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This creative project involved the preparation of a cultural landscape report for Frascati Plantation near Gordonsville, Orange County, Virginia. Using methodologies adapted from the National Park Service and National Register of Historic Places, the report defines the existing conditions, historic significance, and appropriate treatment approach for the plantation’s formal gardens and grounds. The report also explored the appropriateness of art as a research tool, the use of the Golden Ratio in landscape design, and the development and evolution of serpentine brick walls. Other report chapters include site history and contextual documentation, existing conditions assessment, analysis of historic significance and integrity, and treatment recommendations. Frascati is significant for its association with a person of historic interest, social history, architecture, and landscape architecture. The house at Frascati has maintained a high level of integrity, however, the integrity of the gardens and landscape has been compromised. Lack of integrity and a desire to coordinate with the rehabilitation of the house at Frascati to the mid-19th century led to rehabilitation as the chosen treatment option.
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SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

Summary

The goal of this graduate-level thesis is to create a Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) that documents the landscape and proposes treatments for Frascati Plantation located near Gordonsville, Orange County, Virginia. The report will follow guidelines established by the Department of the Interior and outlined in "Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes". A CLR carefully assesses significance and integrity and proposes treatment strategies. This thesis creative project will additionally explore the use of artwork as a source for restoring or rehabilitating a landscape. A series of regional case studies will serve as a precedent for their use as an appropriate and reliable historic source. The use of the golden ratio in garden design and its relationship to the design of the house and site plan will be discussed as both a research and design tool. The history, use, and evolution of brick serpentine walls will also be outlined.

Frascati Plantation is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a property historically significant to the nation, and the Virginia Landmarks Registry. It was constructed (1821-23) for Phillip Pendleton Barbour, Speaker of the House and political powerhouse in Virginia. The contractor, John Perry, had previously been employed by Thomas Jefferson as a master builder at the University of Virginia and was chosen to replicate the same quality of craftsmanship at Frascati. Serpentine brick walls at Frascati did in fact exist and were most likely designed by Perry and constructed with slave labor to surround the three acres of terraced gardens.
Scope of Work

Frascati Plantation is categorized as a historic designed landscape of a recognized style and will be documented in a CLR, which includes a treatment plan. The National Park Service defines a cultural landscape as

A report that serves as the primary guide to treatment and use of a cultural landscape, and that prescribes the treatment and management of the physical attributes and biotic systems of a landscape, and use when use contributes to historical significance. ¹

The CLR will include the following: site history, existing conditions survey, a site analysis, evaluation of significance, assessment of integrity, and treatment approach complete with supporting drawings and sketches.

The project represents research that began as part of the Garden Club of Virginia’s Rudy J. Favretti Fellowship in the summer of 2009. The initial site history and analysis prepared during the fellowship has been expanded into a CLR complete with treatment plan and design.

Methodology

This report used a five-step methodology adapted from A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports and Preservation Brief #36:

1. Historical Research
2. Site History and Context Development
3. Existing Conditions Documentation
4. Analysis of Significance and Integrity
5. Treatment Approach Development

Study Boundaries

The Frascati property consists of 25 acres, a fraction of the original Barbour estate of 885 acres. The National Register boundaries include the contributing buildings such as the main house and the brick kitchen as well as the garden, surrounding pastures, and non-contributing 20th century farm buildings. This boundary ensures that the feel of the property is maintained and is protected by a historic preservation easement.

The property’s legal description is:

Beginning at a point on fence line almost 900' E of State Route 231, 300' S of Hen and Bacon Run, about 1000' NE of intersection of said route and State Route 654; thence extending approximately 1500' SE following 440' contour line to W side of private drive; thence extending about 900' SW along said side of said drive to E side of said route 231; thence extending along said side of said route about 1250' NW to fence line; thence extending 750' NE following fence line to point of origin.

Summary of Findings

Frascati is nationally significant under National Register Criterion B (association with the lives of persons significant in our past) and Criterion C (embodiment of 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 may lack individual distinction). The original nomination listed
the property’s significance in the categories of architecture, landscape architecture, and politics/government. ²

Overall, the house at Frascati possesses a high level of integrity and is considered one of the best documented 19th century houses of Central Virginia.³ Alterations to the exterior have been minimal and do not affect the historic appearance of the front elevation. The level of integrity for the landscape and specifically the formal garden is poor. Since the house has been rehabilitated to the mid-19th century, integrity of the landscape is poor, and modern usage and maintenance of Frascati as a private residence is necessary, rehabilitation is the suggested treatment standard. Rehabilitation is defined by the Secretary of the Interior as “the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.”⁴

³ Ibid.
⁴ Birnbaum, Preservation Briefs #36, 12.
Figure 1 The Piedmont Region in the Eastern United States. (Edited by author, 2011)

Figure 2 Orange County, Virginia. (Edited by author, 2011)
Figure 3 Orange County Call Out Map accessed from http://orangevirginiawelcomesbusiness.com

Edited by author to include historic sites of reference.
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SECTION II: SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS

Chapter 1: Art as a Tool of Restoration

There is little documentation of the original gardens, grounds, and general site layout for Frascati, however, a watercolor painting of the house, dating from the mid-19th century, details the front elevation of the estate, several outbuildings, temple, the serpentine wall, the front picket fence, and trees. Precedent for using artwork in the field of preservation, and specifically in Virginia garden restorations, exists. For instance, the landscape architects for the Garden Club of Virginia have used paintings to help restore gardens and features that were otherwise lost to history, were not documented in other sources, or as supporting evidence of other primary sources. Using artwork to influence a planting plan or in the type of landscape intervention chosen, was employed at the National Trust property “James Madison’s Montpelier”, Montpelier Station, Virginia.

Montpelier is an important precedent site because of the shared familial history with Frascati, as well as the type of landscape intervention prepared for it by the National Trust in conjunction with garden historians, landscape architects, and the Garden Club of Virginia (GCVA). The National Trust has restored the formal terraced garden of the DuPont era, while developing a treatment plan for the rest of the property that would restore or rehabilitate to the period of the Madisons. The house is currently being restored to the James Madison period as well.
The treatment plan for the property developed in part due to the type of documentation available for the property. A plant list from a “weather journal” from the late 18th century is the only documentation of the gardens from pre-1817 renovation. The formal garden is not documented until 1901 when duPonts purchased the property. Mrs. duPont’s scrapbooks recorded its transformation from a depilated garden into a formal terraced garden of her own design and one executed by her landscape architect cousin, Oglesby Paul. When the property was transferred to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the interpretation of the landscape was an important and challenging aspect of the restoration. Frank Sanchis, vice-president for stewardship of historic properties wrote to the director of Montpelier, Christopher Scott that “the interpretation of the garden is extremely important and must relate to both the Madison and duPont periods. The selection of planting materials and the visual appearance of the ensemble will be a considerable challenge.” It was decided to rehabilitate the duPont terraced garden because it had been documented to a greater extent than the earlier Madison garden. This rehabilitation included expanding the upper viewing platform for those with limited mobility to enjoy the gardens, replanting what were deemed the most important ornamental perennial beds and parterres, and restoring the brick steps and

---

6 Ibid, 133.
7 Memo from Frank Sanchis to Christopher Scott, February 14, 1989, Garden Club of Virginia, Restoration Committee, Papers, 1924-97, Section 2, Montpelier folder, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.
flanking Adirondack fences. Other elements of the ornamental beds were not restored for maintenance concerns. In 2001, a feasibility study for restoration of the grounds and house was completed and it was determined that the property and home would be restored to the early nineteenth century appearance, while maintaining the duPont terraced garden. Rudy Favretti, RLA, and former GCV landscape architect noted that “Landscapes change rapidly [and] it is better to show a span of years rather than a frozen period.” This view was accepted by both the National Trust and supported by Montpelier’s horticulturalist. This view coupled with the lack of any documentation of the Madison-era garden has insured that the duPont garden remains intact. An 1818 watercolor of the front landscape of Montpelier and painted by Anne Hyde de Newville, wife of the French minister to the United States, clearly shows the ornate picket fence surrounding the front grounds, one garden temple, and shade trees near the home. Though the perspective of the drawing was skewed, archaeological excavations confirmed the placement of the fence and it has been recently reconstructed using the watercolor as a source to build and paint them.

Using graphic sources in landscape restorations has been happening for decades, with the well-known restoration involving the use of sketches and art being a major component of the original restoration of Monticello.

---

8 Bemis, 134-134.
10 Bemis, 128.
Charlottesville, Virginia, in the 1930s. Many of Thomas Jefferson’s sketches, planting plans, and notes survived, but it was with difficulty that the landscape architects and gardeners determined which plans had indeed been put in place, which were mere exercises, and if they were indeed executed, how they evolved after the initial planting. They used dated sketches and soil investigations to do the initial restoration work in the 1930s. This original work has since been modified and supported by current archaeological techniques.

The restoration of the landscape at Lee Hall Mansion, Newport New, Virginia, by the GVAC, was another property where no evidence of a formal garden existed, but art was used in designing an appropriate landscape. William D. Rieley, RLA, used a pencil-and-watercolor sketch from the mid-19th century, along with historic maps, an early 20th century survey, and other documents to create a planting plan and framework for the fences found on the property. The sketch was used in conjunction with historic maps to plant large shade trees, while period appropriate shrubs were incorporated to complete the landscape. This landscape has since been installed in phases, with completed landscape representing a ‘conjectural historic setting’ rather than completing a recreation plan.

---

11 Ibid, 121.  
12 Ibid, 93 and 95.  
13 Ibid, 96.
Figure 7 Black-and-white photograph of the original mid-19th century watercolor painting of Frascati. Artist and location of the original painting are unknown. (Orange County Historical Society)
In architectural terms, two quantities are in the golden ratio (also known as the golden section or golden mean) if the ratio of the sum of the quantities to the larger quantity is equal to the ratio of the larger quantity to the smaller one.

The golden ratio is an irrational mathematical constant, approximately 1.6180339887. The golden ratio has been used in art, architecture, and music for centuries and can be found occurring in nature. The Greeks are the first known to use the ratio in the building of their temples, and the Renaissance brought about a revival in its use in art, architecture, and landscape.

