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ABSTRACT

Historic Preservation’s concept of significance has evolved throughout the discipline’s short lifespan. While this field is ever growing and adapting, there are pieces of history that get lost while waiting to be deemed significant. This leads to buildings, places, sites, and objects becoming lost while in hindsight they have significant qualities. However, this does not mean that information is lost permanently. This thesis reevaluates the plantation landscapes of St. John’s Parish, South Carolina lost when inundated by Lake Moultrie in 1942. Prior to this inundation, all structures were dismantled. This area covered roughly eighty-six square miles and contained twenty plantations. Architectural historian Thomas Waterman conducted a survey of the area in 1938 which focused on high style colonial and antebellum houses but mentioned very little about cultural landscapes or outbuildings. This thesis “fills-in” the Waterman report, recovering and assessing the landscapes and plantation outbuildings that were not included in 1938. The survey proposed in this thesis begins with a post hoc method with a case study in St. John’s Parish. The survey assessment began with available historical documents, maps, photographs and other historical images. This method of regaining information pertaining to lost sites and buildings can be applied to other survey. While conducting a post hoc study is not ideal for understanding historic sites, it will at times be a necessity. This thesis serves as an example of how to recreate lost historic sites and landscapes based on documentary evidence alone.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Documentation of historical resources requires some aspect of field work in order to create a record for further research, interpretation, and illustration. Unfortunately, many resources are lost before full investigation or documentation can take place. But does this mean that information is lost permanently? This thesis creates a methodology for recovering lost history by establishing a *post hoc* survey method. It starts by reevaluating the survey of St. John’s Parish in South Carolina conducted by Thomas Waterman in 1938. The data for this research pertains to the resources now submerged by the Santee-Cooper Hydroelectric Project. This now submerged region serves as the case study for creating the

![Figure 1: Lake Marion and Lake Moultrie, Santee Cooper Project, SC; © 2010 University of South Carolina.](image)
proposed methodology (see figure 1). It evaluates previously overlooked cultural elements within the original survey area and then creates a criterion for inclusion.

The purpose of the post hoc survey is to build on the original survey. This survey method was based on current Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and National Register Criteria. Since the discipline of historic preservation broadened its definition of inclusion over the past eighty years, reevaluating early surveys can help revise our understanding of specific resources and recover missing or incomplete datasets. What is important to the historical record often comes in flows of fads. As a result, something that is later considered important is already lost. This post hoc method shows the need for reevaluation and how to re-engage with lost cultural resources.

Prior to construction of the Santee Cooper reservoirs in the late 1930s, focus was on documenting and recording the main plantation houses. Less attention was given to the surrounding landscape and outbuildings. The outbuildings, dwellings and landscapes of these plantations were a reflection of all the people who lived within the plantation complexes, important among them were the enslaved persons. This area covers roughly eight-six square miles and contained over twenty working plantations.1 While the modern lakes also encompass areas of St. Matthews Parish (established 1768) and St. Stephens

---

Parish (established in 1754) the scope of this thesis will be limited to submerged portions of St. Johns Parish.

1938 Survey

Prior to construction of the hydroelectric project, Thomas T. Waterman completed a survey of the area to be affected and inundated by the project. During this time, Waterman was pursuing other projects for Historic American Buildings Survey, this is evidence to

Figure 2: Santee Cooper Project Area Map Depicting the Plantations with the proposed St. John's Parish. 1938-1952, South Carolina Historical Society.

1938 Survey

Prior to construction of the hydroelectric project, Thomas T. Waterman completed a survey of the area to be affected and inundated by the project. During this time, Waterman was pursuing other projects for Historic American Buildings Survey, this is evidence to
suggest this project was rushed. He made notes of several plantations thought to be affected, but with many he only included a few photos and sketched floor plans of the main houses. When the construction was completed, the area was flooded and the historical resources, except for a few that were relocated, were lost beneath the waters.2

Thomas Waterman evaluated the plantations based on what was the standard methods of significance to record the main houses located in the inundation area. If a plantation no longer had a standing house, like Saracens Plantation, Moorefield Plantation, and Chelsea Plantation, he did not include them in the survey.3 Early historic preservation work focused on best examples of architecture. Over the years, more significance has been placed on vernacular architecture. This thesis revisits the resources included in the Waterman survey, evaluates and recovers previously overlooked cultural elements by using methods of data salvage, and reconstructs the cultural and architectural landscapes.

Methods

This thesis demonstrates the need for and establishes a methodology for post hoc surveys. A post hoc survey need arises when the cultural material of interest is no longer extant. This survey proposes a method for retrieving information from no longer extant, un-reachable, and prohibited sites. This type of survey explores resources that have been neglected in past surveys. St. John’s Parish works well as a case study as all the buildings had been dismantled and the area inundated. The first step for this thesis was to reevaluate

---

2 Waterman, A Survey of Early Buildings, 36.
3 There are other plantations in the area that Waterman did not include in his report. These three he specifically calls out in his report. He does not visit these plantations. Waterman, A Survey of Early Buildings, 35.
the report by Thomas Waterman from 1938. This was done by comparing standards of recording buildings in 1938 and normal protocols of today. The second was to delve into what literature existed on the history of the area. Once this was conducted, the need for the thesis became evident. Since the history of these individual plantations and their landscapes was lacking, a purpose for recreating via a post hoc method, was established.

The goal of the post hoc survey is to build on what Waterman recorded in 1938. To create a new survey, an understanding of Waterman’s criterion for inclusion had to be evaluated. Waterman’s focus was placed on the main plantation houses with very little description of surrounding landscapes or outbuildings. Therefore, this survey was designed to create a criterion to document these buildings. Buildings included for this survey consisted of buildings involved with social and agricultural components considered a part of the working plantation. This includes, but is not limited to: dwellings, kitchens, smokehouses, and barns. Other aspects of the plantation considered are boundaries. This can be ditches, creeks, or fences. Boundaries are used to divide and control the land for the purposes of the plantation. Examples might be found between the main house and the enslaved work yard, or even the rice fields.

Since previously overlooked resources are no longer standing and have been inundated by the flooding of the Santee-Cooper hydroelectric project, documentation of these buildings could not follow the contemporary protocols. Typical protocols require site visits and documentation of extant features. Documentation requires measuring buildings, photographing, and field research. With these resources, the information obtained relied significantly on surviving photographic and documentary evidence. Photographs can give
us many details to the structural type, materials, and use of the buildings. In some cases, the layout of the buildings was determined. Plats and maps of these plantations also aided in determining the landscape. Analysis of the plantation landscape required looking for patterns within the known information.

The photographs used for this analysis are all that remain as evidence of the plantation landscapes and buildings located within the project area. The photographs were assessed through HABS guidelines. The features that were assessed include: architectural style, form, function, material, and historical significance. All the buildings were evaluated based on a level of local significance since the region had already established a particular architectural style as discussed by Waterman.

