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WEEKLY LIST OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON PROPERTIES: 4/25/2019 THROUGH 5/10/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address/Boundary</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Vicinity</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>NHL</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>Wardman Park Annex and Arcade, 2600 Woodley Rd. NW, Washington, BC100003945</td>
<td>BOUNDARY INCREASE APPROVED</td>
<td>5/10/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO, JEFFERSON COUNTY, Ririe Community Hall, 455 Main St., Ririe, SG100003924</td>
<td>LISTED</td>
<td>5/8/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS, DU PAGE COUNTY, Lilacia Park Historic District, 150 S. Park Ave., Lombard, SG100003914</td>
<td>LISTED</td>
<td>5/9/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA, CARROLL COUNTY, Holy Guardian Angels Church and Cemetery Historic District, Jade Ave. and 245th St., Roselle, 04001424</td>
<td>LISTED</td>
<td>5/9/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA, JOHNSON COUNTY, Borts, Albert J. and Alice E., House, 416 Reno St.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wartrace, MP100003898, LISTED, 5/8/2019
(Agricultural Resources of Bedford County, Tennessee, 1805-1969 MPS)

TENNESSEE, CANNON COUNTY, Brown-Hancock House, 110 W. Water St., Woodbury, SG100003901, LISTED, 5/7/2019

TENNESSEE, DAVIDSON COUNTY, Clover Bottom Farm (Boundary Increase), 2941 Lebanon Rd., Nashville, BC100003900, BOUNDARY INCREASE APPROVED, 5/7/2019

TENNESSEE, JACKSON COUNTY, Sutton, T.B., General Store, 169 Clover St., Granville, SG100003902, LISTED, 5/7/2019

TENNESSEE, MONROE COUNTY, Tennessee Military Institute Residential Historic District, 1310, 1311 & 1313 Peachtree St., Sweetwater, SG100003903, LISTED, 5/7/2019

TENNESSEE, SHELBY COUNTY, Barretville Bank and Trust Company Building, 9043 Barret Rd., Millington, SG100003904, LISTED, 5/7/2019

TENNESSEE, SHELBY COUNTY, U.S. Marine Hospital, 360 Metal Museum Dr., Memphis, SG100003905, LISTED, 5/13/2019

TENNESSEE, WHITE COUNTY, Sparta Residential Historic District (Boundary Increase), 8 E. College St., Sparta, BC100003906, BOUNDARY INCREASE APPROVED, 5/8/2019

TEXAS, COMAL COUNTY, Kabelmacher House, 23968 TX 46, Spring Branch vicinity, SG100003922, LISTED, 5/8/2019
This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form*. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter “N/A” for “not applicable.” For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions.

### 1. Name of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic name</th>
<th>Brown-Hancock House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other names/site number</td>
<td>Brown, Christopher Columbus, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of related multiple property listing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Remove “N/A” if property is part of a multiple property listing and add name)

### 2. Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street &amp; Number:</th>
<th>110 West Water Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City or town:</td>
<td>Woodbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>37190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, 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 at the following level(s) of significance:

- [ ] national
- [ ] statewide
- [X] local

Applicable National Register Criteria:

- [ ] A
- [ ] B
- [X] C
- [ ] D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of certifying official/Title:</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Tennessee Historical Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

In my opinion, the property _ ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Commenting Official:</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brown-Hancock House

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

___ entered in the National Register
___ determined eligible for the National Register
___ determined not eligible for the National Register
___ removed from the National Register
___ other (explain:) ___________________

Signature of the Keeper ____________________________ Date of Action ____________

5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check as many boxes as apply.)</td>
<td>(Check only one box.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Building(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public – Local</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public – State</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public – Federal</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Resources within Property

(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 buildings</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 sites</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 structures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 objects</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register 0

Cannon County, Tennessee
Brown-Hancock House
Cannon County, Tennessee

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/single dwelling</td>
<td>DOMESTIC/single dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/Secondary Structure</td>
<td>DOMESTIC/Secondary Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: Greek Revival; Italianate; Classical Revival</td>
<td>Mixed: Greek Revival; Italianate; Classical Revival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)
Other: I-House
Mixed: Greek Revival; Italianate; Classical Revival

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: BRICK; LIMESTONE; SLATE; WOOD

Narrative Description

Located at 110 West Water Street in Woodbury, Cannon County, Tennessee, the Brown-Hancock House is a two-story, brick I-house with end chimneys, capped by a side gable roof with slate shingles.¹ The vast majority of the house’s stylistic elements are typical local expressions of the Greek Revival style: a low-pitched side-gabled roof, prominent full-height pedimented portico, sidelights and transom around the doorway. Also present are brackets reminiscent of the Italianate style. Originally constructed c. 1869, Nashville architect Thomas W. Gardner significantly expanded the home from 1916 to 1918 with the addition of a two-story ell on the rear, north elevation and a solarium on the east. The retention of the c.1869 Greek Revival elements and addition of the Classically-styled solarium enabled the home to fit neatly into the Classical-Revival style popular during the early 20th century. The property contains one other contributing building—a detached, single vehicle garage that was built during the c.1916-1918 expansion of

the house. There are two structures on the property: a contributing brick cistern dug during the house expansion and located immediately to the rear (north) of the ell; and non-contributing remnants of a dry stack, stone retaining wall located at the northwest corner of the property. Located just off the northeast corner of the Cannon County square, the siting of the house retains its historic proximity to the civic and commercial heart of the county as well as its access to the East Fork of the Stones River to its north. The Brown-Hancock House remains an intact example of the vernacular Greek Revival architectural style prevalent in the region during the mid-19th century and the Classical Revival style in fashion during the early 20th century. The Brown-Hancock House retains a high degree of integrity in the original design, setting, and decorative millwork and brickwork, as the property has seen minimal changes (See Figure 1).²

Figure 1. Late 19th c. photo of Brown-Hancock House. Photo courtesy of property owner.

Setting

The Brown-Hancock property is bound to the south by Water Street, the terminus of Cannon Street and a Regions Bank building to the west, the east fork of the Stones River to the north, and a residential parcel with bungalow to the east. The house faces the north elevation of a mid-century commercial building that fronts Cannon Street. While not on the courthouse square proper, the house sits immediately off the square at the northeast corner higher than but within the viewshed of the c.1935 National Register-listed Cannon County courthouse to the southwest. A line of manicured bushes runs northward from the western end chimney, creating a privacy barrier between the west portion of the yard and the drive that serves the bank.

²Thomas W. Gardner, original blueprints, “Alterations and Additions to Residence Walter Hancock Esq. Woodbury, Tennessee,” n.d. It should be noted these blueprints are not exactly “as built” as some of the arrangements of amenities (toilets, sinks in bathrooms, open porch) and materials (such as flooring in porch areas) on the blueprints do not match what was actually installed. These blueprints are held by the current property owner. Images of the blueprints were submitted with this nomination and can be found in the Figures Section.
This line of bushes ends where a gravel drive begins at the bank parking lot. The gravel drive runs east across the backyard of the property to the detached garage that sits northeast of the house. A brick cistern that has been capped with concrete sits immediately north of the house’s ell. A manicured yard slopes downward from the rear of the house and is bisected horizontally by the gravel drive. The yard continues to slope downward toward the river fork and is bound on the northwest corner by remnants of a dry stack retaining wall. The rear (north side) of the property is bound by the East Fork of the Stones River. The viewshed from the back of the property across the fork includes the public greenspace of city-owned Dillon Park. The core of the bungalow-style home to the east of the Brown-Hancock property was originally the detached kitchen that served the c.1869 home. The kitchen building was moved to its current location (now, a legally separate property not included in this nomination) during the c.1916-1918 expansion when a kitchen space was built into the new ell addition. While many of the commercial buildings near the Brown-Hancock House are of modern, mid-20th century construction (the bank building to the west, the furniture store and utility buildings across the street), the setting retains integrity in its prominent, elevated siting overlooking the county’s civic and commercial seat.