The golden ratio is often depicted as a single large rectangle formed by a square and another rectangle, a sequence that can be continued infinitely and perfectly within each section. There are specific locations within a golden rectangle that hold special visual interest and are called the “eyes of the rectangle”. These locations are found on the center point of a line drawn from...

---

the exact center of the rectangle to each corner of the rectangle. Focal points or areas of emphasis can fall on these eyes, “creating a strong visual path in their composition”.  

It appears that an approximation of the Golden Ratio was used at Frascati Plantation both in the architecture of the house, but also in the site plan and the size of the formal garden and the serpentine brick wall. Soil probing in the garden indicates that the garden was divided into eight garden rooms, four rooms deep, by two rooms wide. A series of archaeological test squares were completed along the lines determined by soil probing. No stone or brick foundations were found in the test square, but one whole brick, several broken bricks, decomposed brick, mortar, and a sandy layer was found, as well as various nails, a shard of porcelain, glazed terracotta shards, and a broken piece of bar iron.

The diagrams in Figure 9, show with x marks where brick debris was found, while also showing the relationship of the Golden Ratio in each segment of the garden. The smaller formal garden rooms were designed at a ratio of 1:1.72, the larger plots at a ratio of 1:1.880, and entire garden space inside the wall at a ratio of 1:1.504, and the site plan of the garden (and wall) in relation to the house was a ratio of 1:1.788. Giving an allowance for inaccuracy in the soil probing and the movement of the debris field of the wall after deconstruction, bring the ratios within a reasonably close approximation to the Golden Ratio and shows a use of the proportional system in the site plan of Frascati.

Along the southern wall and at the bottom of the first terrace, decomposed brick and a sand layer were discovered. Noland explains in The American Farmer, that “As no stone is required for the foundation, it is only necessary to pare off the soil and to lay the first row of bricks on

16 Ibid.
the surface without mortar...”¹⁷ This explains the lack of foundation stones and the presence of sand, used to level the first course of brick. Archaeologist Joanna Wilson believes that the test squares have determined that this is in fact the site of a brick garden wall and that if through a large-scale excavation, the till layer was completely removed, a pattern of the serpentine nature would be distinguishable through both appearance and texture.

¹⁷ Noland, 263.
Figure 9 Golden Ratio Diagram. The gardens at Frascati approximate the Golden Ratio in both the individual garden room dimensions, overall garden dimension, and in the site planning of the garden in relation to the house. The numbers are the ratio of each section, while the ‘x’ marks locations where soil probing indicated brick fragments. (Illustration by author, 2011)
Figure 10 This is the southern boundary of the serpentine wall as found through soil probing and archaeological investigations. Every flag represents a brick or stone fragment. (Photo by author, 2009)

Figure 11 Camera facing north. The flags show a cross section, considered to be the borders of a 3foot wide garden path. Every flag represents a brick fragment. (Photo by author, 2009)
Figure 12 The archaeologist for the Commonwealth of Virginia uncovered one full brick and several fragments, plus sand and decomposed limestone layers in several test squares. (Photo by author, 2009)

Figure 13 Another brick fragment from the line of surveyed points. (Photo by author, 2009)
Figure 14 Camera facing west. Notice the flags along the former garden wall as well as hitting fragments at the intersecting paths.
Chapter 3: Brick Serpentine Walls

Brick serpentine walls were rumored to have surrounded formal gardens at Frascati but were razed towards the end of the nineteenth century. It became clear that these walls had in fact existed and were standing after the Civil War. County historian W. W. Scott states that “Until long since the war, there was a ‘serpentine’ brick wall around the garden, identical with those now at the University and at Barboursville House.”

The Woodriff family folklore held that the bricks from Frascati’s walls were used in construction of the English basement of Santolina, built circa 1890 neighboring the Frascati plantation. At least a dozen capstone bricks matching the same dimensions and style of those discovered at

Figure 15 Serpentine Wall Bricks. Top: Captstone Bricks. Bottom: L: Found in Frascati’s garden, C: Found in Santolina’s basement, R: Found in the archaeological excavation at Frascati, (Photo by author, 2009).

Frascati were found on-site at Santolina in 2009. Bricks of the same dimension as those found at Frascati are in-situ as a portion of the original Santolina basement as well. Piers Woodriff, current owner of Santolina and descendant of John and Elaine Woodriff, produced samples of the “funny-looking” bricks—the capstone bricks—always being around both at Santolina and at Frascati from the time he was a child. On August 12, 2009, three capstone bricks were found near the old pump house and eight were stored in the basement.

Without regular maintenance brick serpentine walls have a relatively short lifespan compared to other walls, and can begin to fail after 50 years. Taking this average lifespan into account, as well as the transfer of the property out of the Barbour family and the ensuing Civil War, the walls at Frascati most likely fell into disrepair and led to their eventual reuse. Even the legendary walls at the University of Virginia had begun to be torn down within fifty years of their construction. The only known original serpentine walls still standing in Virginia are located in the gardens of Folly Plantation, Augusta County, Virginia. According to the owner, the walls were constructed prior to 1820.

Figure 16 The gardens of Folly Plantation are surrounded by the oldest surviving serpentine walls in the United States. (Photo by author, 2009)
Serpentine walls were made famous in Virginia by Thomas Jefferson at the University of Virginia and it is believed that their use across the Commonwealth can be linked to this installation. Jefferson could have encountered serpentine and zig-zag walls, sometimes known as “ribbon” or “crinkle-crankle” walls, while on one of his 1786 visit to England or Green Spring Plantation, built three miles west of Jamestown.19

The serpentine walls found in England were transplanted from the Netherlands, where they are known as *slangenmuren* or snake walls.20 There are several surviving examples of serpentine walls in counties and communities in England where Dutch and French prisoners of the Peninsular Wars were housed and could have been used as cheap labor, 13 walls being found in the gardens of Lymington alone.21 Tim Rock, former editor of the Architectural Review, states in “Bending the Rules”, that while there are surviving examples, serpentine walls are considered rare and uncommon features with only 14 walls recorded in the Netherlands and 107 ‘listed’ examples in England.22

---

21 Ibid, 57.
22 Tim Rock, “Bending the Rules.”
Serpentine walls in Europe were normally constructed for use as forcing walls\(^{23}\) and to grow espaliered fruit trees. At Frascati, it is unlikely that the walls functioned in this way. Orchards of varying fruits, however, were found throughout colonial America and it is mentioned of a “walk to the old orchard” and “the lawn looking towards the orchard,” in captions of the scrapbooks made by Elaine Irving Woodriff in her time living at Frascati in the early 1900s.\(^{24}\) Orchards were integral to colonial plantations, as early as the mid-eighteenth century, with Sarudy stating there were few farms or plantations without apple and peach orchards.\(^{25}\) It is unknown exactly where the orchard was located, but through analysis of the Woodriff photographs, it appears that it was located northeast of the house past the formal gardens. Hazel (Woodriff) Edens, who grew up at Frascati, does not remember an orchard, but believes that it had to be at the rear of the grounds.

Serpentine walls could be built with one-third the amount of brick and one-half as thick as traditionally-built walls. The lateral strength of a serpentine wall comes from the angle or curve of the wall, so that it can be built with as little as four inches thickness, without needing additional lateral support. Technical notes detail that successful serpentine walls with a thickness of four inches, should have a curvature of no more than twice the height of the wall above finished grade, and the depth of the curvature should be no less than one half the height.\(^{26}\)

\(^{23}\) Forcing walls are normally of masonry construction and are used to ‘force’ plants into blooming or fruiting earlier than when they naturally would.

\(^{24}\) Elaine Irving Woodriff, Eden Photographic Albums, Volume 8, 1914.

\(^{25}\) Sarudy 122.

This cost-benefit of constructing serpentine walls did not escape Jefferson and may have been a reason for their construction at the University. Garden books of the period, such as the *Encyclopedia of Gardening* and *The American Farmer* spoke favorably of the use of serpentine walls and heralded them as the best and cheapest form of garden wall. W. M. Noland, in *The American Farmer* details the construction of and benefits of serpentine walls in 1822, stating “This enclosure is of late invention and known but to few. I have no doubt however, of its becoming a favorite fence, when fair experiments have been made of its costs and strength.”

With Jefferson’s local influence and articles such as Nolan’s printed in farm journals, serpentine walls were constructed on several Virginia plantations.

---

27 The full text on serpentine wall construction is located in the appendix.
SECTION II: CONTEXTUAL DOCUMENTATION

Chapter 1: Historic Context

Historic contexts are those patterns or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning (and ultimately its significance) within history or prehistory is made clear.  

National Register Bulletin #15

Frascati is part of the broader pattern of garden history in the early Federalist period which begins circa 1780 and continues through 1830, which has its roots in the formal English terraced gardens of the Colonial period amongst the upper middle class. Viewing the plantation is context with other period estates and their evolution over time will help establish the relationship of the garden to the Frascati property and its owner throughout its history.