For the post hoc method, extensive historical research conducted this survey. The report by Thomas Waterman was used to reference the plantations within the now-flooded area. The material associated with these plantations, available on the Library of Congress website, was used. These materials include all the photographs and field sketches by Waterman. The Lowcountry Digital Library (LCDL) and Historic Charleston Foundation (HCF) archives also contained useful records. The South Carolina Historical Society (SCHS) and the collections at the South Caroliniana Library were also consulted.

The post hoc survey established an analysis of each plantation as to how many outbuildings were extant in 1938. This information is discussed in the results section to show the usefulness of gathering data in this manner. This also shows the probability of

---

5 https://www.loc.gov/
data that might be found after a significant amount of time has elapsed. For St. John’s Parish, over 80 years had passed since the original survey was completed. While some written documentation was found, photographs proved the most useful.

**Region and History**

St. John’s Parish is located within the Lowcountry of South Carolina. The area is located 50 miles north of Charleston, South Carolina, and extends from the reaches of the Northern Santee River, south to the head waters of the Cooper River. The Santee River and the Cooper River have long been important to the commercial and social needs of the community in St. John’s Parish. The Santee River, which borders the northern portion of St. John’s Parish, was an important resource to the plantations within St. John’s Parish. The lakes of the Santee-Cooper engulf the once bountiful land. The landscape of the region was drastically changed by the construction of the lakes and the hydroelectric plant in 1938. The project affected over 200,000 acres of land within the parish.

**Settlement**

St. John’s Parish lies within the reaches of the Santee River at its northeastern extent and the southeastern reaches of the Cooper River (see figure 3). In addition to their importance for transportation, these rivers make up a part of the swamp land that made the area viable for agriculture. Rice was suitable for the swamplands and the highlands were suitable for indigo cultivation. These swamp lands were what brought many settlers to the

---

area as early as 1680, when the first settlers came to the area. It became an official parish in 1706 under the Church Act. Huguenots escaping France from religious persecution, were among the first to settle the region along with the English. They were not the only settlers to come to the region as the early settlers were made up of a diverse group of immigrants. Along with these settlers came an influx of Africans used as slaves. By 1715, the enslaved African population was over 750 persons, tripling the number of Europeans within the area. Historian George Terry claims that the steady rise of Africans into the area was not only due to the rise in production at the plantations but also due to natural increase among

7 Terry, Champaign Country, 41-89. Edgar. A History of South Carolina, 50.; Richard Porcher, Our Lost Heritage (Unpublished Manuscript) 133. This manuscript is still under edits and can be obtained from the owner.

Figure 3: St. John's Parish, 1790. Universal Magazine, Vol. LXIV Pg 281.
the enslaved community. He suggests that slave owners encouraged marriage among the enslaved Africans to produce children for the labor force. According to Terry, these families were largely able to stay intact due to the size of the plantations. At Dean Hall, he shows that 70 percent of the enslaved community contained family buildings while the remaining fourteen percent were a mixture of singles residing in households of extent family members. Of non-related singles, sixteen percent were found to be living within the community. All of the enslaved community would have resided within a “settlement” and shared cooking and other common activities. The enslaved Africans residing on the plantations would have made up the entire labor force of the plantation. The majority would

---

8 Terry, Champaign Country, 143-146.
have been used in typical agricultural work, specifically rice, indigo, and later cotton production. Skilled labor such as weaving, blacksmithing, brickmaking, carpentry etc., would also have been encouraged and made mandatory to learn among the enslaved community. This allowed the plantation to be more self-sufficient and to as keep expenses of other necessities, such as clothing, down. Following the Civil War, the freed African Americans still worked on many of plantations as tenant farmers (see figure 4). By the time Waterman conducted his report, many African-Americans were still living in communities located on these plantations. They lived in houses originally built for their enslaved ancestors and used other outbuildings from the slave days of the plantations.

The community of St. John’s Parish was a diverse one, containing many cultures. The people who resided here helped shaped the land. By the 1740s, St. John’s was becoming its own community separate from the rest of the colony. The elite families purchased many of the smaller surrounding farms and larger plantations were established.

**Agricultural Development and Land Use**

The agricultural use of the area changed over the years. This shaped not only the community of Middle St. John’s Parish but the plantation landscapes as well. With each new endeavor more buildings were built, new fences went up, and new boundaries between enslaved and free people were created.

The plantations within St. John’s Parish primarily cultivated rice and later cotton. Indigo was a major secondary crop to rice. These crops kept laborers consistently busy.

---


11 Porcher, *Our Lost Heritage*, Unpublished Manuscript, 610-633. This information is supported by interviews Richard Porcher conducted for his manuscript.
Rice fields would be prepared through the months of January until March. From April until May the fields were planted. Once harvested, the remainder of the year was spent preparing the grain for market. Indigo preparation began a month after rice and was ready for a first cutting around July. The maintenance of both crops was strenuous and time consuming. All fields had to be constantly hoed and weeded until ready for harvesting. This agricultural industry relied heavily on the trade agreements with Great Britain, especially with regard to indigo. By the 1790s, most plantation production was centered around long-staple cotton. Construction of the Santee Canal just a few years later boosted the area’s economic success.

The planters within Middle St. John’s diversified their crops. Both indigo and rice were early crops produced. Indigo production unfortunately declined in Middle St. John’s following the Revolutionary War. The bounty that was placed on indigo by England was effectively removed following the war and trade with Europe was no longer feasible. None the less, indigo left its mark on the land. The indigo manufacturing process requires a drying house, dams, and vats. Enslaved laborers would work with the crop from December until July and into August. Plantations were year-long operations within Middle St. John’s. Reservoir rice production was common place in Middle St. John’s though two forms of this exist. Inland swamp and artesian spring methods both required extensive manipulation of the landscape for cultivation. Inland swamps are fed by a nearby water source and are manipulated by a ditches and embankments allowing water to flow into and

---

12 George Terry, *Champaign Country*, 258-266.
13 Ibid.
out of the fields through trunks. Artesian springs contribute to the water source for the rice fields. Buildings associated with rice production include winnowing barns, threshing barns, seed house, rice chimney and rice mills.  

After the Revolutionary War, the production of rice and indigo never again emerged as a principal crop in St. John’s Parish. Rice continued to be produced but Santee long-staple cotton became the primary crop. Plantation production grew up until the time of the Civil War. Following the war, production dropped though the crop never disappeared from the landscape. Buildings associated with the production of cotton included seed houses, storing barns, cotton gins etc. Necessary with the production of cotton, fiber processing took place in weaving and loom houses in order to prepare the fiber for textile manufacture.  

Over the years, the plantations became more self-sufficient. Many daily trades were learned by the enslaved persons living and working in the plantation complex. Brick production, joinery, blacksmithing, and weaving just to name a few. Many of the plantations began breeding thoroughbred horses. These horses definitely served as a status symbol as these horses were imported from England. These horses were used extensively for both plantation work and sport.  

