroom has been created out of a third of the east bedroom.

One of the key features of the house is a very handsome, curved stair that rises in the rear corner of the stair hall, sweeping up the west side of the room. This stair has a molded handrail, turned balusters and a faceted newel post, all rendered in walnut.

Throughout the house, the door and window surrounds have flat architraves framed with an applied molding. On the first floor most of these surrounds are peaked to form a triangular pediment over the opening. The window surrounds also have horizontal panels under them framed with raised moldings. Both the architraves and the flat panels are grained in a light-colored wood (pine or ray-less oak), while the framing moldings are grained in a dark walnut. Everywhere in the house are four-panel doors which are grained with light-colored flat panels (pine or a ray-less golden oak) and darker stiles, rails and panel moldings (walnut). The doors have mostly mortise locks with china knobs and are hung on steeple-finial butt hinges. All of the flat plaster on the interior walls of the house has been removed. It is being replaced with sheetrock skim-coated with plaster to simulate the original finish.

Most of the mantels in the house are of the same simple, Italianate, post and lintel pattern. The mantels in the two downstairs front rooms, however, have arched friezes with applied medallions, and raised, arched panels on the pilasters. The parlor (northeast room) also has the only plaster ceiling medallion in the house. Although the parlor woodwork has been painted over, it is possible to see that the mantel and baseboards were originally grained as a white marble with black veining. On the other side of the hall, the downstairs front bedroom mantel and baseboards are marbleized in a black marble with gold veining. Baseboards in the hallway have a fine, gray-green marbleizing with red and green figuring.

The second floor rooms have a simplified version of the woodwork on the lower levels. Both bedrooms originally had identical dark gray-marbleized baseboards and
mantels and grained door and window surrounds, but all of the woodwork in the east bedroom has been repainted. A closet and bath have also been constructed along the rear wall of the east bedroom.

The interior arrangement of the rear wing is more complex than the exterior would suggest. In actuality, there are two wings of uneven length set on either side of a T-shaped hallway, the top of the tee being the transverse hall running along the back of the wing. The interior of this T is finished like an exterior wall, with clapboards and exterior window and door surrounds. A small, clapboarded chaseway has also been built into the northwest corner of the hall.

The east wing consists of a large bedroom separated from the front bedroom by a small bathroom and an antechamber with an outside entrance. The north wall of this rear bedroom has an unusual horizontal tongue and groove wooden paneling grained to look like pine or oak. This room also has gray marbleizing on the mantel and baseboards.

The west wing is the original dining room, which was initially accessed only from the interior hallway. A doorway was cut from the parlor to the dining room in the 1920s and this door location has been retained in the restoration. A small kitchen was also added to the end of the dining room in 1935, but most of that kitchen was removed in the recent work. The graining and marbleizing of the dining room has been painted over.

(C) Smokehouse ca. 1855, 1882

Located along the rear property line is a small, tin gable-roofed, clapboarded frame smokehouse which appears to be, at least in part, an antebellum structure. The pitsawn framing of this building suggests that it may originally have been part of the Governor Branch House complex. The smokehouse has a single, two-panel door set in the north gable end, and while there are ghost marks for an earlier door that would have hung on strap hinges, the existing two-panel door matches other doors in Enfield which are said to have
survived from the Governor Branch house. The side elevations of the building have narrow, vertical openings filled with louvered panels.

(NC) **Storage Building. ca. 1910.**

Adjacent to the smokehouse is a gable-roofed, weatherboarded frame storage building of the same size and configuration, but of early-twentieth century construction. The door in its north gable end is of board and batten type.

(NC) **Picket Fence. ca. 1882.**

Running along the west property line is a rare, but unfortunately dilapidated square-picket wooden Victorian fence which appears to be contemporary with the house.
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Parker, James H. House
Halifax County, North Carolina

Exhibit A

First Floor Plan

Second Floor Plan
8. Statement of Significance

Built in 1882, the James Harvey Parker House is locally significant in the history of Enfield in Halifax County under Criterion C for architecture. It is a premier representative of an important assemblage of Italianate houses built in Enfield between 1875 and 1890. This group of Italianate houses represents a post-Reconstruction return of prosperity to the town that was a result of its becoming a major trading center for the surrounding rural area, the economy of which was based on increased agricultural production. During this major period of growth and development for the town, James H. Parker (1823-1899), a self-made wealthy landowner and planter in Halifax County, purchased a town lot from the estate of former Governor John Branch and began the construction of an impressive Italianate-style house that reflected the dominate local style of the period. During Parker's seventeen-year residence in his Enfield house, he was a successful businessman and amassed large tracts of town real estate in addition to his substantial rural holdings. His 1882 house is notable for its wealth of Italianate detail, including a handsome walnut staircase, a variety of mantels, and the finest surviving graining and marbleized decorative painting in Enfield. The house is presently being restored to its substantially original appearance by a descendent of its builder.