Historic Gardens of Virginia describes how gardening was an early practice in Virginia with colonists bringing garden traditions, seeds, and clippings from England to be started in their new home. As English gentry and merchants became Virginia planters, their gardens of fruit trees, shrubs, formal beds, winding paths, and arbors began to expand. Formal gardens were common features of Virginia estates from as early as Bacon’s Castle in 1665. The garden designs grew in complexity up through the early nineteenth century. Mary Johnston, in Historic Gardens of Virginia, concluded that the period dating from 1800 until the beginning of the Civil War was the

heyday of gardens in Virginia.\textsuperscript{30} The Civil War brought about the destruction of many estates, including their gardens. The abolition of slavery resulted in the loss of their main source of labor. Victorian sentiments brought about a renewed interest in gardening and by the early 1900s, the Colonial Revival style became a landscape standard. Colonial Revival gardens continue to flourish in today’s Virginian landscape.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{breemo.png}
\caption{This diagrammatic planting plan for Bremo Recess (c. 1812), Fluvanna County, Virginia. The formal garden includes a mix of vegetable and ornamental beds in a geometric pattern. Originally published in \textit{Historic Gardens of Virginia}.}
\end{figure}

The formal English style of Frascati’s era often included symmetrically aligned, square garden plots filled with ornamental and vegetable crop parterres, lined with boxwood borders and enclosed by brick garden walls. The gardens were often terraced and referred to as “falling gardens.” William Lux’s grounds featured what would later become the public “Gray’s Garden,” Baltimore County, Maryland. This terraced garden was laid out in 8 rooms with the terraced platforms, measuring 66 feet long, the equivalent of a Gunter’s chain, a common measuring device.\(^{31}\) This measuring device falls within the approximation of the Golden Ratio, which was discussed in Section II, Chapter 2, and would have been the easy and standard way to approximate the Golden Ratio in garden design. These equal-sized “oblongs”, as Phillip Miller, a prominent English garden writer of the period called them, were as a rule, defined by a central allée complete with a gravel walk from the door at the center of the house. Miller promulgated his advice in the book The Gardeners Dictionary, and many colonial gardeners followed his suggestions, constructing main-axis symmetry dominated gardens complete with beds twice as long as broad. Frascati’s formal beds were laid out in a similar fashion, with a central allée flanked on either side with terraced garden beds 66 feet long. According to Sadury, terraces served a similar purpose as the piazza, elevating the wealthy owner above the common audience strolling through the garden. She continued to say that “One look at nature so well ordered and the observer could have no doubt that here lived a person destined to be in charge.”\(^{32}\)

Sarudy concludes that the “ordered and hierarchical implications of classical terraced gardens probably appeared to the gentry who were losing their privilege of rank” through old political ties with Britain, and were thus trying to cling to that privilege natural and inevitable order, in


\(^{32}\) Ibid, 24.
place of historic precedent. This nationalistic need to cling to the formality of the former classical period was occurring while England was abandoning formal geometric patterns. By the time Speaker of the House Barbour was planning his gardens, these thoughts of class and rank in society would have played a role in installing such large, formal gardens at Frascati.

Caroline Coleman Duke, writing in *Historic Gardens of Virginia*, describes in detail the formal gardens of Barboursville House, the estate most often linked and compared to Frascati. Duke states that the original Barboursville garden covered nearly three acres and was entirely surrounded by a red brick serpentine wall. She goes on to describe that the design of the garden was laid out in formal squares which were separated by wide, grass-covered walks. Each of these beds were bordered with flowers and the interior was reserved for the growth of “small vegetables”. A cherry tree was placed in the center of the garden, with rose arbors radiating out from it. Plants included naturalized daffodils, narcissi, forget-me-nots, and “many varieties of peonies”. The serpentine walls were covered in English ivy and violets, while lilies of the valley were planted within their curves, while “avenues of lilac and other shrubs, with blossom or decorative berry for each month of the year, as well as sunny corners of sweet herbs, as essential to the excellence of old gardens as old cooks.”

---

33 Sarudy, 142.
34 Sale, 258.
36 Ibid, 259.
37 Ibid, 259.
Chapter 4: Property Ownership

The history of Frascati begins with the Barbour family, a family known for their dedication to Commonwealth and the new Republic. Thomas Barbour moved from Culpeper County into Orange County as a young man, purchasing 454 acres in 1761 in St. Thomas Parish. By the time of their son James's birth on June 10, 1775, the Barbour family owned over 2,000 acres and several slaves. Thomas was appointed King's Justice in 1768, represented the county in the House of Burgesses, was sheriff in 1776, and a member of the Revolutionary Conventions in 1774 and 1775. He was a county lieutenant and a colonel in the Revolution. Thomas’ second son, Philip, was born on May 25, 1783, and according to Marty Banks, the family was living under financial pressure and debt. Philip was a pupil of the Reverend Charles O’Neil, an Episcopal priest that was known for his strict discipline and use of severe whippings and continued his education at The College of William and Mary in 1799 where he studied law. He was

38 Slaughter, Philip, Genealogical and Historical Notes on Culpeper, County, Virginia, Raleigh Travers Green (1900), 137.
admitted to the bar in 1800 and commenced practice in Bardstown, Kentucky; returning to Virginia in 1801 to practice law in Gordonsville. Philip married Frances Todd Johnson in 1804 and had seven children.\textsuperscript{40} In 1806, Thomas and Mary Barbour sold their home tract of 885 acres to their son, Philip, who began construction his new house at Frascati in 1821, during his tenure as Speaker of the House. Philip’s brother, James, went on to hold various political offices including the 18th Governorship of Virginia and was elected United States Senator from Virginia. Governor Barbour’s estate known as Barboursville was designed by Thomas Jefferson and the house and gardens are often compared to Frascati.

Philip had a long and influential political career. Banks described Philip Barbour as the “pride of the democracy of Virginia”, supporting southern rights, the importance of state sovereignty, and a strict constitutional interpretation.\textsuperscript{41} Philip was quick to align himself against the Federalists and was often publicly critical of John Quincy Adams and his administration, though his brother was a member of the President’s Cabinet.\textsuperscript{42} He was twice elected to the Virginia General Assembly, and then served in the United States Congress from 1814 through 1830, serving as the 12th Speaker of the House from 1821-1823.\textsuperscript{43} He declined to run for re-election in 1824 and turned down an offer to become the professor of law in the University of Virginia in 1825. Instead, he was appointed a judge of the general court of Virginia and served for two years, resigning in 1827 to return to his seat in the House of Representatives as a Jacksonian. For the first two years of his second stint in the House, he was chair of the U.S. House Committee on the Judiciary. In 1829 he was president of the Virginia Constitutional Convention.

\textsuperscript{40}Kirkland-Gottschalk, Pamela Claire. “Frascati by Perry of Jefferson for Barbour,”(1989), 3.
\textsuperscript{41}Banks, 4.
\textsuperscript{42}Ibid, 6.
\textsuperscript{43}Biographical Directory of the United States Congress.
Philip turned down offers of a chancellorship and the post of U.S. Attorney General before finally resigning on October 15, 1830 to accept President Jackson’s appointment to be judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. Jackson appointed Barbour by recess appointment on October 8, 1830. He was formally nominated on December 14, 1830, and two days later he was confirmed by the Senate, and received his commission, where he served until March 17, 1836. Barbour was highly supported by the south as Jackson’s running-mate in the 1832 re-election campaign. Philip, realizing the possibility in a party-split, withdrew from the campaign and urged his supporters to back the national ticket. This political maneuver may have insured Jackson’s re-election. It further elevated Barbour’s position in the party and provided the opportunity to hold higher office.

Philip Pendelton Barbour refused nominations for judge of the court of appeals, for Governor, and for United States Senator. He did accept an appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court, being nominated by Jackson on December 28, 1835, and confirmed on March 15, 1836. Southern newspapers heralded the elevation, northern newspapers and Whig publications lamented the shift in Court rulings, pointing out “such shallow metaphysical hair-splitters as P.P. Barbour.” Barbour served on the Court until his death in Washington, D.C., on February 25, 1841. Fellow justice, Joseph Story, in a letter to his wife, described Philip Barbour in the following way:

[Barbour was] a man of great integrity, of a very solid and acute understanding, of considerable legal attainments (in which he was daily improving), and together a very conscientious, upright, and laborious judge, whom we all respected for his talents and virtues, and his high sense of duty.

Philip Pendleton Barbour is buried near the Chapel in Washington’s Congressional Cemetery.

---

44 Biographical Directory of the United States Congress.
45 Banks, Marty, 6.
46 Biographical Directory of the United States Congress.
47 Banks, Marty, 7.
48 Quotation cited in Banks, Marty, 7.
After the death of P.P. Barbour, the property passed out of the family by several deeds between 1847 and 1849. Colonel James Magruder, became the president of the Blue Ridge Turnpike (now Route 231) and it was less than a coincidence that he chose to purchase Frascati, which fronted on the turnpike. Magruder suffered many losses during the Civil War, losing four of his five sons and a son-in-law in battle. 49 Ann Miller posits in Antebellum Orange, that he was perhaps “unable to live with the memories attendant at Frascati,” and sold the property in 1863. 50 The property changed hands several times until Elaine DuPont Irving purchased the property in 1902. 51 Frascati remained in her descendants’ ownership until it was purchased by the Admiral and Mrs. Barrow. Mrs. Barrow still resides in the house.

50 Miller, 59.
51 Elaine DuPont Irving is a descendant of literary giant Washington Irving, as well as the influential duPont family.
Chapter 5: Site History

Frascati is located near Somerset, Orange County, Virginia, along State Route 231 (Blue Ridge Turnpike). Orange County is in the Piedmont Region of the Commonwealth of Virginia. It commands a view of the Blue Ridge Mountains and is one of several well-known plantation homes in the county. Frascati is located only a few miles from Montpelier, a National Trust Historic Site and the ruins of Barboursville House, a house designed by Thomas Jefferson for Governor James Barbour. The gardens at Barboursville were surrounded by serpentine walls and a description of the gardens has survived.

In 1806, Thomas and Mary Barbour sold their home tract of 885 acres to their son, Philip. It was during Philip Barbour’s tenure as Speaker of the House, that he began the construction of the house at Frascati. He entered into “Articles of Agreement” with John M. Perry, on November 7, 1821. Perry was an Albemarle County contractor and was one of the builders employed for the construction of the University of Virginia. It was clear that Barbour was aware of Perry’s skills and work at the University, stating in the agreement that “The brick work to be equal to any...at the University”.