1. ** Dwelling (c.1869, 1916-1918)**

The Brown-Hancock House’s basic c.1869 I-house form was maintained during the 1916-1918 addition of a two-story ell to the north (rear) elevation of the house and a solarium to the east elevation. An extant patio was also enclosed and now supports the westernmost sleeping porch above. During the addition, much care was taken to reproduce matching bricks and continue the original common bond pattern throughout the exterior walls. The entire house sits on a continuous foundation of block-cut limestone, perforated by metal air vents. A low-pitched side gable roof with slate shingles caps the c.1869 portion of the house, while a hipped roof of similar pitch and slate shingles caps the ell addition.

The façade (south elevation) is expressive of the Greek Revival order with its symmetrical three-bay design and centered, full-height pedimented portico with balcony that rests on a 24’ 2” wide and 7.5’ deep limestone porch below. A wide band of trim with dentil molding underneath forms the triangular pediment within the gable of the portico. Below the pediment, an elaborate frieze with alternating Italianate brackets and decorative raised panels run the perimeter of the portico and continue to crown the entire south elevation below the roofline. The portico is supported by four free-standing, square wooden columns, all with limestone bases. Two matching square pilasters, also with limestone bases, flank the entryway. The main entrance to the house contains a single-leaf, six-paneled door (protected by a modern glass storm door) surrounded by a three-part transom above and four-part sidelights on either side, all of which are located beneath a limestone lintel that mimics those above the windows. The second-floor wood balcony of the portico is accessible from the interior via glass-paned double doors located beneath a lintel and flanked by two-part sidelights. A screen door protects the double doors. A wooden balustrade with vertical, v-shaped balusters runs the perimeter of the balcony. The portico ceilings on both levels are wood paneled.

One original six-over-six, double-hung wood sash window is situated in each bay on both the first and second floors, all beneath matching lintels and above limestone sills. A rowlock brick course caps the lintels on the two ground-level windows. The continuous limestone foundation is visible on the westernmost portion of the façade due to the incline of the land toward the east. To the east of the main entrance is a c. 1918 solarium crowned with the same style balustrade found on the portico balcony. A pronounced cornice and frieze crowns the entire solarium. In the center of the solarium’s south elevation is a wooden double-door entry with three glass panes aligned vertically on each door and eight-pane transom above. Flanking this entrance are two six-pane windows. Two pilasters located near the corners of the solarium’s south façade
frame the entry and fenestration, with the easternmost pilaster creating the southeast corner of the building. The solarium’s continuous brick foundation is visible on its south elevation, as are two limestone steps leading from the yard to said entrance.

The west elevation, described from south to north, is comprised of the gable end of the original main block of the house, featuring a shouldered exterior end chimney. The elaborate cornice and frieze from the façade are continued directly underneath the gabled roofline and end in matching cornice returns. To the north of the chimney is a frame patio that was enclosed with wood siding during the c. 1918 expansion. Above this space is a second-floor sleeping porch with four, eight-pane casement windows, also added during the c.1918 expansion. The two levels of this frame addition are demarcated horizontally by a projecting cornice and plain frieze that wrap the corner, cap the enclosed patio, and are met by three gently pitched siding boards from above to shed rainwater past the projecting cornice. This frame addition sits atop a rowlock brick course above its limestone foundation.

The west elevation of the brick ell addition is capped by a cornice and plain frieze. The common bond brick pattern from the original portion of the house is continued in the ell. Fenestration includes an asymmetrical arrangement of six-over-six wood sash double-hung windows—the second floor and one on the first floor and each featuring a partial wood lintel framed by double rowlock brick arches above and sills that mimic those found elsewhere on the house. North of this fenestration is a frame porch area enclosed with lattice. Above this is a second sleeping porch with six eight-pane casement windows that make up the entire western wall of the porch. Similar to the aforementioned sleeping porch and enclosed area beneath, the two levels of this frame addition are demarcated horizontally by a projecting cornice and plain frieze that wrap the corner, cap the enclosed porch, and are met by three gently pitched siding boards from above to shed rainwater. The mortared limestone foundation is increasingly visible on the west elevation as the land gently declines toward the rear (north) of the property. The west side of a mortared, limestone block stair wall that serves the lattice-enclosed porch and modern concrete slab with HVAC units atop is visible from this elevation.

The north (rear) elevation features the c. 1918 additions to the house. From east to west, this elevation includes the rears of the one-story solarium, the ell addition, and enclosed patio and sleeping porch near the western gable end of the house’s main block. The solarium’s north (rear) elevation is identical to its south (façade) elevation (described previously) with the exception of double screen storm doors protecting the glass-paned double-doors that lead to the back yard. Due to the decline of the yard to the north, a larger portion of the solarium’s brick foundation is exposed on its north elevation than on its south elevation (façade).

The north elevation of the brick ell includes an interior brick chimney rising from the roof, two six-over-six double-hung windows on the ground level, and one smaller six-over-six double-hung window on the second level. All three windows have partial wood lintel framing beneath double rowlock brick arches above and sills that mimic those found elsewhere on the house. To the west of the brick portion of this elevation is the aforementioned frame porch enclosed with lattice and the second sleeping porch directly above. The transition from the brick to frame portion of the ell is further indicated by a slightly lower roofline on the latter. A single-leaf lattice door into the lattice-enclosed porch serves as the rear entrance to the house. Seven concrete steps with stair walls of mortared, block-cut limestone lead from the yard up to this entry. The sleeping porch above contains two northward-facing eight-pane casement windows. The unfinished basement is accessed through the limestone portion of the rearmost (north) ell wall, just to the east of the
Moving westward on the north elevation, the enclosed frame addition to the main block of the house with sleeping porch above is visible. This enclosed area is accessed from the backyard up two concrete steps through wood-framed, eighteen-pane double doors. One six-over-six double-hung window perforates the wall between the doors and the brick ell wall. The second floor features the sleeping porch with four, eight-pane casement windows and one six-over-six double-hung window. The demarcation of the two levels by projecting corner and plain frieze continues from the frame addition’s west elevation. Also continuing from the west elevation of this frame addition is the rowlock brick course atop the limestone foundation.

The east elevation, described from south to north consists of the gable end of the original main block of the house, featuring a shouldered exterior end chimney. The elaborate cornice and frieze from the façade continue directly underneath the gabled roofline and end in matching cornice returns. One six-over-six double hung window with lintel and sill that mimics those found on the façade is located to the north of the chimney, within the original main block of the house. The east elevation of the solarium consists of two bays, each with three six-pane casement windows underneath a six-pane transom. These bays are divided by two pilasters. Additionally, two pilasters of the same style are located near the two corners of the solarium’s east façade, with the southernmost and northernmost pilasters creating the southeast and northeast corners of the building. The solarium’s brick foundation is slightly more visible on this east elevation than on its south (façade) elevation due to the northward decline of the lot.