Following the turn of the twentieth century, many of the plantations sold their timber to private entities and northern investors. The large plantations became used by the

---

15 Terry, Champaign Country, 243-278; Porcher, Our Lost Heritage, 665-675.
16 Ibid.; Porcher, The Story of Sea Island Cotton; Edleson, Plantation Enterprise in Colonial South Carolina, 48 and 259.
17 Porcher, Our Lost Heritage 203 and 440.
upper class in the region as hunting lodges. These old plantations had different uses for the African Americans living in the homes of their enslaved ancestors.

**African American Settlements**

Following the Civil War, many African Americans joined in labor contracts with their former owners. Initiated and handled by the Freedman’s Bureau this enabled freed people to work and live where they had during slavery. Many freed individuals were sharecroppers for the families they served under before the war. Many purchased their own land to farm as their own. From this, small African American communities emerged in St. John’s (see figure 5 and 6).  

These communities once again shaped the landscape of St. John’s Parish. Freed people lived along the original slave streets and worked the same fields (see figures 4-6). Some plantations were sectioned off and divided into smaller parcels inevitably creating

---

18 Porcher, *Our Lost Heritage*, 610-628. These communities were photographed by Samuel Lord Hyde prior to the construction of the reservoirs. These photographs, and the notes taken by Hyde, are all that document these communities outside of the interviews conducted by Richard Porcher. Samuel Lord Hyde Photographs, Lowcountry Digital Library; Samuel Lord Hyde papers, 1901-1939, SCHS.
new communities. Churches and schools were established by the African Americans living in the community. They lived and worked this land and made it their own until Santee-Cooper literally changed the course of the river.\(^{19}\)

Unfortunately, little documentation is left of these communities. Samuel Lord Hyde was sent by Santee-Cooper to photograph the area. His pictures and notes on the African American communities in 1939 were bleak. He described a desolate and dilapidated existence.\(^{20}\) Walter Edgar in his book commemorating the fifty-year anniversary of Santee-Cooper describes the area in a similar manner. His description of the area during the onset of the project is one that resembles many Great Depression era stories. He states that the area’s decline began with the fall of cotton prices following the first World War.\(^{21}\)

Based on a collection of interviews conducted by Richard Porcher for his upcoming book, *Our Lost Heritage*, those African Americans living within Middle St. John’s say their life was much better than what was described by Hyde.\(^{22}\) They were typical farmers living the only life they had ever known, but with the construction of the reservoirs the majority of their history and legacy was lost. From slavery following emancipation a history of an entire community was lost beneath the waters. They lost cemeteries, churches, schools, homes, and a community.\(^{23}\) While some families and their homes were relocated to a community in Bonneau, they gained little by the Santee-Cooper project. During this

---

\(^{19}\) Porcher, *Our Lost Heritage*, 610-628.

\(^{20}\) Samuel Lord Hyde Photographs, Lowcountry Digital Library; Samuel Lord Hyde papers, 1901-1939, SCHS.


\(^{22}\) Porcher, *Our Lost Heritage*, 625-628; Samuel Lord Hyde papers, 1901-1939, SCHS.

time their opinion on leaving their home had little value with the authorities. Without the right to vote, or the financial ability to hire lawyers, they could not withstand the inevitable change. They could not even afford the electricity and “advancement” that Santee-Cooper brought to the region.

**Canals and Waterways**

The success of these inland plantations in St. John’s Parish relied heavily on access to Charleston Port. Those plantations along the Santee River used this waterway as a quick route down to the coast, but the river was often overburdened by debris and often impassible. As early as 1770, the idea to control the river system through a series of canals began. This would encourage movement, settlements, and trading further inland. 24 The construction of the canal relied heavily on the work of enslaved persons from nearby plantations. Following the American Revolution, indigo production had fallen off and many slave owners had little work for their workers. The Santee Canal Company rented both male and female slaves to complete the work on the canal. While other canal operations had employed women to work as cooks, seamstresses, and other duties, the Santee Canal Company used women as a third of their major workforce. 25 The Santee canal operated from 1800 to around 1850. It lost use after the railroad boom in the middle of the 19th century. While the canal saw may highs and lows, it did help the economy of the inland plantations. It made the export of goods more expedient as well as the import of needed

---

resources, such as new slaves. The plantations located within St. John’s Parrish relied heavily on the use of and ease of access to the canal for all its commerce. 26

**Santee-Cooper Project**

Even by the turn of the 20th century, there were discussions of revamping the early canal. A more direct waterway was still needed for the more inland farms and plantations to reach the port of Charleston. By the 1930s, discussions turned to electrifying the rural community. Beginning as the South Carolina Public Service Authority, these discussions developed into actuality by 1934. It was the hope of the Public Serve Authority (Santee-Cooper) to bring prosperity to the area. 27 Many of the surveys sent out by Santee-Cooper describe the area as a desolate community in need of resources. Many of the larger

---


27 Afterwards referred to as Santee-Cooper exclusively.
plantations were no longer cultivated crops, but relied more on selling their timber and others were used for hunting clubs. The goal of the South Carolina Service Authority, or Santee-Cooper, was to bring life back to the supposedly dying area. The Enabling Act of April 1934, sought to accomplish four goals: to provide affordable electricity to South Carolina; develop navigable waterways along the Santee, Cooper, and Congaree Rivers; reclaim and drain swamp lands; and reforest watersheds along the rivers.28

Despite those reports, Santee-Cooper met a backlash from the old families in the area. Since its beginning, this project was not well received. From environmental factors to the fear of too much government involvement, the project was met with opposition. People were troubled that a history and region would be lost. The area contained a high

Figure 8: Cleared Timber, Berkeley County, 1940; Library of Congress.

28 Bostick, Sunken Plantations, 16; Edgar, History of Santee Cooper, 5; The official title is Act to Incorporate the South Carolina Public Service Authority and to Define its Powers and Duties.
degree of historical importance with its battlefields, early American churches, cemeteries, plantations, and so forth. Many residents did not want to see this area so rapidly and completely changed. No matter the resistance, “progress” won and construction began in 1939. To alleviate concerns, three intact plantation houses were saved: Woodlawn Plantation, The Rocks Plantation, and Hanover Plantation.

African Americans in the community also disagreed with the accounts sent out by Santee-Cooper. To them this was their home. Many had known little else. Unfortunately, their voices were not considered. Over 900 African-Americans became displaced due to the project. Santee-Cooper did help relocate many homes that existed in these African American communities and a new community was established around the lakes, but it took generations before most African American residents benefited from the project.

By 1941 the project reached completion, resulting in the creation of Lake Marion and Lake Moultrie. Both lakes were named for Revolutionary War heroes that had plantations within the flooded area. The construction of the dam along the Santee River held back the waters creating the larger 100,000-acre lake named for General Francis Marion. The smaller of the two lakes, Lake Moultrie named for General William Moultrie, contained 60,000-acres of water.