Barbour was also careful to make notations that the interior styling and woodwork to be of the quality of that in the house of his neighbor, Thomas Macon. The Macon house, known as Somerset, was built in 1803 and is a Federal-style two story brick house built over an English

---

52 Barboursville Ruin is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
53 The full text of the “Articles of Agreement” can be found in the appendix.
basement, with a hipped roof, and four interior chimneys.\(^{54}\) It is known for its fine interior woodwork, craftsmanship that inspired Barbour in his plans for Frascati. The house at Frascati was constructed 1821-1823. The house is described in the Virginia Landmarks Registry as well as in the National Register of Historic Places nomination as “one of the outstanding architectural monuments of the Piedmont.”\(^{55}\) According to Ann Miller and other architectural historians, the house’s Tuscan portico and correctly proportioned classical detailing, shows a strong Jeffersonian influence, but the house follows a more conventional floor plan popular at the time --two rooms deep on either side of the central stair hall.\(^ {56}\) This is in contrast to James Barbour’s house at Barboursville, which was designed by Jefferson and shows his blending of French and Palladian forms.

While the main house at Frascati has survived for nearly 200 years with very few alterations, the historic gardens, however, are not as well-maintained or documented. Gardens have a life-expectancy and can be altered easily with the changing tastes and preferences of the current owner. While no known garden construction contracts exist, there are key sources of documentation for the Frascati gardens. A watercolor painting exists of the property and is thought to have been painted in the 1850s, as shown in Fig. 16. This date is estimated because of a similar painting of Montebello that shows the house after renovations that took place in the 1840s. The painting shows the type and placement of trees, shrubs, fencing, outbuildings, and most importantly the serpentine wall.


Of great interest is a small trellis-like structure found to the north of the house and may be one of the two garden “temples” listed in the appended list to the building contract. The structure includes a western-facing doorway. Behind the temple and a low box hedge connects to the house. Between the “temple” and house is what appears to be a servant’s house. It features two louvered windows and a central doorway on the western elevation. This building, as well as the two temples, are not listed in the fire insurance letter by Barbour. The omission of the temples could be that they were not considered buildings to be insured, while the servant’s quarters could have been constructed between the time of the letter and the time the painting was made. The front yard is shown with four foundation boxwood shrubs planted at the base of the portico’s columns and young boxwood shrubs bordering the sidewalk and extending along each side of the house.
Temples in the garden were important visual elements and sometimes were settings for social gatherings in colonial life. These structures had been used in gardens in the eighteenth century for more traditional focal points, devoid of tables or seating underneath their roofs. By the end of the century, however, garden temples were sometimes the center of gatherings. The only evidence of temple structures at Frascati are found in the account of extra work done at Frascati appended to the building contract. The account specifically lists work done on “two temples” for a cost of $16.00. A cedar arbor was in place during the Woodriff-era at the end of the box allée and served as a gathering location during their time at Frascati.

Trees featured in the painting include what appear to be Lombardy Poplars, evergreen trees, including what may be the holly tree still growing south of the portico, and several deciduous
trees that have been limbed-up. The original side-portico, located on the southern elevation of the house, is shown with full-length louvered doors, enclosing what would otherwise be an open porch. These are not unlike the “portacules”\textsuperscript{57} found at Monticello and Bremo Recess. Just south of this portico are two planters on raised legs. The painting also shows the serpentine wall, smokehouse, kitchen, and one of the servant’s houses. These three buildings are located as described and diagrammed in Barbour’s letter. A hand water pump is located in front of the kitchen. Surrounding the front of the property is an elegant picket fence, featuring thin, pointed pickets, arranged in a concave pattern; rounded-topped posts; and a garden gate at the front entrance with alternating short and tall pickets.

The painting hints at a large circular driveway in front of the fence. The drive extended farther than the current driveway and hints of its existence can still be seen today both in the topography, as well as by a row of cedars that partially border it. A road plat, named “Map of Roads through Col. James Magruder’s Farm” by G. S. Newman, shows the turnpike (now route 231), side roads, and prominently displays the original layout of the almost perfect semi-circular driveway.

Most documentation of the garden is available from the Irving-Woodriff era with several photographs of the house and grounds dating from the early twentieth century. Elaine duPont Irving Woodriff, following in the great horticultural tradition of the duPont family, carefully crafted the gardens at Frascati to meet her specifications. The duPont’s horticultural legacy is evident in the estates they left behind.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{57} “Portacules” is the term used by Thomas Jefferson. It is most likely a corruption of portcullis.
\textsuperscript{58} Henry Francis duPont crafted extensive gardens at Winterthur; while Pierre duPont is remembered for opening his personal estate to the public, now known as Longwood Gardens; and William and Annie Rogers duPont purchased Montpelier and installed beautiful formal gardens. Henry Francis duPont had formal training and a degree in horticulture and landscape design from Harvard University.
These photographs are preserved in archival collections throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia and at the Winterthur Library, Wilmington, Delaware. The photographs show the garden after the deconstruction of the serpentine wall, but still maintaining garden rooms and borders well into the mid-twentieth century. The Winterthur photos and history of the garden provided by Elaine Irving-Woodriff in the revised edition of *Historic Gardens of Virginia*, show that the box allée was originally located only in the upper-third of the garden, with the
Woodriff’s planting more box during their time at the residence. She explains how a large border of boxwood hedge that had separated the garden from the back piazza was moved and replanted in semi-circular fashion throughout the garden, some of which is still present today. It was also during this time that the semi-circle apse of box was planted at the terminus of the central allée.

Hazel Edens, grand-daughter of Elaine, recounted to the author how she remembers the garden. Looking west from the house down the allée, the first room to the right was the “sundial room”. The sundial was surrounded by English Ivy and featured a flowering cherry tree. The next room to the east, was a small boxwood maze with brick paths laid in basket-weave pattern. Between the second and third rooms was a lily pool with circular steps on either side. The third room was a perennial room that also grew a variety of shrubs, including Quince. The large vegetable garden was planted at the end of the Magnolia line. A Raspberry patch and asparagus beds were planted in front of the Magnolias. On the northern side of the allée was a lawn tennis court.

Figure 26 The rear of the house, the uppermost terrace and the sundial of the garden room are captured in the early 20th century. (Hazel Edens, private collection)

Figure 27 Sundial and plantings in the upper garden room installed during the Woodriff period. (Hazel Edens, private collection)
Figure 28 This photograph shows that the garden room borders were still being maintained into the 1920s. (Hazel Edens, Private Collection)

Figure 29 A photograph taken in the back yard. Large shrubs dominated the borders of the open lawn. (Hazel Edens, Private Collection)
Figure 30 Undated photo showing an interesting fencing method to attempt to maintain a uniform boxwood hedge. (Ferol Briggs, Jr. Scrapbook, V. II, Orange County Historical Society)
Figure 31 Early 20th century. Front gate in place, with boxwood along sidewalk and original foundation boxwood at the base of the columns. (Ferol Briggs, Jr. Scrapbook, V. II, Orange County Historical Society)
Figure 32 Frascati 1959, The foundation boxwood planting has completely hidden the portico and columns. The boxwood has engulfed the walk and created a tunnel affect. (Ferol Briggs, Jr. Scrapbook, V. II, Orange County Historical Society)
Figure 33 This 1972 photo shows the boxwood foundation plants still in place, while the boxwood along the sidewalk has been removed.

Figure 34 This is how the rear elevation of the house looked in 1972, with the upper balustrade still in place. There has been debate if this was an original rail or a Woodriff alteration. The rail was removed during the rehabilitation in the 1980s. (Ferol Briggs, Jr. Scrapbook, V. II, Orange County Historical Society)
Figure 35 The house in 1985. All original boxwood at the front of the home has been removed.

Figure 36 This perspective shows boxwood still in place near the rear of the home, in alignment with what was painted in the watercolor. This boxwood has since been removed as well. (Ferol Briggs, Jr. Scrapbook, V. II, Orange County Historical Society)
Figure 37 Brick Kitchen 1972

Figure 38 Brick Kitchen 1985. (Ferol Briggs, Jr. Scrapbook, V. II, Orange County Historical Society)
SECTION III: EXISTING CONDITIONS

Figure 39 Current Front Lawn. (Photo by author, 2009)
Chapter 1: Introduction to Existing Site Conditions

Frascati consists of a unique combination of historic contributing and non contributing buildings, structures, and features that portray the plantation’s evolution through time. The following observations were recorded in 2009 as fieldwork for the Favretti Fellowship. Through the comparison of these existing conditions to the historic make-up of the property, it can be determined to what level the integrity or level of historic character remains intact. Analyzing the integrity of the property can thus help in defining the treatment plan for Frascati.

The plantation is located on a flat ridge, with gently rolling landscape of former agricultural lands that are now maintained as hay pastures, sloping on all sides. Bosques of trees have naturalized in the pasture, fence rows (and former fence rows), and an intermittent wetland is located just northeast of the gardens. To the east of house and gardens is a cluster of 20\textsuperscript{th} century farm buildings consisting of barns, a silo, and other outbuildings which are used mostly for storage, but are well-maintained. The crushed stone driveway intersects the property on axis with the house and gardens. A split rail fence borders the property on the southeastern border along Route 231.

Generally speaking, the front landscape of Frascati has been maintained to the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century. American boxwood was replanted in the 1980s, along the front brick walk in the location of the original plantings. The large foundation box, from the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century has been removed, but not replanted. A large holly tree stands to the right of the front portico and may be contemporary with the house. More boxwood are located around the interior circumference of
the circular drive, some of which are very old, based on size, and some planted at the same time as the newer sidewalk planting.

Many deciduous trees, interspersed with Eastern Red Cedar, have naturalized in the pasture bounding the property entrance and along the perimeters of the maintained lawn. This pasture is cut for hay annually and is fenced with split-rail along the road and a variety of wire fencing around the other sides. The split-rail fence bounded the lawn on all sides until last year when the owner had the portions that had deteriorated removed. The drive and paths are either crushed stone or blacktop. Many twentieth-century outbuildings are found on the property.

The original formal gardens of the early nineteenth century and the revival gardens of the twentieth century have lost all integrity, but the bones of the garden’s structure are intact. The garden features a central allée of boxwood that is approximately 30 feet tall. The first segment of the allée is approximately 129 feet and has been determined to be the original Barbour location. A modern swimming pool has been installed at the end of this allée. An extension of the allée was installed during the Irving-Woodriff and is slightly smaller in size measuring 103 feet in length on the northern border and 68 feet in length on the southern. It terminates with a semi-circular apse of boxwood measuring 100 feet across and is approximately 60 feet in radius. Two sets of terraces mark the boundaries of the four uppermost gardens rooms (two on each side of the allée). Large expanses of grass lawn make up the majority of groundcover.