Moving northward, the east elevation of the brick ell addition contains two six-over-six double-hung windows with partial wooden lintels framed by double rowlock brick arches on the second floor and a contiguous row of three six-over-six double-hung windows perforating a 16’ section of protruding brick wall on the ground level. A cornice and frieze that mimic those found on the south (façade) elevation of the house cap the protruding portion of the wall. An interior chimney rises from the eastern field of the hipped roof ell addition. The remaining fenestration of the ell includes one four-over-four and one six-over-six double hung window on each floor, all of which have partial wooden lintels framed by double rowlock brick arches above and limestone sills underneath. A rectangular, wood frame 3-pane basement window perforates the limestone foundation underneath a partial wooden lintel and soldier course brick arches. The limestone foundation on the east elevation of the house is increasingly visible moving northward due to the decline of the lot.

INTERIOR

The original c. 1869 interior of the Brown-Hancock House featured a typical I-House floor plan with a central hall flanked by single-pile of rooms. Per the architect’s original blue prints, the expansion between 1916 and 1918 added a one-story solarium to the east of the main block, and a two-story rear addition which elongated the original central hall and included a formal dining room, pantry, kitchen, and bathroom on the first floor, and two sleeping porches, two bathrooms, and two bedrooms on the second floor. Both phases of the house maintain their original spatial organization and defining features. During the expansion, the woodwork in the original portion of the house was replicated throughout the additional spaces for consistency of design. Both phases of the house retain this original woodwork. The original floors and floors of the new spaces were covered with oak during the c.1916-1918 expansion and are retained throughout all areas of the house. The tiled areas such as the solarium and bathrooms retain their original c.1918 tile
flooring and wainscoting as well. The current floorplan reflects that drawn by Gardner and his associates c.1916-1918, retaining the intelligent design of the house, with its naturally-lit interior spaces and thoughtful division of public and private areas.

First floor

Through the main doorway on the south elevation of the house is the original central hall with restored plaster walls and original molded baseboards, cornice, and simple door surrounds. The baseboards are relatively simple with a flattened shoe and semicircular head. When the house was expanded in the 20th century, the original millwork of the main block was replicated in the new spaces for continuity of design. Narrow-width oak flooring in the central hallway continues throughout the house and dates to the 1916-1918 work on the house. Adding to the formality of the space, the floor of the central hall is accented by three narrow-width boards that are darker than the others and run the perimeter of the space. According to the current property owner, the original ash and chestnut wide boards remain underneath the oak flooring.

The central hall contains a half-turn staircase which begins rising on the east wall of the hall, contains a landing, and continues rising southward along the west wall, leading to the center hall of the second floor. The baseboards of the center hall continue as stringer board along the stair wall, throughout the landing, and the remaining stairs thereafter. There is a four-panel door in the north wall accessed at the landing that opens to a landing of the staircase on the other side of the wall. The turned balusters, handrails, and newel posts of the staircase are walnut. The open stringer board on the staircase contains decorative scroll brackets beneath each tread. Raised paneling covers the space beneath the open stringer board, adding to the formality of the staircase.

A single-leaf, four-panel door (leading to storage) is located beneath the stairway, perpendicular to the rear (north) wall of the central hall, while an identical, adjacent door pierces the central hall’s rear (north) wall, leading to the rear addition. A doorway (with door identical to the others) in the center hall’s west wall leads to the west parlor, while a doorway (with door identical to the others) in the center hall’s east wall leads to the east parlor.

The flooring, baseboards, and door surrounds of the central hall continue into the east parlor. The room lacks a cornice but is crowned by a picture rail located approximately six inches from the ceiling. A fireplace with marble firebox surround and hearth is located in the center of the room’s east wall, between two doors that lead to the solarium. The mantle is classically styled with fluted, square Doric pilasters on plinths that flank either side of the firebox. A paneled architrave is located below the mantle cornice. One six-over-six double hung window with stool and apron pierces the south wall of the room.

Two identical wooden doors, each with twelve glass panes, flank the fireplace and lead from the east parlor into the solarium addition. The baseboards in this space are less formal than those found throughout the rest of the house and the room’s slender cornice is similar to the picture rail found in the preceding parlor. The shape and massing of the woodwork trimming the solarium’s fenestration is similar to that found in the rest of the house. The solarium’s northern, eastern, and southern walls are almost entirely comprised of fenestration. The north wall contains a centrally located double-leaf door that leads outside, each leaf with three vertically-aligned glass panes, beneath an eight-pane transom. One fixed, six-pane window flanks either side of the doorway. The east wall is divided into two bays, each with three fixed, six-pane windows beneath an eight-pane transom. The southern wall is identical to the northern wall. The space retains its original tile flooring.
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A wide doorway with original pocket doors divides the east parlor from the dining room to the north. The flooring, door and window trim, and picture rail of the dining room match that of the east parlor. A chair rail with paneled wainscoting beneath runs the perimeter of the dining room. A fireplace is located at the center of the dining room’s north (rear) wall. The fireplace and chimney structure is not flush with the interior dining room wall but extends outward into the floorplan. The firebox surround and hearth is made of Tennessee pink marble. The mantle is classically-styled with round, slightly-tapered Doric columns resting on plinths that flank either side of the firebox. A paneled architrave is located below the mantle cornice. A series of three six-over-six, double-hung windows pierces the dining room’s east wall. A single-leaf, four-panel door on the room’s western wall leads to the hallway of the rear addition. A single-leaf, four-panel swinging door piercing the dining room’s north (rear) wall to the west of the fireplace leads to the pantry.

The flooring and door and window surrounds of the pantry match that of the rest of the house. There is no cornice in this room. The space is rectangular with the length running west-east. There are built in storage cabinets above and below counter space, all of which take up the entire length of the room’s east wall. Above the cabinets on the east wall are two fixed, eight-pane windows aligned horizontally that look into the adjacent laundry room. The south wall of the space contains the doorway to the dining room on the east and a doorway to the hall on the west portion of the wall. A single square, center-pivot window with privacy glass is situated above eye level on the west wall of the room and looks into a bathroom on the other side of the wall. On the north wall of the pantry is a six-over-six double hung window that looks into the latticed porch area and adjacent four-panel door that leads into the kitchen.

The flooring and door and window trim of the kitchen match that of the rest of the house. The west wall of the kitchen contains a doorway with a four-panel door that leads to the latticed porch area. The north wall contains two six-over-six double-hung windows that flank a section of wall not flush with the rest of the wall and formerly served by the chimney that rises above the kitchen roof. The east wall of the room contains one six-over-six double-hung window. The north wall contains a doorway with four-panel door that leads to the laundry room.

The flooring and window and door trim in the laundry room match that of the rest of the house. The east wall contains one four-over-four double hung window. The west wall of the room contains the two previously mentioned fixed, eight-pane windows aligned horizontally that look into the pantry.