With the rise of these waters a history was lost. Prior to this inundation an opportunity to do justice to the history of the area was missed. Through the National Park

30 MESDA collection, Access # 0000.21, Original Installation: Frank L. Horton; Renovations: The dining room of White Hall was moved to the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts (MESDA), Richard C. von Hess Foundation, White Hall Dining Room, http://mesda.org/item/collections/dining-room/21326/.
31 Bostick, *Sunken Plantations*, 12; Porcher, *Our Lost Heritage*, 610-628
Service, Thomas Waterman conducted a report on some of the buildings within the proposed project area in 1938. He was principal in having Hanover relocated outside the flood zone.

Submerged beneath the waters of Lake Marion and Lake Moultrie, these resources finally can recount the history of all its inhabitants. Photographs recovered from multiple archival resources are used here for assessing the style of buildings and layout of the working plantation. This thesis delves into methods with which to recover lost components of history. While additional documentation was needed for this thesis, the prime objective was discovering methods by which data salvage are possible. Within the preservation field, it is not always possible to document or save every historical building, landscape feature, or cultural element. While data salvaging is not the ideal for documentation, it will at times be a necessity. This thesis should serve as an example for future methods of data retrieval when a resource has been lost by unforeseen circumstances. It is not all water under the bridge, there is a history that lies beneath, ready to tell us more, if we only look close enough.
CHAPTER TWO

Background Methodology

This thesis accomplishes two goals. The first goal is to fill in the lost history of the plantations with descriptions of the landscapes and workings of the plantations in the region. The second goal is to create a methodology for future use in parallel endeavors. This case study shows what is possible when access to a site of significance is lost. It also serves to prove the importance of diligently recording and documenting history prior to its destruction. Even in more recent history, places of significance have been lost. This has been especially true when time restraints are often the cause of inadequate documentation, thus causing a survey to be rushed only to find later that a resource had not been fully documented. Waterman’s report and this thesis are testament to this type of situation. This is hopefully an example of how to take the first step in reclaiming lost history.

To create the methodology for a post hoc survey, an overview of the original survey (conducted in 1938 by Thomas Waterman) and general survey methods will be discussed. In addition to this, literature regarding the plantation landscapes is also included. This will create a background of how surveys and historic preservation developed over time. The importance of this thesis is to emphasize detailed, on-site surveys as well as the usefulness of a post hoc survey. The summary of Waterman’s report is provided. This is followed by a literature review into the history and development of historic preservation methodology. Thirdly, the steps used to create the post hoc survey are discussed. This section will lead into the analysis of the plantations which will include a brief history, Waterman’s observations, and the historical research that makes up the post hoc survey.
Waterman’s Survey

Before discussing the individual plantations, an in-depth look at Thomas Waterman’s survey is needed. This thesis steps beyond the bounds of simply documenting the lost outbuildings but explores the reasoning for their exclusion. This is conducted by exploring the development of the Historic Structures survey. The report entitled, *A Survey of the Early Buildings in the region of the proposed Santee and Pinopolis Reservoirs in South Carolina*, assessed the area to be inundated by the proposed reservoirs construction. Waterman states that his report serves as a “brief written and photographic record” of the buildings within the area and to assess their “architectural value.” The research area proposed by Waterman included the area to be inundated by the Santee-Cooper reservoirs. The reservoirs today make up Lake Marion and Lake Moultrie. His report included photos and sketches of eighteen plantation houses with varying detail of descriptions. Waterman’s report inspired the relocation of three of these plantation houses, The Rocks Plantation, Hanover Plantation, and Woodlawn Plantation. The Rocks Plantation was the only one moved along with its outbuildings, but, unfortunately the main house burned in 1992. By using the Waterman report as an example, this thesis seeks to “fill-in-the-blanks” of this lost history by using methods of data salvage to reconstruct the landscapes.

---

34 Ibid.
Architecture of St. Johns Parish

Thomas Waterman based his examples of St. John’s high style architecture on two architectural plans. These he labeled the Santee Plan and the Pinopolis Plan. The types differed mostly in floor plan, while there were some houses that exhibit attributes of both plans. The Santee Plan was typically an asymmetrical central hall floor plan with two rooms of unequal size near the front and two rooms flanking the rear hall (see figure 9). These houses would typically have two front entrances off the large porch. One entrance would lead to the larger room, the other door to the smaller room. Waterman noted that these floor plans later became more adapted or rearranged as the asymmetrical floor plan did not work. The roofs of those houses in the Santee Plan were gabled and contained a number of dormers across the second floor. The Pinopolis Plan varied in that it was more symmetrical and the roofs were typically hipped (see figure 10). Outside of these features

Figure 9: Santee Plan with Additions, Thomas Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.
they mimicked their neighbors in the Santee area. Waterman determined that while these houses resembled Caribbean or French West Indies architecture, the plans had evolved naturally for the purposes of those in St. John’s.

![Figure 10: Pinopolis Plan, Ophir Plantation; Thomas Waterman Survey Sketch, Library of Congress.](image)

In addition to these plans, Waterman assessed other attributes of the high style architecture of the region. These related more to the finishing’s on the exterior and interior. The ornate and careful craftsmanship that the majority of St. John’s parish houses reflect was not lost on Waterman. These ornate details Waterman described as being mid-Georgian or Federal-inspired detailing. Waterman attributed the importance of the house to the level of detail given to these finishings.

---

35 These were more recently researched by Jeremy Bradham in his Master’s thesis, *The Documentation of Lawson’s Pond Plantation and the Craftsmanship Employed in the Upper St. John’s Parish, Berkeley County, South Carolina*, Master’s Thesis, Dept. of Historic Preservation, (Clemson University, 2007).
What was Waterman’s Significance Criteria?

To fully understand the methods employed in conducting an early architectural survey, the report Thomas Waterman wrote must be evaluated. The purpose of this is to establish the criteria that Waterman was using in assessing the plantations. Once an understanding of Waterman’s criteria are in hand, the post hoc survey can begin with its own set of criteria. Waterman never clarified why the sample of eighteen plantations that were included in his report were chosen. Other plantations are briefly mentioned throughout his report, but these eighteen are the only ones he visited for the purpose of his survey. It is assumed, though Waterman did not say, that he visited other plantations in the area. Waterman had to have visited these other plantations; otherwise, it is unclear how he knew if the main houses were no longer standing. He distinctly claimed three plantations no longer retain the main house. This is also the reason he mentioned they were not included in the report. Therefore, unless he was going off some other information, he must have visited these plantations to know they no longer existed. Since Waterman made the claim that Saracen Plantation, Moorfield Plantation, and Chelsea Plantation were not included because the main house was no longer standing, it seems obvious that Waterman’s assessment of the historic buildings was confined to the main houses. This does not mean that Waterman did not care about other buildings. In fact, the report itself is testament to this. At three plantations, of the eighteen he surveyed, he describes outbuildings. In several other plantations he discusses the conditions of the fields and surrounding landscape. Waterman also included photographs of many of these resources. It seems obvious that the architecture of these once fine plantation houses was the focal point of Thomas Waterman’s
report. While Waterman made observations of others buildings, his first purpose was the main houses. This follows the standard practice for preservation at the time. Preservation began with preserving examples of high style architecture. Other sites were deemed significant for their associations with the people who lived in those houses. Typically, these noteworthy people lived in homes of high style architecture. Waterman based his evaluations of significance on what he knew of the regions history.\textsuperscript{36}

In St. John’s Parish, Waterman’s focus centered around the Huguenot influences that he expected to see. Knowing that the Huguenots were a large part of establishing the parish, he expected to see traces of these influences. He claims that because of war and neglect, little remained of the Huguenot influences throughout the region. While he struggles to find these influences at most of the plantations, Hanover Plantation stands out

\textsuperscript{36} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early}, 2.
to him. For Waterman, this is the best remaining example of Huguenot influence in the region. In fact, it is the only house he claims to have national importance. Hanover Plantation, having been constructed 1716, Waterman claims it is “unique to the colonies.”