The fence-row forming the northeastern boundary to the garden and extending from the apse has a 68 feet long section of boxwood extending north and 31 feet of box extending south. Boxwood dating from the Woodriff-era also enclose the sundial garden room and is located near the kitchen and smokehouse, forming a circular border of overgrown box along the west side of
the property. The boxwood varies in size, quality, and health. Some of the older specimens have become leggy and diseased.

Mature Black Walnut, Southern Magnolia, Flowering Dogwood, and various other trees and shrubs are scattered throughout the back yard. Magnolia and walnut trees are planted in a row along an abandoned roadway or path that intersects the former walled garden and runs parallel to the fence-row. Large Rose-of-Sharon shrubs are found along the outbuildings and could be descendants of shrubs planted by the Woodriffs.
EXISTING CONDITIONS PHOTOGRAPHS

Unless otherwise noted, all photographs in this section were taken by the author in 2009.

Figure 40 The front elevation of the house. Notice the missing boxwood shrubs along the brick sidewalk. (Will Rieley, 2008)

Figure 41 The tympanum of the portico, supported by plaster covered brick Tuscan Order columns. The verticality of the columns was extended by foundation boxwood plantings originally.
Figure 42 Camera facing southeast, the photo shows how boxwood planted during the Woodriff era completely shields the house from the road and blocks the original viewshed.

Figure 43 Camera facing east. Along the modern driveway, boxwood lining the original border of the driveway and picket fence. This is one of several mature trees on the property.
Figure 44 This photograph shows the modern driveway and the indentation of where the original semi-circular carriage drive once was found. (Will Rieley, 2008)

Figure 45 Camera facing west. The split rail fence that borders the property along Route 231 and the pasture that is found on all sides of the property.
Figure 46 Camera facing south. The English basement and lawn with boxwood in the distance. This side was altered to include a large porch during the Woodriff era. All that remains is the door.

Figure 47 The “piazza” on the rear of the house as described by Barbour. The ghost outline of the upper balustrade is still visible.
Figure 48 Camera facing southeast. Photo taken within the large boxwood massing that borders the western edge of the property and extending to the house. This massing could be part of the original boxwood that is seen in the watercolor.
Figure 49 Camera facing east, looking towards the boxwood allée. This is the first terrace and the flags mark the location of brick rubble.

Figure 50 Camera facing southwest. This shows the house from along the northern boundary of the original garden border. The Barbour allée is to the left of the photo.
Figure 51 Camera facing west. Photo from within the sundial room. This is the only garden room that is still surrounded by boxwood on all sides.

Figure 52 Camera facing north towards the Barbour allée. The millstone sundial is in the center and peonies are in the foreground.
Figure 53 The millstone sundial. Not original

Figure 54 Steps leading from the sundial room to the next garden room.
Figure 55 Camera facing west. This view shows the boxwood that surround the sundial room.

Figure 56 Camera facing west, from below the second terrace remnant. The large boxwood hedge shields the border of the sundial room.
Figure 57 The boxwood allée with Saucer Magnolia and a flattened former garden terrace in the foreground. The sundial room is in the background left.

Figure 58 The swimming pool and concrete surround at the end of the Barbour allée. The remnants of the terrace are visible to the left.
Figure 59 The open lawn behind the sundial room. Trees and shrubs have planted without.

Figure 60 Camera facing east. The boxwood allée extension with Black Walnut trees.
Figure 61 Camera facing west from the pool looking towards the house in the Barbour allée.

Figure 62 Camera looking west, down the Barbour allée.
Figure 63 Camera facing east, the boxwood apse at the end of the allée. The area is overgrown with vines and volunteer trees. A Kentucky Coffeetree is to the left and a dilapidated grape arbor made of Cedar is in the center.

Figure 64 A row of Southern Magnolias extend north and south from the boxwood allée and along what was determined to be an old farm road.
Figure 65 The rear elevation of the house.

Figure 66 The south elevation with modern kitchen addition in place of the portico and a patio.
Figure 67 Camera facing north. Notice the American Holly, an original tree.

Figure 68 Camera facing northeast. The brick kitchen with the old servant’s quarter’s addition and shed. This now serves as the guest house.
Figure 69 Looking south. 20th century, noncontributing farm buildings.

Figure 70 Looking east at corn crib and shrubs surrounding the smoke house and behind the kitchen.
Chapter 2: Overview of Landscape Characteristics

Spatial Organization: The organization and patterns of spaces within the landscape. Spaces are created and defined by elements of other landscape characteristics such as fences, vegetation, buildings, and water features.

The house and immediate grounds compromise the central portion of the property with the formal gardens, mown lawn, and ornamental plants maintaining the central axis. Twentieth century farm buildings and structure spiral adjacent from the original historic core of the property. Pasture and naturalized woodland groves border the property on all sides. A gravel drive runs along the central axis with the house hallway and garden allée and terminates in a small semi-circular drop off near the front brick sidewalk.

Vegetation: Trees, shrubs, perennials, turf, and all other vegetative growth within the landscape.

The property includes many species of trees, shrubs, and flowering plants. In most cases the large trees found on the property were not planted or cultivated in a foreseeable pattern but grew up along fence rows or in pastures. Of particular interest is the Kentucky Coffeetree that grows near within the boxwood apse at the terminus of the allée. The large American Holly is the only tree that is thought to date to the Barbour era.

Smaller trees such as dogwood and the Southern Magnolias, as well shrubs such as the azalea and boxwood have been planted by the owners in the last few decades. Wildflowers and other perennials are maintained in small flower beds near the house.

---

60 The landscape characteristics in this report have been adapted from A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports and The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes.
The plant list below is a record of the vegetation identified and recorded on the property in the summer of 2009.

-Plant List

American Holly  Ilex opaca
Black Walnut    Juglans nigra
Common Boxwood  Buxus sempervirens
Common Hackberry Celtis occidentalis
Common Persimmon Diospyros virginiana
Crab Apple      Malus spp.
Eastern Red Cedar Juniperus virginiana
English Ivy     Hedera helix
Flowering Dogwood Cornus florida
Garden Hydrangea Hydrangea macrophylla
Heavenly Bamboo Nandina domestica
Hosta           Hosta spp.
Kentucky Coffee Tree Gymnocladus dioicus
Littleleaf Linden Tilia cordata
Black-eyed Susan Rudbeckia hirta
Norway Maple    Acer platanoides
Norway Spruce   Picea abies
Pignut Hickory  Carya glabra
Privet          Ligustrum spp.
Purple Coneflower Echinacea purpurea
Rose-of-Sharon  Hibiscus syriacus
Saucer Magnolia Magnolia x soulangiana
Silver Maple \hspace{10em} A. saccharinum
Shellback Hickory \hspace{10em} C. laciniosa
Sugar Maple \hspace{10em} A. saccharum
Southern Magnolia \hspace{10em} M. grandiflora
Tall Garden Phlox \hspace{10em} P. paniculata
White Ash \hspace{10em} F. americana L.
Yew \hspace{10em} T. L.

**Buildings & Structures:** A building is considered a permanent, relatively-enclosed construct whose prime function is to provide shelter for people or objects. Frascati’s house, brick kitchen, and barns are considered buildings. A structure is a smaller, non-habitable, and usually immovable constructed element. Farm outbuildings would be considered structures.

The house at Frascati is 57 feet by 39 feet, executed in Flemish-bond brick with tooled penciled joints. The original agreement called for the “exterior walls of the whole house to be faced with rubbed stretchers well-burned.”\(^{61}\) A shallow hipped roof covers the two-and-a-half story, double-pile, central house type of the Georgian and Federal types. The main entrance is sheltered by a monumental, tetrastyle, pedimented Tuscan portico set on a brick podium. The portico is supported by stuccoed-brick columns, has a complete Tuscan entablature, and pediment with a semi-circular lunette in the typanum. A small portico on the south end of the house has been replaced with a modern kitchen wing. According to a surviving, undated fire insurance letter written by P.P. Barbour the rear elevation of the house was covered by “a two storied Piazza in the rear made of wood.”\(^{62}\) Barbara Sarudy, in Gardens and Gardening in the Chesapeake: 1700-1805, discusses how piazzas were being added to homes starting in the late 1700s, corresponding with a growth in leisure time and development of ornamental geometric


\(^{62}\) Aetna Fire Insurance Letter, Barbour Family Papers, undated. Full text found in the appendix.
These gardens were intricately patterned and best viewed from above, where the owner could show guests his success at taming nature.

Photographs from as late as 1972, show this “piazza” still in place with a balustrade along the second story. Some historians believed the piazza to be a Woodriff-era addition, but photos from their tenure, show the piazza in place and altered at the north end to be an enclosed room. Elaine Woodriff noted in her scrapbook the “new” porch on the northern end of the house and the numerous pictures showing the rear piazza, provided ample opportunities to mention they had also made changes to it. The piazza that survived up until the end of the twentieth century could very well have been, at least in part, the original early 19th century Barbour piazza. The Barrows removed the upper-story balustrade, added the Chippendale rail, and shortened the width of the back stairs during the rehabilitation of the house in the 1980s.

Non-contributing farm outbuildings and barns from the 20th century are found to the southeast of the gardens and house and can be viewed from the garden site. They are in good condition and are used mostly for storage.

Views & Vistas: In this case, views are considered to be landscape scenes of notably exceptional or undesirable quality.

The main view of the Blue Ridge Mountains from the front portico of Frascati is obstructed by large boxwood shrubs that were planted along the semi-circular drive in the early 20th century. This had been an important view for most of the property’s history. Other views include from the central door of the house through the boxwood allée and from the end of the allée back to the house, it is obstructed by the location of the modern swimming pool and large Black Walnut trees not original to the garden design.

---

**Small Scale Features**: Functional, recreational, or decorative elements that are smaller than structures and typically more easily moved.