The center hall in the rear of the house is accessed back through the pantry. The flooring and window and door trim in the rear center hall match that of the rest of the house. The hall contains a half-turn staircase that begins rising on the east wall, contains a landing, and turns to rise along the west wall leading to a hallway on the second floor. There is a four-panel door in the south wall accessed at the landing that opens to the landing of the staircase on the other side of the wall. The design of the closed stringer boards is consistent with the baseboards of the space and match those of the staircase in the front central hallway. The staircase has plain, squared balusters and square, classically inspired newel posts. In the east wall of the rear central hall is a doorway with four-panel door that leads into the previously described dining room. The south wall is pierced by a four-panel door that leads to the front center hall (the original c.1869 portion of the house). One six-over-six window is located on the west wall near the northwestern corner of the hall.

A bathroom original to the c.1918 addition is accessed through a door on the rear center hall north wall, adjacent to the butler’s pantry doorway. The bathroom retains the original commode, pedestal sink, black and white checkered floor tile, and subway tile wainscoting. One four-over-four double-hung window, with
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trim, stool, and apron consistent with the rest of the house’s windows, pierces the west wall. The single square, center-pivot window with privacy glass that looks into the butler’s pantry pierces the east wall.

A half-glass (made of six individual panes) wooden door located in the west wall of the rear center hall leads to the enclosed patio room. The window and door trim of this room match that of the rest of the house. The baseboards in this room are less formal than those throughout the rest of the house and match those in the solarium. The room retains the tile floor original to the c.1918 expansion of the house. A recessed double doorway on the room’s south wall leads into the west parlor of the original c.1869 portion of the house. A set of double doors, each with eighteen glass panes, and one six-over-six double hung window pierce the north wall.

The west parlor (original to the c.1869 portion of the house) is accessed through the west wall of the original center hall (as well as through the double doors of the above described patio enclosure). The window and door trim, flooring, and picture rail of the west parlor matches those of the rest of the house. The baseboards are the same shape as those in the rest of the house but boast restored faux marbling. Matching faux marbling adorns the fireplace mantle located in the middle of the room’s west wall. The mantle is classically styled with square, Doric pilasters on plinths. The architrave below the cornice of the mantle is plain. One six-over-six double-hung window is located on the parlor’s south wall. Wooden double doors, each with 15 glass panes, lead to the patio enclosure through the parlor’s north wall.

Second floor

At the top of the half-turn staircase is center hall of the second floor. On the south wall of this space is a double-leaf door leading to the second-floor portico seen on the main façade, each leaf containing eight glass panes. Four-part sidelights flank the doorway. The narrow-width oak flooring, simple baseboards with a flattened shoe and semicircular head, and door surrounds of the first floor continue into the front center hall space on the second floor.

A four-panel door in the north wall of the central hall provides access to the c. 1918 upstairs addition. The flooring, baseboards, door and window surrounds match those of the c. 1869 central hall. The rear staircase is less formal than the c. 1869 staircase in the front half of the house, yet retains the features of Victorian-era staircases, such as square paneled posts and simple square balusters. The western wall of the central hall expansion contains a door into the west bathroom, as well as a single, six-over-six double hung window.

Through the western wall of the second floor’s front central hall is the southwest bedroom. The flooring and window and door surrounds of the upper central hall continue into the west bedroom. The baseboards in this space are less formal than those found in much of the rest of the house, lacking the semicircular head that characterizes the more formal baseboards throughout the house. In the center of the room’s west wall is a classically-styled fireplace mantle with square, Doric pilasters on plinths. The architrave below the cornice of the mantle is plain. A four-panel wood door leads to a sleeping porch through the bedroom’s north wall. A six-pane double-hung window is centrally located on the room’s south wall.

The c. 1918 sleeping porch is accessible through the southwest bedroom. The flooring, baseboards, door and window surrounds of the west bedroom continue into the sleeping porch. The northern and western walls of the sleeping porch are entirely comprised of fenestration. The western wall is comprised of four eight-pane casement windows. The northern wall is identical to the western wall.
A bathroom adjacent to the sleeping porch is accessed through the northern wall of the southwest bedroom, to the east of the sleeping porch doorway. The bathroom retains the original c.1918 fixtures: bathtub, commode, pedestal sink, and subway tile wainscoting, consistent with the first-floor bathroom. The original blue tile flooring remains intact. A medicine cabinet with stool and apron beneath is located on the bathroom’s west wall. One six-over-six, double-hung window perforates the north wall and is surrounded by trim consistent with that of the rest of the house. A four-panel door located in the east wall leads into the rear central hall.

Across the front central hall from the southwest bedroom is the southeast bedroom, accessed through a four-panel wood door consistent with those in the rest of the house. The flooring, baseboards, window and door surrounds, and fireplace mantle of this bedroom are consistent with the southwest bedroom. The fireplace mantle is located in the center of the room’s east wall with one six-over-six, double-hung window to its north. One six-over-six window is located in the south wall. The southeast bedroom also contains access to the attic on the ceiling near the west wall. On the north wall is a four-panel door leading to the first of two bedrooms added during the c.1916-1918 expansion. Also on the north wall, west of the previously mentioned door, is a four-panel door that opens into a closet.

The first of the two bedrooms original to the c.1916-1918 expansion is accessed through the original southeast bedroom’s north wall. The flooring, baseboards, door and window surrounds, and fireplace mantle are consistent with the southwest and southeast bedrooms. There is a closet located in the southeast corner of the room, the space of which extends into the floorplan of the bedroom. The closet space is accessed through a four-panel door. Two six-over-six, double hung windows are located on the east wall. The fireplace is located on the north wall. The chimney and fireplace structure are not flush with the wall but extend out into the room’s floorplan. A four-panel door on the room’s west wall opens into the second floor’s rear central hallway. Above this door is an awning window with original operating crank.

The rear central hallway on the second floor contains flooring, baseboards, window and door surrounds consistent with the bedrooms. This space is also accessed by the half-turn staircase (located near the space’s south wall) rising from the rear central hall of the first floor. The west wall of the rear central hallway contains the doorway to the previously described bathroom accessed through the southwest bedroom. North of this bathroom doorway is one six-over-six, double hung window in the west wall. At the northwest corner of the rear central hallway is a storage closet accessed by a four-panel door located in the hall’s north wall.

To the east of the storage closet is a doorway to a rear hallway passage that leads to a second sleeping porch (not pictured) located on the northwest rear corner of the c. 1918 addition. Similar to the other sleeping porch, the northern and western walls are entirely comprised of fenestration. The western wall is comprised of six eight-pane, casement windows. The northern wall is comprised of four eight-pane, casement windows. The east wall contains a four-panel door that leads into the northeast bedroom. A storage closet is accessed through the southern wall to the west of the entry into the sleeping porch from the rear hallway passage.

The northeast bedroom (not pictured), the second bedroom added during the c.1916-1918 expansion, is accessed through the north wall of the rear hallway passage. The flooring, baseboards, window and door surrounds, and fireplace mantle are consistent with the rest of the bedrooms. The northeast bedroom’s west wall contains the doorway to the second sleeping porch. A fireplace is located in the center of the north wall with one six-over-six double hung window located to the east. One six-over-six window is located on the east wall. A closet is accessed through a four-panel door on the south wall.
The third bathroom (not pictured) of the house is located between the two bedrooms of the c.1916-1918 addition, on the east side of the rear hallway passage. The bathroom retains the original c.1918 fixtures: bathtub, commode, and pedestal sink as well as the tile flooring and subway tile wainscoting. One four-over-four window perforates the east wall of the bathroom.