These Huguenot influences at Hanover Plantation, according to Waterman, are the Gambrel roof with wide spread dormers which mimic houses in the French West Indies. Another identifier of French influence is the inlay on the chimney top in French; Peu a Peu (see figure 13). While Waterman describes the house in great detail, very little is verified on his definition of French or Huguenot influences.

Figure 13: Hanover Chimney, Peu a Peu. 2018, Kristina Poston.

---

38 Waterman specifically calls out Guadeloupe in the French West Indies. His examination of what this means is very slim, 10.
39 Roughly translated means “little by little.”, 10.
40 The main door to Hanover Waterman describes as having been “French in style” with large panels. He describes it as so, “There are two large horizontal panels separated by a narrow one in the center. This latter has a sunk panel mould, and the former very wide bevels covered with richly worked applied mouldings at intersection with the rails and styles......and is so completely French.” Unfortunately, the location of this door unknown as it has not been seen since Hanover’s removal, 10.
Another point of significance that Waterman points out from time to time in his report, is the construction date. He mentions the significance of houses built prior to 1800. Like the Hanover Plantation house, built in 1716, this house was deemed significant because it reflects, not only Huguenot influences, but those of early colonial America. The other plantation houses eventually relocated, due to Waterman’s suggestion, were built following 1800. These houses are significant on their architectural value alone. For Hanover Plantation, or others built prior to 1800, these had national value. From this it can be determined that Waterman was assessing the buildings on different levels, those locally and those nationally. For instance, The Rocks was relocated due to its architectural value to the region. Waterman felt that house was a prime example of the architecture in the region.

In conclusion, Waterman is vague about what he is deeming significant or of “architectural value.” From how he wrote about the plantations, it can be gathered what exactly he was assessing. Taking this into consideration with standards at the time, a criterion for Waterman’s survey can be obtained. Waterman was assessing plantation houses based on their colonial value, this being established as anything built prior to 1800. The influence of Huguenot architecture also featured into his assessment as well as ornamental or high style architecture.

To sum up the Waterman’s assessment of significance: he focused his attention on the main houses, he looked for Huguenot influences, emphasized that structures built prior to 1800 were of national importance, and on the local scale significance was evaluated by the level of detail and floor plans of the high style architecture.
Report Assessment

Whether under pressure of time or by Santee-Cooper, Waterman’s report seems inconsistent. He disregarded anything built following 1800 for national importance though he does allow some exceptions for local significance. Built in 1805, The Rocks Plantation was one that impressed Waterman. Here he seems to almost disregard his previous evaluations of architectural value. What is prominent about his evaluation of The Rocks Plantation is its good condition, as it had been recently renovated at the time of his assessment. He draws the comparison to the other worn and neglected plantations within the region. This is an unusual reason for determining that other plantations were not significant. Most of the houses had only recently been uninhabited. Repairs would have been a minimal necessity. His evaluation of the condition of the houses placed too much emphasis on having a pristine appearance, rather than an appreciation for their functional and stylistic attributes. This bias in his perspective resulted in a failure to recognize the significance of other important plantations.

Lawson’s Pond Plantation is a perfect example of this bias. Though it is one of the plantations that were untouched by the flood waters, its importance to the region is insurmountable. He describes the weatherboard of the house as being discolored by weathering and left unrestored. This is in fact untrue. To this day the weatherboard of Lawson’s Pond Plantation is grey and weathered. This is not due to dilapidation, and was left in its raw state intentionally. The boards are cypress and were never meant to be painted. Cypress has natural repellents to insects and painting can harm the natural elements in the wood. He downplays the elaborate nature of the finishes that make
Lawson’s Pond plantation house so grand. Perhaps his disregard for the plantation was more prominent due to its safe location away from the impending waters. His assessments appear rushed and hurried without real cause given for what he is seeing. This urgency is voiced by Waterman in discussing the lack of time devoted to visiting all the plantations within the region, chiefly St. Julien Plantation, Walnut Grove Plantation, and Numertia Plantation. However, it seems like he is more disappointed that there is such a lack of evidence for the Huguenot influence among the plantations.41

As Frisk Kimball describes of Waterman in his review of Waterman’s *The Dwellings of Colonial America*, Kimball notes that Thomas Waterman seeks evidence for European influences.42 It is in this review that Kimball suggests that Waterman forces the French influences on the attributes of Hanover house. More plainly, what Kimball suggests is that Waterman was so caught up in identifying only Huguenot influences, that he failed to notice others. This appears to cause the lack of immediacy in his request to Santee-Cooper for further documentation.

Waterman’s final resolve is to encourage further documentation of the area. He does suggest that both measured drawings and photographs be made of all the plantations within the region. He again claims in his conclusion that his report is not meant to be the stand alone record of the area but merely an “examination of the material.”43 While he continues to assess the importance of several homes worthy of removal and relocation, he

again discusses the dilapidation of the majority of plantation homes. While his conclusion is a call for better documentation, it is a weak one. It’s interesting to note that the houses that he deemed important, other than Pond Bluff Plantation, were all relocated. This even includes Woodlawn Plantation, one home that he details in disrepair but deems worthy. Perhaps if throughout the report he would have shown more encouragement to the majority of the plantations they too would have been saved. Could the fact that this almost deliberate misdirection of the importance of these plantations throughout the report be why Santee-Cooper never followed through with a full documentation? As Waterman himself says, it would only need three people working for approximately three months. It is worth considering his lack of favor for the majority of the houses within the region and how it could have heavily influenced future decisions. Either way, no further documentation of the plantations was considered and houses were dismantled and the flood waters engulfed the landscapes. With the exception of Northampton Plantation, where he surveyed the surrounding landscapes and outbuildings, he disregards these features. These buildings seldom appear in his documentation as a whole. His focus remains attentive to more high style colonial architecture. Unless outbuildings specifically exuded this style, they were disregarded. Even for the outbuildings at Northampton Plantation, he gives very minimal description and regard. For the other plantations in the region, he gives little indication as to the existence of these buildings.44

44 Waterman, A Survey of the Early Buildings.
Early Historic Preservation Methods

Thomas Waterman surveyed St. John’s Parish with standards the profession had enacted at that time. These standards created lenses for which historic preservationists viewed the area to be surveyed. As attested by Waterman in the title of his report, his survey focused on the early buildings. Colonial architecture was not only the focus of the preservation movement, but of architecture in general. During the 1930s there was a rise in Colonial Revival architecture. Historic preservation was just developing as a discipline during the time Waterman set out to conduct this survey. The surrounding landscape and outbuildings occasionally caught his eye and he reported what he observed. To fully understand why Waterman conducted the survey in the manner that he did, a discussion of the development of historic preservation is needed. This leads into the need for developing the post hoc survey discussed in Chapter Three.