A small millstone has been converted into a sundial in the uppermost boxwood garden room. It is located in the original boxwood bordered room as during the Woodriff period, but is not the original sundial. Date of the replacement dial is unknown.

A cast-iron urn sits at the terminus of the upper allée and is unplanted. Could be from the Woodriff period, but is not in its original location.

A small wildflower garden is maintained adjacent to the brick kitchen. The flower bed is a modern addition, not historic in placement.

A wooden picket gate is located along the fence row bordering the northern edge of the pasture. It is of similar design to the front gate pictured in the historic photographs of the early 20th century.

A modern brick patio connects the rear portico and the modern kitchen wing.

A hot tub is located on the northwest side of the rear portico.
Chapter 3: Inventory of Plant Material

Figure 71 Diagram of Existing Plant Material, keyed to specific period of time when applicable. Existing trees represent those trees that were not planted and appear to be voluntary in nature. (Illustration by author, 2010.)
Figure 72 Diagrams showing existing plant material and the era to which it has been traced. (Illustrations by author, 2010.)
Chapter 1: Significance

**Period of Significance** is the span of time during which a property attained the significance that makes it eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or the State Register of Historic Places.

**Significance Summary**

Frascati Plantation’s garden was originally laid out using English high style garden design complete with falling or terraced gardens. The house and brick serpentine wall was designed and built by master builder John M. Perry. Since that time, the grounds have undergone substantial alterations, but continues to be a significant for its architectural and political history.

Key character-defining features include the main house, brick kitchen, boxwood allée, and the garden terrace remnants. The house and kitchen continue to convey the original character of design and materiality. The allée and terraces are in a more fragile condition, but remain in their original locations and serve as a benchmark of the garden borders.

Frascati was listed on the Virginia Landmarks Registry in 1980 and the National Register of Historic Places in 1982. The nomination lists the areas of significance as architecture, landscape architecture, and politics/government. The majority of the nomination was based on the architecture of the house and brick kitchen and the association with the Barbour family, while investigations into the garden history were not included.
According to National Register guidelines, Frascati is nationally significant under National Register Criterion B (association with the lives of persons significant in our past) and Criterion C (embodiment of 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 may lack individual distinction). Within these criteria, Frascati is significant in the areas of social history, architecture, and landscape architecture.

Periods of Significance

The period of significance for Frascati’s National Register Nomination was the period of construction 1821-1823. It was determined that the period of significance for this report, should be 1821-1848, marking the beginning of construction and the sale of the property after the death of Barbour. This date acknowledges the significance of the house, brick kitchen, gardens, and grounds.

A second period of significance is from 1902-1915. Elaine duPont Irving purchased the property in 1902 and 1914 the last date recorded in her scrapbooks of the garden. During this period the gardens at Frascati were redesigned with significant alterations including an extension of the allée and addition of garden features.
Significance According to National Register Criteria

The National Register of Historic Places Criteria for Evaluation is used as a guide for evaluating the significance of historic properties. Criteria evaluates the historic importance according to events, people, design methods or styles associated with the landscape or its ability to provide historic or prehistoric information. Areas of significance such as architecture, landscape architecture, settlement, or social history help organize each criteria into coherent themes within American history.

To be eligible for National Register of Historic Places, a landscape must possess national, statewide, or local significance within one or more of the Criteria for Evaluation:

A. Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broads patterns of our history, or

B. Association with the lives of persons significant in our past, or

C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction, or

D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.  

---

64 National Register Bulletin # 15, 41.
Criterion B

Frascati was the home of Supreme Court justice and statesman Philip P. Barbour. He was deeply concerned with the design and construction of his home as attested to in the Building Agreement for the house. Barbour was born at Frascati while it was under the ownership of his parents and he later purchased the property for the construction of Frascati house and installation of the gardens and brick serpentine wall. The construction of Frascati took place during Barbour’s tenure as Speaker of the House. The homes and gardens of a statesman was an important symbol of wealth and success.

Criterion C

Frascati is a nationally-significant example of architecture and landscape architecture as it employs the use of the Golden Ratio in the main house and it appears that the Golden Ratio may have been used to layout the formal terraced garden. The house is recorded in the National Register nomination as a “stately dwelling” representing “one of the architectural monuments of the Piedmont.” The house, and most likely the formal terraced gardens, were surrounded by a brick serpentine wall constructed under the direction of John M. Perry, master builder. Perry was one of the builders employed in the construction of the University of Virginia and several architectural features are found in Frascati, as well as the use of a serpentine wall in the garden.

---

Frascati National Register Nomination.
Chapter 2: Analysis of Integrity

Introduction

The retention of specific aspects of integrity is vital for a property to convey its significance. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant. The seven aspects are:

1. Location
2. Design
3. Setting
4. Materials
5. Workmanship
6. Feeling
7. Association

In order to understand how Frascati’s landscape has changed over time and determine if it conveys its historic significance, this study undertakes a comparative analysis of historic versus existing conditions. The analysis involves the following steps:

- Comparison of key character-defining features from the historic periods of significance to the existing conditions.
- Assessment of contemporary features for their impact on historic character.
- Identification of features missing from the periods of significance.
**Location:** The location of the property has been maintained.

**Design:** The overall site plan of garden to house has been maintained in relation to the house. The semi-circular driveway has been altered and now bisects the front grounds of the property. The physical design of the formal terraced gardens is lost. The allée is overgrown, is the second or third succession from the original mother plant, and has moved out of its original alignment. Traces of the original garden boundaries are evident in the topography. Soil probes have identified the footprint of the former serpentine garden walls. Remnants of the terraced gardens do remain with two sets of slightly sloping terraces surviving to the present, with one ‘garden room’ being redesigned during the Woodriff tenure.

**Setting:** The site has maintained its rural setting with historic estates and working farms neighboring it. Within the landscape the setting of the garden is maintained with pasture bordering the property. Native trees and fence-row plants shield the view of neighboring properties and the 20th century, non-contributing buildings and structures.

**Materials:** The herringbone brick paved sidewalk is extant and is maintained in good condition. Materials of the formal garden have been lost. The brick serpentine wall is no longer extant. Historic plant material from the Barbour period is limited to an American Holly tree east of the main portico and the Common Boxwood allée. Remnants of Irving-Woodriff era Common Boxwood and other shrubs exist in varying quality. Mature Black Walnut, Southern Magnolia, and other trees survive from the early 20th century as does descendent plants from Rose of Sharon near the brick kitchen, a boxwood hedge along a portion of the realigned circular drive, and a boxwood apse at the end of the allée.

**Workmanship:** The brick kitchen is still intact. Clapboard sided additions made during the Woodriff era are maintained today as a guest house. The additions are thought to be the
smokehouse and possibly the slaves’ quarters that appears in the Barbour fire insurance letter and meet the general measurements given therein.

The design of the individual garden beds, parterres, and vegetable plots has been lost. The brick serpentine walls were torn down in the late 19th century. The garden temples and picket fence bounding the front lawn are not extant.

**Feeling:** The house and front lawn maintain a feeling of a 19th century plantation within its rural setting. The pasture and open space of the site has been preserved. Farm buildings and structures are clustered to the southeast of the house and do not have a large visual impact on the feeling of the landscape. The view of the mountains has been blocked by overgrown trees and shrubs.

**Association:** The property maintains its association with Phillip P. Barbour as his birthplace and home.

**Summary**

Integrity of the original garden and landscape of Frascati has been compromised, as the historic fabric of the formal gardens has been lost or altered. The location, setting, and overall feeling of the property are intact. Association with Barbour has not been lost, but the design of the gardens has been altered dramatically and materiality is not extant to a great degree.

The following chapter will outline recommendations on how to return the property to its original character and period-appropriate design.

---

66 Insurance policy found in the appendix.
SECTION V: TREATMENT

Chapter 1: Introduction

Preservation Brief #36 states

The overall historic preservation approach and treatment approach can ensure the proper retention, care, and repair of landscapes and their inherent features. In short, the Standards act as preservation and management tool for cultural landscapes.\(^{67}\)

The treatment approach for Frascati was guided by *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*, a National Park Service guide for landscape planning decisions. The four treatment standards set forth in this publication is based on the level of integrity and intended use of the landscape in its current state. The standards are: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction.

*Preservation*: The act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity and materials of an historic property.

*Rehabilitation*: The act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

*Restoration*: The act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

*Reconstruction*: The act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure or

\(^{67}\) Birnbaum, *Preservation Briefs #36*, 12.
object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location. 68

Section V sets forth the guidelines and recommended actions that begin to form the basis for a treatment program. According to the National Park Service, in A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports, “the goal of any treatment program is long-term preservation of a landscape’s historic features, qualities, and materials.” 69 Frascati’s completed program will determine how the homeowner can retain the surviving features and materials of the property, while adapting a historic period-appropriate formal garden design for installation.

69 Page, 82.
Chapter 2: Recommended Option: Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation to the Barbour period is recommended for Frascati because it allows the homeowner to introduce new and compatible uses and features and maintain alterations necessary for 21st century living, while retaining the character defining features that make the property a living historic landscape. New and compatible uses include lighting, accessibility/universal design, interpretive signage, and plant selection. Rehabilitation normally relies on maintenance and repair actions as a major focus to retain historic character-defining details.

In Frascati’s case, so little remains of the garden, that a large amount of replacement and replanting will occur. Rehabilitation allows for the replacement of missing historic features based on documentation or a new design of compatible character. The Secretary of the Interior’s guidelines for rehabilitation state that if an exact reproduction is not possible, a new feature of similar character should be installed.

When an entire feature is missing the landscape’s historic character is diminished. Although accepting the loss is one possibility, where an important feature is missing, its replacement is always recommended in the Rehabilitation guidelines as the first, or preferred course of action. Thus, if adequate historical, pictorial, and physical documentation exists so that the feature may be accurately reproduced, and if it is desirable to re-establish the feature as part of the landscape’s historical appearance, then planning, designing and installing a new feature based on such information is appropriate.