2. Detached garage (c.1916-1918, C)

The one-bay, 15 x 28’ common bond brick garage was added to the property as part of the c.1916-1918 expansion. The garage has a continuous block-cut limestone foundation that is increasingly visible as the property slopes downward to the north. Due to the building site’s grade, the limestone foundation is visible along nearly the entire west elevation. A single-leaf, double plank wood door beneath a flat segmental arch is located near the garage’s northwest corner on its west wall. Due to the change in elevation, the door provides access to an interior space slightly lower than the space created for the vehicle. The east and west walls of the garage extend above the roofline to form a three-level, stair step parapet on each that descends to the north. A higher parapet with decorative brick corbeling below the cornice crowns the south elevation/façade. A modern garage door is located beneath a flat segmental arch that matches the one above the doorway on the west elevation.

A fallen tree damaged the building in 2010, after which it was repaired using the original brick.4

3. Cistern (c.1916-1918, C)

The cistern located immediately to the northeast of the house’s ell addition was dug during the c.1916-1918 expansion of the house and is lined with the same bricks used for the addition to the house and new garage. The cistern was capped with concrete at an unknown date.

4. Remnants of rock wall (n.d., NC)

There are remnants of a dry stack stone retaining wall (running north-south) located at the northwest corner of the property.

---

4 Current property owner, personal communication to Savannah Grandey, October 11, 2017.
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8. Statement of Significance

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

- A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

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

- Property is:
  - A Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
  - B removed from its original location.
  - C a birthplace or grave.
  - D a cemetery.
  - E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
  - F a commemorative property.
    - less than 50 years old or achieving
  - G significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Architecture

Period of Significance
c.1869; 1916-1918

Significant Dates
c.1869, 1916-1918

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

N/A

Cultural Affiliation

N/A

Architect/Builder
Gardner, Thomas West
Brown-Hancock House

Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph

Constructed in 1869 in the ever-popular I-house form with Greek Revival and, to a lesser extent, Italianate details, the Brown-Hancock House was expanded and further stylized into a vernacular expression of Classical Revival by prominent Nashville/Bell Meade architect Thomas West Gardner who carefully designed and implemented a large expansion of the house beginning in 1916 and ending in 1918. As such, the Brown-Hancock House is eligible under Criterion C as a locally significant example of mid-19th century Greek Revival I-House with Italianate details as well as early 20th century Classical Revival. The house is also locally significant under Criterion C as an excellent local example of an historic adaptation of a property that represents the modernization of American residential life.

Narrative Statement of Significance

Historic Background

The first Euro-Americans to settle the area that would become Cannon County arrived in the late 1790s near Readyville and Bradyville (the present western portions of the county). The legislature formed Cannon County in January 1836 from segments of Rutherford, Smith, and Warren Counties, later adding portions of Wilson County to its north. The first substantial village, and the first county seat, was Danville, whose name was later changed to Woodbury. The town’s first arrangement was a linear street plan that Henry Trott and William Bates later adapted into a central courthouse square plan in 1836. It was at the northeast corner of this central square plan that Christopher Columbus Brown had his stylish I-house with Greek Revival details built in 1869.

Born around 1831, Brown became a successful Woodbury merchant by 1860 and married Ann Coleman in 1869. Later in the year he acquired land, bound by the East Fork of the Stones River and Water Street, from Ann’s father, Frank. Frank owned the Coleman Inn located across Water Street from the newlyweds’ lot.

---

5 It is likely that William Wharton (b: 1799, d: 1888) built the original c.1869 portion of the Brown-Hancock House. Originally from Virginia, Wharton was a local carpenter in Woodbury during the mid to late 19th century. Wharton built two dormitories and the main school building in a mixture of Greek Revival and Italianate styles for the Baptist Female College in Woodbury from 1857 to 1860, of which only the female dormitory/Adams House still exists (NR 87001035). He is also credited with the design of a one-story, Greek Revival home (referred to as the “Wharton House”) built in the 1860s in Carl Kenneth Fieth, “Historic Preservation in Woodbury, Tennessee,” (master’s thesis, Middle Tennessee State University, 1982), 59-60. Some of the character-defining elements of these buildings, namely the cornices with alternating Italianate brackets and raised panels, are also found on the Brown-Hancock House. Considering the small size of Woodbury and the success of his Baptist Female College buildings, it is possible a notable community member such as Christopher Columbus Brown could have commissioned this reputable local craftsman to build his home. However, there is at present no documentary evidence proving Wharton responsible for the c.1869 core.


Soon after, he had the brick I-house built on the corner of the square in which he and Ann raised their children: Claudia, Charles, William, Alice, and Grace Christine.

Brown died in 1894, after which his wife, Ann, and youngest daughters, Alice and Grace Christine, continued to live in the house. The eldest daughter, Claudia (1871-1948), married local civic and business leader Walter Hancock in 1898. By 1910, Walter and Claudia Hancock had moved into the home with Ann and Claudia’s sister Grace. Ann lived with her daughter and son-in-law in the house until her death in 1928.

Known initially among the community as the Ann. E. Brown homestead, then the Walter and Claudia Hancock House, the Brown-Hancock House remained in the same extended Brown-Hancock family until 1951 when it was conveyed to N.B. and Lila Hancock (no confirmed relation).

Walter Hancock

The Hancock family has a long history in Cannon County. In 1809, Richard and Lewis Hancock migrated to Tennessee from Virginia and began a lucrative farming business. Settling on Sycamore Creek in Cannon and Wilson counties, the Hancock brothers owned adjacent farms consisting of 3,000 acres of farmland.

Lewis Hancock’s eldest son, Richard Alexander, was born in January 1827. He married Anna Jeff Sneed and together the couple had six children—one of which was Walter Hancock.

Hancock was influential in Woodbury from the late-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries through a long career of public service. In 1888, at the age of nineteen, Walter helped organize the Bank of Woodbury, eventually becoming the bank’s vice president and director. In 1893, he left Cannon County to study law under William C. Houston, then-member of the Tennessee House of Representatives. After becoming a lawyer, Hancock ran a successful law practice from the Woodbury square with clients throughout the mid-state and became involved in Cannon County’s local politics as an ardent Democrat. Hancock served as the Mayor of Woodbury for three terms during the 1910s. It was around this time that Walter and Claudia hired Nashville architect Thomas W. Gardner to substantially expand the house’s floor plan and install three
bathrooms and a kitchen inside the house. Oral tradition maintains that Walter agreed to continue living in Claudia’s childhood home on the condition that it undergo such expansion and modernization.  

By the late-1910s, Hancock turned his political focus toward national issues. During the First World War, Hancock demonstrated his commitment to the local war effort while serving as the chairman of the local draft board. By the end of the 1910s, Hancock’s political involvement expanded further as he became an outspoken proponent of Prohibition. He served as the president of the Woodbury Anti-Saloon League and maintained his commitment to a dry state well beyond the enactment and repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, as he gave traveling prohibition talks in Cannon and Rutherford counties throughout the 1930s. Hancock was also a close associate of Governor Gordon Browning during his first term in office.

Hancock is remembered as having played an active role “in all programs designed for the betterment of his community and took the lead in church, civic and social enterprises in the Woodbury area.” His involvement in one enterprise, in particular, is indicative of his influence on the town of Woodbury. As Woodbury expanded as the county’s main town in the early decades of the twentieth century, it “never had a railroad connection and remained largely isolated from major transportation networks until the completion of the original Memphis-to-Bristol Highway (now U.S. Highway 70S) during the late 1920s.” Hancock, though no longer serving in his mayoral capacity, served on the Cannon County delegation to advocate for the Memphis-to-Bristol Highway through Woodbury.