The preservation movement started shortly after the birth of the nation. As early as the nineteenth century, patriotic Americans were concerned with saving places of importance. The places they deemed important related to the early days of the country. An early example of this is the saving of Independence Hall. This was the site of the signing of both the Declaration of Independence and The Constitution. In 1813, citizens of Pennsylvania encouraged and fought to save this nationally important site. These early attempts at preservation focused on sites, such as this, that directly related to patriotism
and colonial heritage.\textsuperscript{45} Heritage revolved around great people, specific events, and specific architectural style. While much of the early movement of preservation was started by locally concerned citizens, local governments were also involved. As early as 1848, the State of New York fought to protect the Hasbrouck House.\textsuperscript{46} The Hasbrouck house was used by General George Washington during the Revolutionary War as one of his campaign headquarters. The State of New York became very interested in purchasing the house to ensure its safekeeping. They were successful in this endeavor and even purchased six additional acres surrounding the property to ensure its preservation. This movement was the first state organized preservation endeavor.\textsuperscript{47} Robert Stipe discusses the early movement as centered on “ancestor worship” and the “aesthetic movement.”\textsuperscript{48} Traditionally, Stipe claims, preservation has been concerned with “great people, great events, and great architects.”\textsuperscript{49} This drive for saving particular sites lead to the industrialization of history. Many historic sites, museums, and memorials were erected for the education of the public. Saving these sites and making them available to the general public was an outlet used to educate immigrants and Americans on the history of America.\textsuperscript{50}


\textsuperscript{46} Hosmer, \textit{Presence of the Past}, 40.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{48} Stipe, \textit{A Richer Heritage}, iv.

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{50} Hosmer, \textit{Presence of the Past}, 20 and \textit{Preservation comes of Age}, 5; Stipe, \textit{A Richer Heritage}, 8.
This early movement of preservation continued well into the twentieth century. Historians establish the official beginning of preservation with the successful saving of George Washington’s home at Mount Vernon. Washington’s house was established as a historic site in 1858 through the diligent work of local preservationists. Again, this house was saved based mainly on the association with a great person.51 These early sets of criteria remained among preservationist well into 1940. This follows directly with the movement of the nation as a whole. Between 1850-1940, the nation showed a significant desire for Colonial Revival architecture. During this early period, buildings exhibiting great artistic or architectural detail, as well as being attributed to a well-known architect, were highly coveted.52 By the early twentieth century the criteria for selecting historic buildings was well established. These were buildings reflecting national heritage, colonial events, and founding fathers. It also extended to specific architectural detail that reflected colonial times or a famous architect or craftsman. Charles Hosmer claims that preservationists fell in to separate camps during this period. Those with historical interests tended to promote the saving of a building which reflected heritage and patriotism. These buildings would be considered useful in educating the public on American history. Others focused on appreciating the fine details of architecture.53

By 1920, preservation was rapidly developing and more government involvement increased during this period. While the preservation movement began as a grass roots movement it quickly spread to local and then national agencies. The government became

---

53 Ibid.
increasingly more concerned with protecting sites of national importance. President Theodore Roosevelt, was instrumental in the founding of several important preservation movements. Under his term as president he established the conservation of national lands as well as the Antiquities Act of 1906.\(^{54}\) In 1916, the National Parks Service (NPS) was established, but it was not until the 1930s that historians were hired by the NPS. Thomas Waterman began his career with the NPS in 1934. The Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) was established in 1933 during the Great Depression. This program helped employ out of work architects and photographers.\(^{55}\) The surveys required by these organizations were limited to the built environment and did not include any archaeological or Native American sites. The main focus for historians during this time was to “identify” and “inventory” buildings of national importance. Written in 1937, a memorandum for surveys clearly states that structures built after 1860 were not to be considered.\(^{56}\) Architectural historians followed these protocols well into the mid-twentieth century. Preservation remained focused on finding buildings relating to important events, people, and architecture. The movement is best expressed by a quote of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1935:

“The preservation of historic sites for the public benefit, together with their proper interpretation, tends to enhance the respect and love of the citizen for the institutions of his country, as well as strengthen his resolution to defend unselfishly the hallowed traditions and high ideals of America.”\(^{57}\)

---

\(^{54}\) Hosmer, *Preservation Comes of Age*, 260.


\(^{56}\) “First Steps in Historic Sites Survey” Memorandum for Field Historians, April 26, 1937, National Park Service.

\(^{57}\) Sprinkle, *Crafting Preservation Criteria*, 7; Hearings before the Committee on Public Lands, *House of Representatives*, Seventy-fourth Congress, First Session, April 1, 2, and 5, 1935.
The preservation movement continued to develop and grow within the agencies of the national government. By the 1960s, further evaluations resulted in better established national registries. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) expanded on the earlier 1935 Historic Act. The NHPA of 1966 established several more in-depth responsibilities of the federal government, and its agencies, with regards to safeguarding possible sites. Important people, places, events, specific architectural styles, are all still very relevant but the language used in these acts becomes more broad. For instance, rather than specific events, it emphasizes broader cultural patterns.\(^{58}\) One particular change was the establishment of the fifty-year rule. This rule helped create a relative time frame with which to assess sites. This opened the door for saving more of America’s history, rather than on focusing only on the colonial. This rule does not solely determine sites of importance, as sites are also evaluated based on other parameters. For instance, the site of the broken levees in New Orleans was listed on the National Register based on the cataclysmic event. Another example would be the Sears Tower being nominated at just forty-eight years. This was based on many architecturally related significances. While some might see the fifty-year rule as too constricting, there are other safe guards for finding a site significant.

Since the 1960s, preservation has grown and expanded its boundaries. Many believe that the creation of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 launched the modern era of preservation. The field, at this time, was becoming ever more inclusive. While the field still holds on to the early traditions, new ones are included. As society

---

\(^{58}\) Sprinkle, *Crafting Preservation Criteria*, 21.
becomes more involved with wanting an inclusive history, the field of preservation will obliges. Historic preservation still seeks to teach the public about the long history of our nation. Now it includes more narratives rather than just those of famous people and events. Native Americans and their heritage are better protected under new regulations. Slave narratives are also becoming increasingly desired. Today the field is acknowledging the more troubling and controversial aspects of the country’s past. For plantations, focus has shifted away from the main house and looks to the work spaces. The field of historic preservation is shifting towards a broad collective to include one that is socially and racially diverse.59

**Development of Theories**

In order to help understand how the field of preservation has developed over the years, the following theoretical approaches have been examined. For this analysis to be done properly, a full understanding of the current methods in cultural landscapes, plantation archaeology and historic preservation are assessed. The following literature establishes common practices as well as common plantation attributes. Since this will lead to the needs of the post hoc survey and the locations are no longer accessible, literature concerning existing sites are helpful in establishing comparable examples.