A second course of action for the replacement feature is a new design that is compatible with the remaining character-defining features of the historic landscape. The new design should always take into account the spatial organization and land patterns, features, and ...should be clearly differentiated so that a false historical appearance is not created.

---

70 Birnbaum and Peters, 52-53.
In this study, these statements mean restoration and reconstruction opportunities are within the scope of rehabilitation. Non-extant circulation, formal gardens, features—predominantly the serpentine brick wall, garden temples, and picket fence, and vegetation can be accurately recreated or new features of similar character can be installed.

The relation of the garden to the house, and *vice versa*, should be considered when selecting a treatment plan. The house has been rehabilitated to the Barbour period. The Golden Ratio design being continued from the house to the site planning of the garden is an important and unique characteristic that could be lost if the Irving-Woodriff period was chosen to as the period for rehabilitation. The water-color can help accurately design the front lawn and one garden temple for reconstruction.

Preservation is not a recommended option. There are very few historic features to be maintained or repaired and preservation does not allow for new or compatible use. Restoration and reconstruction are not recommended alternatives because they do not represent change over time and allow for modern design needs. It is also a cost-prohibitive option. Most importantly, there is not enough documentation for either of the garden’s period of significance to recreate a completely historic reconstructed landscape. The remaining plant material is also in poor condition.
Treatment Recommendations

- Garden Style: The style employed in the rehabilitation of the formal gardens will be inspired by surviving and reconstructed period examples found in Virginia. The reconstructed gardens found at the Montpelier, University of Virginia, Bremo Recess, Mary Washington House, and other gardens documented in *Historic Gardens of Virginia* and installed by the Garden Club of Virginia. The gardens of Belle Grove, Bacon Castle, and others, were used as examples of vegetable garden interpretation. Principles of the golden ratio were considered when designing features in the garden rooms. The serpentine wall will be reconstructed and the boxwood of the allée will be pruned back into its original form and if necessary, removed and replaced along the original alignment with new healthy plants.

  - The first tier of garden rooms includes a Rose Garden with small edging boxwood used to form parterres around planting beds of roses and perennials. The crushed stone paths intersect at the ‘eyes’ of the room. This is the most formal garden and is thus located at the front of the garden, and nearest to the home. It is also designed to be viewed from the piazza roof by the owners of the property.

  - The Sundial Room, found south of the Rose Garden, is orthogonal in nature with lawn laid out in the center of the room, and a sundial located on axis. This garden has always been designed around a sundial and was edged with boxwood. Small edging box is located along the path to denote the planting beds. The beds include larger flowering shrubs in rows surrounded by
perennials. The long edges of the room are planted with larger boxwood to form a hedge separating the rooms. This hedge was historically in place in this room.

- The Oval Lawn Garden found just east of the Sundial Room, is a room for use in lawn games and recreation. Four smaller circles radiating from the path serve as locations for sitting in the garden or as a node for statuary. Flowering trees, shrubs, and perennials dominate this garden’s borders.

- The Perennial Garden with flowering trees is located east of the Rose Garden. It is dominated with flowering and vegetative perennials, with each orthogonal bed bordered by flowering trees.

- The Vegetable Plots and Orchard will be used as necessary by the current owner. The four plots set aside for vegetables could also be planted in lawn as is the case of Bacon’s Castle. The increasing desire to grow and eat locally grown food could be fulfilled easily with this garden design. The orchard will be planted with a variety of fruit trees. Apples were, historically, the most prolific crop, but cherries, pears, and other fruiting trees were also used for fresh as well as canned food needs. A variety of fruit trees can be planted to meet the needs of the owner.

- Function: This rehabilitation will require a complete reinstallation of the landscape plants and garden features. Care will be taken to design the gardens and grounds to meet the needs of a 21st century homeowner. The four vegetable plots past the formal gardens will be available for planting vegetables as would have originally been done, or kept in lawn for a lower maintenance alternative. The swimming pool has been removed. If the homeowner wanted to install a pool, it could be located behind the brick kitchen with the ‘smoke house’ building serving as a pool house. Low-impact
lighting and lighting to highlight garden features could be installed to increase the hours of use.

- **Design:** The design implemented will follow the findings of the historic and archaeological research made on the site, as stated in Sections I and II. Selection of plant materials, features, and formal garden designs will be of the period. Walks will be of crushed stone with the allée path being 10 feet in width, while secondary paths will be 3 feet in width. Small edging boxwood will be employed in the knot gardens and borders, while larger American Boxwood will be used for the main allée and plantings in the front lawn.

- **Ornamentation:** Features such as the temple structures, picket fence, and outbuildings will be reconstructed using the watercolor painting, other local reconstructions, manuals for design, catalogs, and other sources to create period appropriate features in the landscape.

- **Plant Materials:** Historic species, varieties, and heirloom plants will be used when possible during the rehabilitation. When difficulties arise in using specific species, the closest specimen will be chosen to meet the form, bloom, or other predominant characteristic of that plant. American Boxwood will be used as the main border and allée plant. Flowering shrubs such as quince, lilacs and peonies, as well as flowering perennials and bulbs will be used in abundance. Flowering trees include cherries, dogwoods, and red buds. English ivy and violets are used for ground cover and to grow within the curves of the brick walls.
Chapter 3: Rehabilitation Plans

Figure 73 Master Plan of Frascati Plantation. Illustration by author, 2011. Scale: 0'-1"=200'
Figure 74 Site Plan for Frascati Plantation. Illustration by author, 2011. Scale: 0'-1"=100'
Figure 75 Detailed Site Plan of Front Lawn. Illustration by author, 2011. Scale: 0'-1"=50'-0"
Figure 76 Detailed Site Plan for the Formal Terraced Gardens and Outbuildings of Frascati Plantation. Illustration by author, 2011. Scale: 0'-1"=50'-0"
Figure 77 Detailed Site Plan for the Orchard and Vegetable Garden Plots at Frascati Plantation. Illustration by author, 2011. Scale: 0'-1"=30'-0"
Figure 78 Detail Plan of the Formal Terraced Gardens of Frascati Plantation. Illustration by author, 2011. Scale: 0'·1"=30'·0"
Section VI: CONCLUSION

Thesis Creative Project Summary

The original research that formed the basis of this Creative Project came through fellowship work completed for the Garden Club of Virginia in 2009. The majority of that original research was tailored to researching the brick serpentine wall through field analysis, historic research, and precedent studies. A publication and existing conditions site plan were finished products of that research. When pursuing the same site in the form of a CLR, it became clear that some research possibilities had been neglected during the initial research process. Exploring the use of the Golden Ratio and its implication for design both originally and during rehabilitation became an interesting addition to the traditional format of a CLA. Art as a research tool for creating rehabilitation plans was explored, with the conclusion that is can be an acceptable source, especially in cases such as Frascati that have limited sources of the original landscape.

Evaluation of the integrity of the landscape was easily concluded, while the choice between rehabilitating the landscape to the Barbour era, the Woodriff era, or a combination of the two periods of time was a much more difficult decision. Several discussions of rehabilitating the gardens to the Woodriff era, while using the watercolor painting as a basis to restore the front lawn and picket fence to the Barbour period were had. There was significantly more documentation from the Woodriff era, but the integrity of existing plant material was poor and the house had already been rehabilitated to the mid-19th century.
The decision was made to rehabilitate to the Barbour period, using the watercolor for the front lawn and other historic gardens as the precedent for the design of the formal terraced gardens. With a full archeological excavation of the site, more information could be gleaned about the original design of the gardens and plant choices, but it can be concluded that the serpentine wall placement, outbuilding placement, and fence design are accurate, while garden design are period-appropriate.
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APPENDIX