Historical Background

In March of 1882, the Roanoke News, a newspaper published in Weldon, North Carolina, printed the following report from Enfield: "Mr. James Parker is having built a handsome residence on the Gov. Branch place, near the Episcopal church" ("Enfield News," Roanoke News, March 23, 1882, p. 3). James Harvey Parker (1823-1899), who had risen from humble beginnings to prominence as one of Halifax County's wealthiest men and largest landowners, was building a town house for his wife and himself. They had previously lived at one or the other of the plantations Parker owned in the Enfield area, most recently at Rose Hill ("Death of J. H. Parker," Roanoke News, June 22, 1899, p. 2, Mann interview). The new
Parker, James H. House
Halifax County, North Carolina

house, together with its domestic outbuildings, was to stand on land Parker had purchased in 1876 from the estate of the late John Branch near the site of the Branch house, which is believed to have been destroyed by fire in the intervening years (Deed Book 65, p. 195, Mann interview). John Branch served as governor of North Carolina, as a U. S. Senator, and as Secretary of the Navy and Governor of Florida, before returning to North Carolina, where he died in 1863 (Powell, p. 210).

James Harvey Parker was born in Halifax County to a family of apparently limited circumstances, but he overcame early handicaps to achieve substantial wealth and local renown. Although probably never elected to county-wide public office, Parker was, as the Roanoke News indicated in his obituary, "popularly known as 'Sheriff Parker.'" One possible explanation for this title is that Parker may have served briefly as a constable in one of the rural townships (Mann interview). The article continues,

Sheriff Parker was indeed a wonderful man in many ways. His education was limited to 3 months at school. Still by determined and studious efforts he was a self-made man, had excellent business capacities and amassed large estates. He was, probably, the largest real estate owner in the county. Most of the town of Enfield belonged to him.

At the time of his death, Parker's estate was valued at approximately $100,000, representing a sizable fortune at that period in Halifax County and making him one of the county's wealthiest men (Gammon and Bradley, Record of Estates: Halifax County, North Carolina, Vol. IV, p. 62). A review of the agricultural censuses from the 1850s to the 1870s shows Parker steadily building his land holdings and net worth. In 1850 he owned a relatively modest 400 acres, only a hundred of which were improved, and apparently owned no slaves. By 1860 he had amassed 3,000 acres, worth $35,000, including 1,000 improved acres worked by 24 slaves. Although the Civil War drastically reduced Parker's wealth, in 1870 he had increased his land to 6,000 acres, 3,000 acres of which were improved, worth at least $24,000. Typical of the period, his farm production was tilted heavily toward cotton and Indian corn. At that point, James H. Parker was the largest landowner in the township (U. S. Census, Agricultural Schedules 1850, 1860, 1870) Parker appears to have been representative of a small number of rural entrepreneurs who not only flourished
during the general prosperity of the 1850s, but also successfully navigated the chaotic conditions of the post-bellum years and used them to better their position.

In 1841, Parker had married Mary Crosby Scott (1819-1902), a native of England who had emigrated to North Carolina with her family at the age of six. The Scotts, after living in Orange County for a number of years, had moved to Halifax County in the late 1830s, settling near Enfield. In one of her obituaries it was said of Mary Parker that she was married to "...one of the most successful men who ever lived in Halifax Country." Continuing in praise of Mrs. Parker it reported that "They were happily adjusted to each other and by hard work, economy and good management, amassed a large fortune, and this was due as much to Mrs. Parker as her husband (unattributed newspaper obituary in survey file).

The Parkers were well known for the "lavish hospitality" with which they entertained at both their country estate and later at their residence in Enfield (J. H. Parker obituary). They were said to have particularly enjoyed welcoming groups of young people to their home, such as the friends of their eight children who lived to adulthood, and they continued this practice even after their children had left the family home ("Death of Mrs. Parker," Roanoke News, 21 August 1902, p. 3.).

In a codicil to his will, Parker provided that, if his wife predeceased him, their house and lot in Enfield should pass to their daughter, Cary S. Hunt (Halifax Wills, Book 7, p. 216). Mary Parker confirmed this bequest in her own will, written soon after her husband's death (Halifax Wills, Book 7, page 360). The 1900 census indicates that Cary Hunt, who was divorced from Z. Herndon Hunt of Oxford, North Carolina, had moved back to Enfield with two of her children and was living with her mother in the house on Franklin Street (Mann interview; Halifax Marriage Register; 1900 U. S. Census, Population Schedule). Ten years later, Mrs. Hunt still occupied the house with her two sons, David Alexander and Samuel P. Hunt, living next door to her brother, Romulus B. Parker, and across the street from her sister-in-law, Elizabeth Parker, widow of W. F. Parker (1910 U. S. Census, Population Schedules).
After 1910, Cary Hunt stayed in the family home on an intermittent basis, returning to it permanently in the 1920s to live there until her death in 1928. Taking care of her in her final illness was her son David Alexander Hunt (1882-1939), who had married Alma Fleming in 1920 (Mann interview; index to Halifax Marriage Register). Cary Hunt willed the home place to her son, noting that he had promised that, at his death, the property would be returned to his siblings or their heirs if he died "...without bodily heirs... (Halifax Wills, Book 12, p. 37)." Nevertheless, in his will Hunt devised the property to his wife Alma, stipulating that at her death it should pass to her sisters, Selma Elizabeth Fleming and Myra Fleming Mann (Halifax Wills, Book 12, p. 531). About 1935 the rear, transverse kitchen wing was removed from the house and remodeled into a separate rental dwelling sited just to the east of the main residence (Mann interview).