Understanding the flux of South Carolina’s economic background helps to establish the inner working of typical plantations. S. Max Edelson dives into the development of South Carolina economy during its colonial period through the agricultural progression in his book *Plantation Enterprise in Colonial South Carolina*. English origins had a great deal

---
to do with how the "plantation" system was set up. Landowners and those given land grants wanted to set up the typical Lord and serf landscape. For these inland plantations, waterways and controlling the inland water was always a necessity to those plantations. Rivers were used as navigational systems and used to cultivate rice fields. Edelson further discusses plantation landscapes. Edelson also notes the physical discomfort that many Lowcountry owners experienced on inland plantations and how they would retreat to Charlestown to avoid the malaria that came from the swamps. Overseers and task masters were left behind and responsible for everyday needs and managing the work. Edelson also delves into a more theoretical topic of defining the plantation landscape. Instead of looking at “the plantation” which gives a romantic or nostalgic feel, academics should consider the landscape from the perspective of those enslaved.

Documenting buildings goes beyond measurements and materials. If that information is not used to uncover the people behind it, then cultural history will be lost. Architectural historian Orlando V. Ridout discusses this concept. In his article he discusses the importance of documenting buildings, but he argues that understanding architecture alone is not enough. How these buildings are used can tell us more about the people and culture that surrounds these buildings. Ridout lays out how documentary evidence can be useful to the understanding of fieldwork. For instance, he discusses how the tax assessment of 1798 for Centerville, Maryland lists all the real property including utilitarian buildings.

---

Not only can these types of documents give information on what buildings are located across a region, but they can also be used across a time frame to analyze the flux of these buildings. This can be used to observe material use and change, and additions or new constructions. Within this kind of data inferences can be formed about the economic means of the region through these fluctuations. If the number of buildings increases, and better materials are being used, then one can infer prosperity and vice versa. While this Ridout focuses on the eastern shore of Maryland, its premise can be used in any region.\textsuperscript{63}

\textit{Cabin, Quarter, Plantation: Architecture and Landscapes of North American Slavery} utilizes both architectural history and archaeology to tell the story of the enslaved complex. This book is a collection of twelve essays, five of which were previously published. For the relevance of this thesis, five of the articles were consulted. The other were eliminated based on their central topics and regional variance.\textsuperscript{64}

The opening article for the book is W. E. B. DuBois, “Home of the Slave” written in 1901. It is an article that still stands the test of time and sets the ground work for understanding enslaved living. It is in this article that the first glimpse of contrasting the slave housing to the main house is proposed. DuBois discusses how this influenced and affected those within the enslaved community long after slavery ended. Carl Anthony

\textsuperscript{63} Ridout, “Reediting the Architectural Past”.
\textsuperscript{64} These articles were excluded because of the topics. In Rebecca Ginsburg’s article she focuses on the escape routes that runaway slaves would take. While a very important topic in regards to slavery, for the purpose of this thesis it was not directly related to the inner workings of a plantation and the daily life on the plantation. It is felt by the author that this would delve into another theoretical field. The other articles focus on the diaspora of culture from Bermuda, Danish West Indies, Tennessee and Northern plantations. While it is known that there was a considerable influence from Barbados into the St. John’s parish there is nothing related to Bermuda or West Indies at this time. For the Tennessee and Northern Plantation articles the production and use of these plantations were felt to more of stretch to relate to those in Lowcountry South Carolina.
proposes the concept of African influence in architecture and culture in his article written in 1976. His intention was to bring to light through vernacular architecture the often hidden concept of African influence. He expresses how it is important to not look at architecture from only one perspective but try to view it with all the information at hand. There are architectural styles included in his assessment from Western Africa and the Caribbean to find influences in North American plantations landscapes. Within the collection of essays, the idea of looking at the enslaved complex with a more interpretive concept is expressed. Many of the articles focus on how the spaces were used by the enslaved people within their segregated areas. Such as Barbara Heaths article, that discusses the use of the yard spaces as evaluated with archaeologically recovered data. Enslaved Africans extensively incorporated yard spaces in their daily lives which centered on cultural ties to their African heritage, coupled with the limited space allowed them by their owners. These yard spaces were surrounded by tree lines, fences, and borders of other kinds which expressed the distinction between freedom and enslavement.65 Most importantly, Heath brings attention to the concept of “space” and “place”. Space, defined by Heath, is the physical aspect to architecture and landscapes, where as “place” is that which is used by an individual and can have a meaning or feeling related to it. These concepts can be incorporated to understand the “place”, the yard as a communal gathering versus the yard as the “space” in-between buildings. In addition to these places and spaces, Dell Upton discusses how space is used for movement across the landscape. Understanding the built environment can

tell us how each group of people on the plantation, free and enslaved, moved across the landscape based upon built boundaries. He depicts these landscapes as “reflexive,” and that the enslaved people used the landscape in a reactionary way. While the planters built these streets of slave housing and tree lined walkways to and from the main house, those that used it the most were the slaves. They more often than not used these landscapes in every aspect of their life while the “gentry” used a small portion of the landscape on a daily basis.

Since African influence into slave architecture has been discussed once before, a more in-depth study will be analyzed here. In 1990, Natalie Adams wrote her thesis *Early African-American Domestic Architecture from Berkeley County*. This body of work was chosen because of the topic and the locality in relation to the current research of this proposed thesis. While the parts of Berkeley County discussed by Adams’ thesis fall outside the current research area, there is a high probability of influence. Her thesis notes the changes and influences seen among late 18th and early 19th century slave settlements within the plantation complex. The majority of her information comes from archaeological data mixed with known standing buildings or ruins at the investigated plantations. She

---


67 It will be noted here that in Terry’s *Champaign Country*, he states that the enslaved community in St. John’s Parish had more a sense of autonomy due to its inland location. The plantation owners spent little time at these plantations because of their fear of disease from the malaria redden swamp land and further inland plantation due to its distance from other status holders. This thesis will explore the use of space by the enslaved Africans of these plantations based on this concept to see if both Terry’s assumption of autonomy and Upton’s assumption of movement can be tested.

68 Most of these plantations discussed in Adams thesis are located along the Cooper River or it’s related branches and therefore mimic the early days of St. John’s Parish when the cooper River Ran through it before the construction of Lake Moultrie.
notes, as others mentioned above, that while enslaved Africans were in oppressed and controlled environs, they were able to hold on to some aspects of their native cultures. These were sometimes expressed through the buildings in which they lived and worked.  