On April 25, 1947, Walter Hancock suffered a fatal heart attack in his home on Water Street. The Tennessean’s announcement of his death on April 27, 1947, declared “Cannon County and that whole section of the state lost its most tireless supporter and promoter. Though he held public office as mayor...he was never one to seek the limelight. But his efforts on behalf of his home community never ceased.”

Claudia’s death followed in 1948, after which the family home reverted to her sister Grace Christine who conveyed the property to N.B. and Lila Hancock (no confirmed relation) in 1951.

Nashville Architect Thomas W. Gardner

While the original c. 1869 façade remains intact, the Hancocks commissioned well-known Nashville/Bell Meade architect Thomas West Gardner to design an addition from 1916-1918, including a Classical Revival solarium, that nearly doubled the house’s size.

---

17 West, Encyclopedia of Tennessee.
19 “Walter Hancock,” The Tennessean, April 27, 1947, p. 22
A native of Winchester, Franklin County, Tennessee, Gardner worked for the Cumberland Telephone and Telegraph Company in Nashville as Chief Draftsman and Chief Engineer before the company merged with Southern Bell in 1912. Though he lacked formal training, Gardner left the company to pursue a career in architecture in mid-1910s, making the Brown-Hancock House one of his early projects. In fact, Gardner worked on the expansion of the Brown-Hancock House as he was designing his own home, the Gardner-Warner Place, in Nashville. This Nashville landmark has been described as a “creative interpretation of Colonial Revival architecture…influenced by the Prairie house style.”

Around the beginning of the Brown-Hancock home’s expansion and construction of his own home, Gardner created a firm with Atlanta architect Edward E. Dougherty who had recently moved to Nashville and built such landmarks as the Colonial Revival-style Belle Meade Country Club (1914-1916) and the Tudor Revival-style Belle Meade Apartment Building (1917, NR 84003474). A graduate of the University of Georgia, Dougherty studied architecture at Cornell University before moving to Paris to attend the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris. He returned to Atlanta where he ran a successful practice and completed several significant projects including the Classical Revival-style Highland School (1911, 1929, NR 06000959) and the Druid Hills Golf Club (1911-1912, Druid Hills Historic District NR 79000715).

Together, Gardner and Dougherty designed such Nashville landmarks as the Renaissance Revival-style Doctors’ Building (1916, 1921, NR 85001607) and the Tudor Revival-style Hunter’s Hill (1928). They also designed the north and south wings and clock tower of the Robertson County Courthouse (1929-1930, NR 78002627) in Springfield, Tennessee, in 1929-1930. Many of the pairs’ most significant commissions were church buildings, including the Classical Revival-style Central Baptist Church (1926, NR 88002988) in Miami, Florida, the First Baptist Church (1926) in Williamsburg, Kentucky, and the Druid Hills Baptist Church (1928, Druid Hills Historic District NR 79000715) in Atlanta.

Throughout his career, Gardner was known as an architect of churches and is credited with designing more than 120 church buildings in the South, either as partner or sole architect. Gardner and Dougherty parted ways in 1930, after which Gardner completed several projects, including the chapel for the Woodmont Baptist Church (1943) in Nashville, and Tennessee Central Railway Freight Depot (1943) in Nashville. Gardner also maintained ties to Walter Hancock and Cannon County, as he accompanied a group of the county’s civic leaders, including Hancock, to view the Robertson County Courthouse in 1934. Though there is no indication Gardner participated in the design or construction of the Cannon County Courthouse (1935-
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1936), in 1934, The Tennessean noted, “A spokesman for the committee [Cannon County committee of
which Gardner and Hancock were a part] said the group was delighted with the courthouse here
[Springfield], and would recommend the construction of one of similar type at Woodbury, but some
smaller.”24 Gardner remained busy designing schools, churches, and to a lesser extent, residences, until his
death in 1952.

Criterion C: Architecture; 1869, 1916-1918

The Brown-Hancock House, with its I-House form and mixture of Greek Revival and, to a lesser extent,
Italianate details, is eligible under Criterion C as an excellent example of the architecture of Cannon
County’s middle to upper class during the mid-19th century. Virginia and Lee McAlester identify Greek
Revival as the first popular romantic style to dominate the United States in the first half of the 19th century. Low-pitch, gable or hipped roofs, entry porches supported by columns, sidelights and transoms around
doors, and a symmetrical façade characterize the style. Andrew Jackson Downing’s popularization of other
Romantic styles, such as Gothic and Italianate, beginning in the 1840s, led to stylistic diversification that
enabled builders and home owners to mix elements of two or more styles to produce an aesthetic that was
familiar, even traditionally patriotic, but also stylish and up-to-date. Although the Greek Revival-style
decayed in some areas of the country by the 1840s due to the popularity and accessibility of other styles, it
remained a dominant and familiar template in rural areas such as Woodbury until the 1860s.25

A local expression of this Greek Revival and Italianate mixture is seen in the 1869 façade of the Brown-
Hancock House with its full-height, pedimented portico, Italianate eaves brackets, and symmetry. A similar,
though more elaborate, execution of styles is exhibited by the National Register-listed Baptist Female
College/Adams House (87001035) built in 1859 by local craftsman William Wharton one-half mile away
from the Brown Hancock House at 210 College Street.26 In addition to noting the former college dormitory’s
full-height, pedimented portico supported by Doric columns, Italianate brackets, and symmetry, the
nomination states:

“The house demonstrates his [Wharton’s] skill to mix the details of two popular styles of the mid-nineteenth century, the
Greek Revival and the Italianate...As is common with a transitional building, a basic form of the earlier style, vernacular
Greek Revival with a heavy reliance upon basic I-house form, is retained, with decorative elements of the newer style,
in this case Italianate, integrated into the building’s composition.”27

The National Register nomination upholds that the Female College/Adams House “is equaled by only one
other extant house is Woodbury,” the Brown Hancock House (identified in the nomination as the Christopher
Columbus Brown House). The nomination continues, “The Brown House may be evidence of the popularity
of the college in the community and an example of a later builder borrowing ideas from the college buildings
for his own use.”28

26 Kent Whitworth and Holly Hewgley, National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form, “Baptist Female
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
Aside from being an excellent local example of Greek Revival-style mixed with Italianate details, the Brown-Hancock House is locally significant for its vernacular execution of the Greek Revival. The simplifications of a prototypically round Greek Revival column are seen in the simple, square Doric columns on limestone plinths that uphold the Brown-Hancock House’s full-height porch. Another particularly regional variation of the Greek Revival-style is the full-height entry porch extending only the width of the entryway, a feature most common in the southern states. Other houses in Woodbury of the same era that have such porticos include the Female Baptist College/Adams House, the William Houston Cannon House (89000503 Listed 6/16/1989) at 107 Houston Lane, the Wiley House (not NR-listed) at 113 Summitt Street.