The three sisters occupied the house together after Hunt's death in 1939. Selma Fleming having predeceased her, Alma Hunt (1889-1979) willed a life interest in the property to her sister Myra Fleming Mann, to pass to her nephew William M. Fleming at her sister's death (Halifax Estates, 79-E-218). In the mid-1980s, Myra Mann entered a rest home and William Fleming began renting the house to tenants who occupied it until 1992 (Mann interview). The house had begun to deteriorate during the occupancy of the three sisters, a process which accelerated during its years as a rental property. In October, 1993, Dr. William M. Mann, Jr., a direct descendant of James Harvey Parker, purchased from Fleming the portion of the property containing the main residence and is rehabilitating the building with respect for its original appearance (Halifax Deeds, Book 1534, p. 437).

Historical and Architectural Context

The James Harvey Parker House was built at the apex of a period of significant growth and development during which the town of Enfield, with its important location on a railroad line, became a major trading center for the surrounding, agriculturally-based economy. In the years immediately following the Civil War, Enfield, like most North Carolina towns, languished. But the decades of the 1870s and 1880s brought a rapid
expansion of business enterprises and the development of an industrial component for the local economy. In 1872, the North Carolina Business Directory listed eleven individuals and companies in Enfield under the heading of Merchants and Tradesmen and revealed that a coach shop, a furniture maker, two grist mills and a saw mill contributed to the economic base.

Five years later, the number of merchants and tradesmen had increased to twenty-one, and a cotton factory, carpenter shop and shingle factory had joined the earlier small industries. By 1884, commerce was thriving to such an extent that the North Carolina Business Directory catalogued some forty-seven mercantile establishments, including a greatly-increased diversity over previous years, when general stores were the rule. In addition, Enfield boasted five cotton gins to serve the needs of the rural cotton culture. However, by the early 1890s Enfield's boom years were beginning to come to an end, affected by the same depressions which affected the agricultural economy on which the town's prosperity was dependent (Black, pp. 11-17).

A significant assemblage of residences survives in Enfield from the period 1875 to 1890, and the James Harvey Parker House is an excellent exemplar of this group (Black, p. 14). A majority of the houses built in Enfield during this era, including the James Harvey Parker House, exhibited overall forms derived from rural vernacular building types, enlivened by ornamentation of varying degrees of lavishness and sophistication that was based on the popular styles of the age. And by the 1880s, the Italianate style had largely replaced the Greek Revival mode, locally, as the dominant fashion for houses which reflected the nationally-current styles.

The James Harvey Parker House is deceptively simple on the exterior, employing a familiar rural dwelling form—the two-story, single-pile, frame building with a gable roof and one-story rear wings. It is embellished with the characteristic ornament of the Italianate style: chamfered porch posts with sawn brackets, bracketed eaves, and pedimented door and window surrounds. The interior is more notable, as it contains an elegant curving stair rising from the rear to the front in the main, central hall, graining on the majority of the pedimented door and window surrounds and paneled window...
spandrels, and an interesting variety of marbleizing on mantels and baseboards in the six principal rooms. Most of this decorative painting remains intact.

The most sophisticated and imposing example of the Italianate style in Enfield is the George B. Curtis House, contemporary with the Parker House. Built adjacent to the railroad tracks just south of the business district, it is a tall and relatively massive frame residence which displays many of the hallmark features of the Italianate. Although its interior is well-detailed, it lacks the decorative painting which characterizes the Parker House.

Both the one-story Bond-Newman-Whitaker House and the two-story Thomas C. Hunter House, dating from the late 1870s, display many exterior decorative details similar to the Curtis House, particularly pedimented window hoods with brackets and fishtail dentils. But the interiors are less elaborate than those of either the Curtis House or the Parker House. The gabled wall dormers are the most distinctive feature of the Hunter House.

At about the same time that James Harvey Parker constructed his Enfield house, or shortly thereafter, two of his sons, W. F. Parker and Rom B. Parker, built Italianate-style homes near their father's residence. Of the two, the W. F. Parker House retains the greater amount of its 1880s Italianate detailing, though the majority of its interior decorative painting has been painted over.

Also included in the group of houses from this period which reflect the local preference for the Italianate style are the Dr. L. T. Whitaker House, which has lost most of its stylistic references through replacement of its original porch; the derelict Hayes-Cuthrell House; and the Wood-Branch House, which was partially remodeled in the early twentieth century (Black, pages 14-16).
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10. Geographical Data Continued

Verbal Boundary Description

The boundaries of the James H. Parker House nomination are as shown by the dashed lines on the attached Halifax County Tax Map #408, drawn at a scale of 1 inch equals 100 feet.

Boundary Justification

The boundaries for the James H. Parker nomination include the western portion of the larger, original tract for the house, and which has been the home lot since 1935. The nominated lot is defined on the west by a fence contemporary with the house, and on the east and south by tree and shrub lines, and provides an appropriate setting for the residence.