Frascati Building Agreement, November 7, 1821

John M. Perry and Philip P. Barbour

This agreement made this 7 day of November, 1821 between John M. Perry of Albemarle of the one part, and Philip P. Barbour of Orange of the other part. Witness that the said Perry in consideration of the sum of money to be paid him by said Barbour, as herein after stated, engages to build for said Barbour at his mountain farm in Orange, a brick dwelling house and kitchen of the kinds, dimensions and styles following that is to say; --The dwelling house to be of brick, fifty seven feet long, and thirty nine feet wide, to be two stories high, besides the basement story; the basement story to be eight feet pitch, of which not more than two and an half, to be below the surface of the earth; the first story above that to be twelve feet pitch, and the next story to be ten feet pitch; The walls for the basement story to be eighteen inches--thick; The partition walls to be made of brick of equal thickness in the respective stories with the exterior walls; The house to have a passage through the middle of it ten feet wide in the clear; and to have a cross partition wall so as to divide the floors of each story into four rooms besides the passage; both the passage walls and cross walls to go from the foundation to the top to be of brick of the same thickness in the several stories as in the outer walls; the whole house basement story and all, to be well plastered with a due proportion of plaster of Paris; the basement story with two coats, the other two stories with three coats; the drawing room and passage each to have a handsome cornice of plaster, and each a handsome center ornament of plaster in the ceiling; the general style of all the woodwork, to be like Thomas Macon's dwelling house except the drawing room and passage, which is to have an -- elegant sub-base instead of
dadoing, and the doors are to be made for locks, and the windows for weights, the dining room
and chamber to have dadoing like Mr. Macon's. There are to be two staircases one private from
the dining room and chamber, with a closet under it; the other an elegant ornamental one out
of the passage; the garret to be no further finished than to have a good coarse floor, and
staircase and door to it; The number and size of the windows, doors and closets, to be under the
direction of said Barbour; the house is to have two porticos, one an elegant one, in front of the
house to be of the proper dimensions to embrace both the stories above the basement story, to
be supported upon brick pillars of the proper size, and to be roughcast with plaster of Paris; the
front passage door is to have an ornamental window over it and on each side. The small portico
at the south end of the house, to be finished in a neat manner with small well proportioned
pillars also roughcast the floor of which is to be laid with brick tile and the cellar steps to be
descended from it; the upper stories to be layed [sic] off into four rooms besides the passage;
the highest if required into five, the basement story is to be laid off so as to have one dining
room with a good fireplace in it, and the room under the dining room is to be fixed with wide
shelves for a locked room, and the remaining rooms to be laid off as the first story. The whole
basement story as well as the others to have the doors, windows & as said Barbour may direct;
the two passages -- two entre [sic] doors each of them to have good and handsome -- laid in
frames of lasting wood, and properly completed; the porticos to be under pinned, and every
window in the house to have neat venetian blinds; all the floors in the basement story to be well
laid with brick; and every plank floor of the house to be secret laid, tongued and grooved of
plank of the best quality, between heart and sap without a knot or burl; every piece of plank
scantling or other timber and shingles which are in any degree exposed to wind or water, to be
of the best qualitied [sic] heart pine; and every material in the house relating to the brickwork
woodwork or plastering to be of the best quality; and the workmanship of all to be well
executed; the exterior walls of the whole house to be faced with rubbed stretchers well burned; and all the rest of the brick well burned, and to be of hard and good quality not one samson brick to put into it. The kitchen to be thirty feet long and eighteen wide, of a single story ten feet above the surface, besides the foundation the wall to be thirteen inches and one half thick, to be divided by a brick wall into two rooms below and two above with a fireplace in each room; the front and end towards the house to be laid with rubbed stretchers, and the rest of sound well burned bricks with no samson bricks. All the rooms to be plastered with two coats. The shingles and all timbers which will be exposed to be of the best heart pine; the lower floor to be of brick; the doors and windows as to size and number to be under said Barbour's direction; any little convenience such as shelved inside or an over to be as required. The materials and workmanship of the kitchen all to be of good --. Said Barbour is to find nails, bricks, locks, hinges, glass, putty, window weights, oil, paints, painting, the capital and bases of the pillars of the front portico, and to dig out foundation, excepting these and excepting also that said Barbour is to permit said Perry to get such timber on the Madison land as can be with propriety used of as will not be at all exposed said Perry is to furnish every material of sand, lime, dust, of plank scantling & other timber in short every material of every kind & description necessary to the erection & completion of the houses aforesaid of the descriptions & in the styles aforesaid & to execute all the workmanship of brick, wood & plastering which will complete houses aforesaid all at his own expense; both as to procuring, hauling in place, and executing, including the finding of all hands, horses, teams, etc. and in short it is the understanding of the parties that with the exceptions of the particular articles aforesaid, which said Barbour is to furnish & the additional one that he is to permit said Perry to cut wood on his land, to burn brick of two third of old field pine & one third of oak said Perry is to furnish all and all & find all, as if he were building for himself which may be necessary to complete the houses aforesaid, of the
dimensions and in the styles aforesaid; and to deliver them complete to said Barbour by
October, 1823; In consideration whereof said Barbour, on his part agrees, to advance to said
Perry several hundred dollars on the 25th of December 1822, these two sums -- him in bond
which he will assign either in orange, Madison, Albemarle or Louisa, two thousand dollars when
the work is all completed, and to pay him in cash one thousand dollars, at the end of twelve
months from the completion of the work without any interest, making in the aggregate, the sum
of four thousand five hundred dollars; but if said Perry requires it, said Barbour is before the
close of the present year, to advance said Perry, one hundred dollars & to furnish for the year
1822 from his Madison land at much corn as he needs for his consumption about the aforesaid
work, for that year, at two dollars & fifty cents per barrel & both of these sums are to be
credited by said Perry to said Barbour as deductions out of the two thousand dollars to be paid
in bonds, and at the date of that payment. One or two descriptions omitted are here inserted;
the walls of the dwelling house above the basement story to be thirteen & one half inches thick;
& the front portico to have an ornamental window in the pediment. Instead of the partitions
made of the basement being two bricks to be one & a half; Sub-base in drawing room to be
equal to best at the University; the brickwork to be equal to any that the said -- will -- at the
University. Good samson brick to fill in with, but such as will make a strong & desirable wall.
Perry to affect in moving the old houses on the cheapest terms that anyone could do it. To lay a
brick from the front gate of the road to the house, of four feet wide. Three hundred dollars
more to be added to the -- to be paid in three equal payments beginning Christmas, 1822,
making in the whole four thousand eight hundred dollars of cash & bonds for this whole work;
and five hundred dollars of the bond payment of two thousand to be paid Christmas 1822
instead of when the work is done, but this is to be subtracted from the two thousand; There are
to be four thousand eight hundred dollars only to be paid for this whole in cash & bonds.

Witness our hands & seals this 7th November 1821.

P. P. Barbour (seal)

John M. Perry (seal)

One erasure of the words, one

& a half; & four instead

of three feet for the width

of a brick pavement, before

executed.

N. Br---ham

Wm. F. Gordon
Mr. Joseph in account with John M. Perry for work at Colo. Barbour's, Imbraced in their contract and not done by Pitt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-9 Sets of jambs and caseing, to cellar windows &amp;c</td>
<td>$14.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 feet work bonds (boards?) in cellar</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- -- to 5 flights of steps</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 eliptic arches in drawing room</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3600 feet of shingling</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 closets complete with doors &amp;c</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one stair case from chamber into cellar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ft 8 Tuscan connections</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 feet Chinese railing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 sets of double archatrace</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 cellars connections</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pr. vernition shelves</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Battin doors &amp;c</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$995.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by extra work done at Colo. Barbour's by Wm. Pitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 ft pannel door jambs differences that and plain</td>
<td>$19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 ft 8 window do -- differences between pannel &amp; plain</td>
<td>15.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional work done on sheeting 36 sors</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addition to front door</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altering window to get out in cellar &amp;C</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one window 5-6 lights sash in cellar</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Extra windows</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 d9 window</td>
<td>23.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work done on two temples</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra work done on Colonade</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbing round Colonade</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$331.36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra work on chimney piece</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$349.36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hewing lintols &amp; 2 Mantles</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Philip P. Barbour Papers, Manuscripts Division, Virginia Historical Society*
Letter from Philip Pendleton Barbour to Aedna Insurance Company.

Inquiry on fire insurance coverage for Frascati. Undated.

Referring to the written diagram A. is a two storied dwelling house covered with tin, with a portico in front covered with tin, with a two storied Piazza in the rear made of wood, and a portico at one end of wood, detached from other buildings, the nearest being the wooden maid's house, distance about 45 feet; there is no manufactory carried on within or about it. This dwelling is occupied by me, is about 57 feet long, and about 42 feet wide, and has a lightning rod at each end.

B. is the smoke house, one story of wood, distance from A. about 45 feet, about 16 feet long, and about 12 feet wide.

C. is the kitchen, one story high, of brick and covered with shingles. about 30 feet long and about 200 feet wide. distance from dwelling house about 60 feet, and from the servant house about 22 feet.

d. is a servant's house, one story of wood, about 80 feet from A. and about 22 feet from the kitchen.

E. is another servant's house, one story high of wood, distance form D about 66 feet.

F. is a two storied wooden mill, about 20 feet long and about 20 feet wide, with two pair of stones. one for grinding corn and the other for corn on the cob. There is a small building (lotts?), to (ba?)tt, flour from wheat sometime (sent?) in very small quantities to grind for servants there is no other mill, machinery, or manufactory whatsoever was it, or on the farm, except the ordinary ones on a farm, where as a wheat machine. & that for distance say not less than 500 yards the nearest house to it is the miller's house, about 80 feet.

At what premium will the Aedna Insurance Company insure?

signature???

Philip P. Barbour Papers, Manuscripts Division, Virginia Historical Society.
On the western slope of the Southwest Mountain, with a full view of the Blue Ridge, is Frascati, the home of Mr. and Mrs. John Woodriff near Somerset in Orange County. The house was built in 1815 by Judge Philip Pendleton Barbour, brother of Governor Barbour, whose estate, Barboursville, is just eight miles from here. Of old-rose colored brick, Frascati is said to have been constructed from plans drawn by Thomas Jefferson, a tradition which seems proven by the likeness of its mantles to one in the old University of Virginia building, now known as the Professors' Club House.

It is supposed that the garden was laid out soon after the house was finished. Originally, it was almost a square with a central walk of sempervirens boxwood extending a third of the way, the whole enclosed by a serpentine brick wall. The latter, alas, has vanished as have also the brick summer house and various small brick outbuildings.

A few shrubs, some plum trees, old-fashioned daffodils or narcissi, were the only remnants of the flower garden when the present owners came into possession. Twenty-seven years ago the latter moved a line of tree box which cut off the garden from the house and replanted it in semicircular wings extending from the ends of the long back porch. This idea of semicircles is being gradually carried out through the entire garden. Eighteen-foot box trees at each corner of the porch forms, with the boxwood wings, archways; one from front lawn to garden; the other, leading to the servants' quarters. Three large square have been made into open lawns surrounded by new box hedges and other shrubs, and a small square near the house at the right of the box walk is now growing into a flower garden with a sun-dial in the center and five
flowering cherries spaced evenly against the box hedge which describes a semicircle at the outer end.

Two huge tree box specimens flank the box walk at a distance of twenty feet upon each side. One of these has a circumference of the eighty-two feet, and not only overshadows but partly encloses the small flower garden. All of the hedges with one exception and many of the single box trees are divisions of the original hedges which bordered the front and side of the house.

The old central boxwood walk is of the course the glory of the garden. One hundred and sixty-two feet long, and twenty feet high and measuring forty feet from outside to outside, there is just room enough for two persons to walk through it. The lower ends extends in the form of little rooms, one of which is completely roofed with box. This hedge is exceedingly thick and green, a different variety from that forming the lovely walk at Hickory Hill.

The central walk of the garden measures five hundred and forty feet from house to end. Two raised turfed walks--one three hundred feet in length--divide the larger lawns planted with lilacs and other old shrubs. A most effective underplanting is achieved with hundreds of daffodils, chionodoxa, muscari, several varieties of wild crocus, fritillarias, scillas, carmassia, and tulips Persica, Clusiana and Kauffmaniana. Later in the season these flowers are supplanted by mats of primroses and sheets of sweet purple and white violets.