When Gardner was commissioned to expand upon the c.1869 home, the retention of its Greek Revival elements (full-height entry porch with classical pediment and gabled roof above; symmetrically balanced windows and center door) with the addition of a Classical Revival solarium (with its engaged pilasters and roofline balustrade) to the east elevation, transformed the home into a vernacular expression of the Classical Revival, or Neoclassical style. Popularized by the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition’s use of a classical architecture theme, the Classical Revival style “drew heavily on the country’s previous interest in the early classical Revival and Greek Revival styles” and was a popular style for residential buildings throughout the early 20th century. Though the Brown-Hancock House commission came relatively early in Gardner’s career as an architect, Gardner further proved his familiarity with and ability to skillfully design Classical Revival buildings throughout the remainder of his career.

The Brown-Hancock House is architecturally significant on the local level for the retention of its Greek Revival-style façade with Italianate details, the character-defining features of which were retained during the home’s expansion and reimagined into a vernacular expression of the Classical Revival-style.

It should also be noted the Brown-Hancock House is the oldest building on and near the square, as fires in 1902, 1907, and 1910 each destroyed large sections of the commercial buildings. This is also true regarding the county’s first brick courthouse, built c.1838 and destroyed by fire in the 1930s.

Criterion C: Architecture; Historic Adaptation of Original Property

The Brown-Hancock House, with the 1916-1918 addition of indoor plumbing and kitchen space, extra living space, sleeping porches, and solarium, is locally significant under Criterion C due to its historic adaptation representing the tremendous changes in American society during the early 20th century. Individually, these modernizations convey specific shifts in American families’ domestic routines and notions of hygiene and convenience. Taken together, the results of the early 20th century remodel of the Brown-Hancock House represent families’ expectations of a modern home, specifically the amenities it should offer its residents in order that they might participate in the sweeping modernization of American residential life occurring near the turn of the century.

Walter Hancock’s supposed insistence that his wife’s childhood home be remodeled for modernity and extra space supports decorative arts historian Candace M. Volz’s assumption that, “Modernity was viewed as a positive force.” Financi ﬁ capable individuals installed modern amenities in their homes to not only increase comfort and convenience but to keep the pace with the evolution of American residential life during the early 20th century. Evidently, the Hancocks found the right architect for the job, as Gardner designed the new spaces and installation of amenities with careful attention toward the preservation of Claudia’s childhood home, resulting somewhat paradoxically in a modern, historic home.

Though many families had a sink, bathtub, and toilet, oftentimes located in separate areas of the house, it was not until the late 19th century that all three fixtures began to be consolidated in a dedicated space called a “bathroom.” For a room that did not previously exist, the bathroom was “revolutionary, affecting – among other things – women’s work, servants’ work, standards of cleanliness, perceptions of status, circulation patterns, design, and ideas of convenience.” To obtain this new room within the comfort of one’s home, individuals built new homes, added onto an existing house, or transformed an existing room. In the case of the Brown-Hancock House, Gardner designed three bathrooms that were sited within the home’s new spaces, one tucked in a discreet corner in the first floor’s rear central hall and two on the second floor, each adjacent to a bedroom.

Cleanliness had been a matter of status since the early 19th century when good hygiene was increasingly equated with civilization and morality. As the century wore on, keeping oneself clean often helped separate the middle- and upper-class from poorer populations, particularly the immigrants from eastern and southern Europe who came to the U.S. in large numbers during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Some reformers went so far as to equate cleanliness with assimilation into American society, moving one author to entitle an article “Americanization by Bath.” As cleanliness increasingly became a staple of health and status, modern bathrooms became an expectation of most middle- to upper-class American families, all of which manifested in “changed standards of cleanliness, making it easier to take baths more frequently than weekly and demanding a certain level of sanitation.”

The desire for cleanliness was also buttressed by toilet systems that carried away human waste as opposed to the earlier outdoor privy or room chamber pot that had to be manually emptied on a regular basis. Proper disposal of human waste had long been an issue that offended social and moral sensibilities, and in some areas, such as the rural South, was so lacking as to become a serious health concern. Considering the health beneﬁts and social ramifications of hygiene during the 1916-1918 expansion of the Brown-Hancock House, it would have been odd for the newly remodeled home of Walter Hancock, a local lawyer, politician, and


34 Ibid., 36.
community booster, to lack bathrooms that afforded him and his family the conveniences and social and health benefits of modern life.\(^{35}\)

The 1916-1918 remodel also saw the kitchen space brought inside the Brown-Hancock House. As many architects who were tasked with modernizing an historic home often did, Gardner sited the new kitchen space within the rear portion of the new ell addition. In the original c.1869 design and construction of the house, food preparation was relegated to a detached kitchen building. Historically perceived as dirty, dark, and poorly ventilated spaces, distancing the kitchen from the house was a common practice until the end of the 19\(^{th}\) century when “the kitchen became a central concern of modernism, attracting the attention of architects, domestic reformers, manufacturers, and utility providers” as a result of changing social dynamics, technological advances, and the availability of cleaner fuels such as gas and electricity.\(^{36}\) Thus, incorporating an airy, well-lit kitchen space such as that in the Brown-Hancock House was not only a step toward modernization in and of itself, it provided the physical space needed for further modernization in the form of mass-produced kitchen appliances.

Bringing the essential human functions facilitated by bathrooms and kitchens inside the house also affected the surrounding landscape, not to mention the daily routines of inhabitants. Privies and kitchen outbuildings became obsolete, fell into disrepair, or were repurposed altogether as in the case of the Brown-Hancock House’s former detached kitchen which was moved and refashioned into a separate residence. Interior access to new kitchen and bathroom spaces also resulted in a more convenient daily routine that required less trips through the yard. Finally, the creation of new spaces within the home burdened servants and women with yet another place to clean.\(^{37}\)

Perhaps one of the most architecturally distinct changes wrought by the 1916-1918 expansion was the addition of two sleeping porches located on the second floor toward the rear of the house, each adjacent to a traditional bedroom. In his *Catalogue of Craftsman Furniture*, reformer and furniture designer Gustav Stickley included sleeping porches in his house plans “to maintain the closest possible connection with outdoor life” and to “let in plenty of air and sunlight.”\(^{38}\) Social historian Alan Gowans states sleeping porches were the manifestation of the early 20\(^{th}\) century desire to integrate outdoor and indoor spaces in a “nostalgic attempt to recapture the old American ‘pioneer heritage’…where the sky is the limit.”\(^{39}\) An excerpt from an article published in the 1921 issue of *Country Life* magazine captures the imagery and feeling associated with sleeping porches:

> To sleep in the open is one of the romances of life and as such it should be cultivated and achieved…But he who has the happiness to rest wholly relaxed upon a couch, with the

\(^{35}\) Ibid., 36.

\(^{36}\) Juliet Kinchin and Aidin O’Connor, *Counter Space: Design and the Modern Kitchen* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2011), 5; It should be noted, the separation of kitchens from the home was an especially common practice in the antebellum South, where it served the additional, racially-charged purpose of segregating those serving and those being served. John Michael Vlach, *Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 43.


stars as a canopy, listening to the small voices of the night – the urgent chirping of insects, the occasional sleepy twitter of birds, and the rhythmic whispering of the wind – finds himself upon the heights…And because all of these joys that can be had for the asking, an outdoor retreat has become an essential in the planning of a country house.\textsuperscript{49}

Though the Brown-Hancock House may not be accurately described as a country house considering its siting in the commercial center of the county, Woodbury’s rural setting, the height of the sleeping porches (provided by the second story as well as the prominent position of the house), and the many windows that comprise much of the porches’ exterior walls and look out upon the rolling hills located north of town certainly provided a restful experience akin to what is described above.

In addition to a general desire for more exposure to the outdoors, the advent of sleeping porches represented early 20\textsuperscript{th} century notions of cleanliness, hygiene, and anxiety regarding disease, such as tuberculosis. In 1909, the \textit{Scientific American} reported, “Fresh air and plenty of it is the best preventative for consumption, the grip, bronchitis, common colds, and pneumonia,” while other outlets claimed sleeping in fresh air was good for everyone, ill or otherwise.\textsuperscript{41} According to architectural and social historian Elizabeth Collins Cromley, it was common practice to “construct screened in porches outside of indoor bedrooms, either as a feature of a new house, or as an easily-made improvement to an older one.”\textsuperscript{42} At the Brown-Hancock House, Gardner added one sleeping porch to an existing bedroom (original to c.1869) and another to the new bedroom in the very back of the house.

Sleeping porches were such the trend, they spawned their own technology, including sleeping bags and protective clothing for cold weather and window beds that extended the sleeper’s head out a window. In 1909, a physician-contributor at \textit{Country Life in America} magazine authored an article entitled “Sleeping Outdoors for Health: A Phase of Modern Living that Science Demands and that is Bound to become Universal – what Physicians and Laymen Think of It” which included describing an “architecture of the future” with sleeping quarters located on roofs or “wherever unlimited oxygen can be obtained.”\textsuperscript{43}

Volz states it was this affinity for bringing the outdoors in that led to the popularity of the sun room, or solarium; one of which Gardner added to the house’s east elevation as part of the larger expansion. Twentieth century solariums functioned much like secondary living spaces that could be adapted for seasonal comfortability, and, as seen at the Brown-Hancock House, were usually sited at one end of the home’s main block. The advent of the automobile is often blamed for the decline of siting outdoor living space in front of the house. Not only were automobiles noisy, the tradition of hearing the latest happenings from passersby on foot and horse faded as other communication and transportation methods became more popular and lessened

\textsuperscript{40} Hanna Tachau, “A New Room in the House,” \textit{Country Life} 41 (November 1921), 62.
\textsuperscript{42} Elizabeth Collins Cromley, “A History of American Beds and Bedrooms, 1890 – 1930: A Social History of Services and Spaces” (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1992), 134.
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The practicality of a front porch. Placing a solarium at one end of a house provided a similar, less noisy and more private view of the goings on in front of the house.\textsuperscript{44}

The remodel and expansion carefully executed by architect Thomas W. Gardner at the Brown-Hancock House included the installation and design of culturally significant spaces that signaled major shifts in American tastes, attitudes, and residential life during the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century and is thus locally significant under Criterion C for historic adaptation of the original property.

Integrity:

The Brown-Hancock House has seen only one major change since its construction c.1869, being the additions designed and implemented in 1916-1918 by Thomas W. Gardner. One minor change since Gardner’s work is seen in the latticed enclosure of the porch adjacent to the kitchen. When the current property owner acquired the house in 2007, he made only cosmetic repairs to the original plaster and woodwork.

The Brown-Hancock House is architecturally significant on the local level for the high degree of integrity of the following qualities from its initial 1869 construction and 1916-1918 expansion: location and setting, in proximity to the civic and commercial heart of the county and to other, similar houses that share the same stylistic and historic context; design and workmanship, for the retention of original symmetry and character defining details typical of local mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century styles; materials, for the retention of original brick, limestone, and woodwork. Taken as a whole, these physical qualities enable the Brown-Hancock House to evoke the period in which it was originally built (feeling), which strengthens its association with the era and allows it to exist as a representative example of that era’s built environment. As a result of these qualities, the Brown-Hancock House is a locally significant example of mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century architectural styles and adds to Cannon County’s small but notable collection of such extant architecture.

\textsuperscript{44} Volz, “The Modern Look,” 29-30.
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1. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property: 1

USGS Quadrangle: Woodbury 319-SE

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates

Datum if other than WGS84:

(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

1. Latitude: 35.828831

Longitude: -86.069707

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

The Brown-Hancock property is bound on the north by the East Fork of the Stone River, on the east by the property line of a residential parcel that also fronts Water Street, on the south by Water Street, and on the west by the property line of commercial parcel that also fronts Water Street.

The boundary of the property is illustrated by the accompanying map entitled “Parcel Map 110 Water Street.” Parcel number is 039K A 102.00.

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The boundary represents the current legal boundaries of the property, including all structures, associated with the Brown-Hancock House.
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Photo Log

Name of Property: Brown-Hancock House
City or Vicinity: Woodbury
County: Cannon    State: Tennessee
Photographer: Savannah Grandey, Elizabeth Johnson
Date Photographed: October 11, 2017

1 of 29. Front façade/south elevation of house (Resource #1). Photographer facing north.

2 of 29. West elevation of original core (#1). Photographer facing east.


4 of 29 North elevation (#1). Photographer facing south.

5 of 29 Northernmost portion of east elevation (#1). Photographer facing west.

6 of 29 Southern portion of east elevation (#1). Photographer facing southwest.

7 of 29 Interior. Original center hall (#1). Photographer facing northeast.

8 of 29 Interior. East parlor (#1). Photographer facing northeast.


10 of 29 Interior. Dining room (#1). Photographer facing south.


12 of 29 Interior. Cabinets in pantry (#1). Photographer facing east.


14 of 29 Interior. Rear center hall (#1). Photographer facing south.

15 of 29 Interior. First floor bathroom (#1). Photographer facing north.

16 of 29 Interior. Center pivot window in east wall of first floor bathroom (#1). Photographer facing northeast.

17 of 29 Interior. Enclosed porch area with original tile floor (#1). Photographer facing west.

18 of 29 Interior. West parlor (#1). Photographer facing northwest.

19 of 29 Interior. Southwest bedroom (#1). Photographer facing northwest.
Brown-Hancock House
Name of Property
Cannon County, Tennessee
County and State

20 of 29 Interior. West sleeping porch (#1). Photographer facing northeast.
22 of 29 Interior. Southeast bedroom (#1). Photographer facing northeast.
23 of 29 Interior. Middle bedroom (#1). Photographer facing northwest.
26 of 29 Detached garage (Resource #2). Photographer facing north.
27 of 29 East elevation of detached garage (#2). Photographer facing northwest.
28 of 29 Cistern located immediately north of the house (Resource #3). Photographer facing east.
29 of 29 Remnants of rock wall (Resource #4). Photographer facing northwest.
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Floor plan of the first floor with photos keyed

Dotted line indicates original c.1869 portion of house
Floor plan of the second floor with photos keyed

Dotted line indicates original c. 1869 portion of house
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Figures

Figure 2: First floor plan as drawn by Thomas W. Gardner and associates. Image courtesy of current property owner.
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Figure 3: Second floor plan as drawn by Thomas W. Gardner and associates.
Image courtesy of current property owner.
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Figure 4: North/rear elevation as drawn by Thomas W. Gardner and associates.

Image courtesy of current property owner.
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Figure 5: South/front elevation as drawn by Thomas W. Gardner and associates.
Image courtesy of current property owner.
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<td>Woodbury</td>
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<td>TN 37190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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