The earliest architecture identified by Adams was a more impermanent type of building. These would have been small one or two rooms built of clay or waddle daub type construction, many even had thatched roofs. Near the end of the 17th century is when more permanent architecture started taking place. These buildings held more characteristics of the African influence. By the middle of the antebellum period, slave housing began to change to a more Eurocentric landscape. The plantations owners wanted to control more of the environment and felt political and social pressure to create “better” housing for their enslaved workers. Adams suggests that through archaeological evidence the enslaved African Americans still expressed their ideas into these built and controlled environments. Her thesis is useful in drawing together the evolution of enslaved housing from its earliest period through the height of the plantation culture.

Along similar lines to Adams’ thesis is *African Architectural Transference to the South Carolina Lowcountry, 1700-1880*. This article, written by archaeologists Fritz Hammer and Michael Trinkley, expands on the concept by including the entire Lowcountry as a data pool. Hammer and Trinkley note that the Carolina Lowcountry’s population of enslaved African residents had far exceeded the populations of their European counterparts by the early 18th century. This had led to a more autonomous community among the

---


plantations where enslaved Africans outnumbered their owners. This coupled with the fact that the plantation owners often left the more inland plantations for fear of diseases helped keep these cultures more intact than at other plantations in the country. The article uses historical, archaeological, and architectural data to surmise the findings. Hammer and Trinkley further the evidence that African influence persisted in the Carolina Lowcountry for an extended period of time despite European influences. \(^{71}\) They also conclude that even current Gullah communities retain parts of these very old customs. \(^{72}\)

Diferring from the customary focus on antebellum houses, John Michael Vlach uses the buildings surrounding the main house to explore the entirety of the plantation landscape in *Back of the Big House*. These buildings, while designed for purposes deemed by the plantation owner, can be explored to understand the individual and culture needs of the enslaved people. Vlach explores these concepts by organizing with each aspect of the plantation landscape. These buildings (kitchens, smokehouses, barns, etc.) are not only representations of the master’s social status or need but also of how the enslaved individual shaped them to make them their own. \(^{73}\)

---


\(^{72}\) This has been evident in the survival of African arts and foodways. But not until more recently and probably with the interest of both vernacular architecture and plantation archaeology did the concepts of African influenced architecture within enslaved contexts take hold. African American Arts have been celebrated or admired since at least the turn of the century, the Old Salve Mart Museum which opened in 1938 was dedicated to the art forms of the lowcountry basket marketing of the Gullah Geechee culture. During this same time period, small wooden constructed houses being used by ancestors of the enslaved community, such as shotgun houses or freedman’s cottages, may have only been seen as a testament of hard times and not skills and knowledge leftover from their ancestors.

For the purposes of this thesis, it is helpful to note how Vlach used his resources. He pulls from the Historical American Buildings Surveys (HABS) documentation of these buildings. He also uses the personal accounts recorded by slaves to describe not only the architecture but also the landscape as well. He also uses personal accounts of various people visiting plantations. In these contrasting accounts a difference on how the spaces are understood is well portrayed. This book represents that which is so often overlooked by others studying architecture. It is a representation of what can be learned about the enslaved individual from the spaces and buildings used in everyday life as well as how they made it their own. Vlach explores the possibility of what can be learned when a building is viewed from different perspectives.  

Vlach does also expand outside the architectural realm and delve into the workspaces. These spaces are important to understand how the individuals shaped their own existence. These cultural landscapes can convey more about the individual than what the master sought to convey through his concept of a building. Whereas a building could be built to depict a personal agenda of the master, the landscape was more easily adapted to convey social diversity.  

Along with Vlach’s use of HABS documentation another source should be mentioned here. Jobie Hill in her 2013 master’s thesis primarily uses HABS in her discussion of slave houses. Her goal is to bring the human interest aspect of history to

---

75 Ibid.
documentation. So often when architecture is discussed it revolves around styles, materials, and constructions. But for the people who lived in these buildings it held many other meanings just as important. Hill combines slave narratives collected by the Federal Writers Project in the 1930’s that recorded slave narratives, with the documentation done by HABS in the same period. From these narratives, a more complete picture of the documented buildings is given. She particularly notes five personal accounts that correlate with five documented buildings. She also incorporates archaeological data found across the excavated sites to compare with the slave narrative. Hill also uses the narratives to verbally recreate the interiors of the slave dwellings. Through her efforts in this thesis, she proved that there is nothing to lose and everything to gain in understanding the human behind the building.77

The concept of this thesis was to help develop a reconstructed history of the plantation landscape within St. John’s Parish. This landscape focuses mostly on the enslaved context, meaning here that which was used by the enslaved workforce on a daily basis. This form of reconstruction comes from sources that are mostly documentary and pictorial. Mostly primary sources will be used in the identification and explanation of these buildings and landscapes. For this reason, the concepts of reconstruction need to be discussed here. In most sources, reconstructing refers to the physical construction of a building based on found documentary or archaeological data. Since the purpose of this thesis is not to physically rebuild these buildings only one article will be referenced that will hopefully explain why further exploration into this discussion is not necessary.

77 Hill, Humanizing HABS, 117-118.
To explore the concept of reconstruction an article by Nicholas Stanley-Price on the topic is examined because of its concise and direct discussion of the topic. As with most concepts of reconstruction, Stanley-Price’s discussion revolves around the built environment. His discussion revolves around no longer standing buildings that have only been identified through archaeological remains. The problem here arises from the notion of a conceptualized history. Controversy surrounds the rebuilding of such buildings because of their ability to evoke a false history. It is not the building that was there and therefore cannot give the same testament to time as would have the original. The other problem that arises from reconstruction is location. Does the construction of the interpretive building on its original location then affect or destroy its reversibility? Reconstructions greatest argument is reversibility. If the actual data set, which would be the excavation site itself, is built upon does that in fact destroy the ability to re-assess it later? In this article he lays out the recommended guidelines for reconstructions.78 These are stated as follows:

1. Reconstruction means returning a place to a known earlier state and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new materials

2. Reconstruction is only appropriate where a place is incomplete through damage or alteration and only when there is sufficient data to reproduce the historic fabric.
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3. Reconstruction should be identifiable on close inspection or through additional interpretation.

As with most things, reconstruction will always be dealt with on a case by case basis. As long as these parameters are followed, reconstruction has a place in historic preservation for educational purposes. While this thesis does not claim to physically reconstruct the landscape or buildings of St. John’s Parish, it is good to keep in mind the concepts of why reconstruction is necessary. These reconstructions are used as teaching methods. For this thesis, a verbal reconstruction is used to help create a more complete knowledge of the landscape and buildings of St. John’s Parish.

Summary of Background Methodology

The background methodology presented here highlights the need for additional research. It points out the flaws of the original survey, confronts the early field of preservation, and discusses the development of historic preservation. Thomas Waterman significantly failed to report all the structures found within the plantation complex. The criteria that Waterman used to assess the plantations buildings was limited. As an architectural historian of the 1930s this is not uncommon. The main plantation houses were of more concern and other buildings failed to be seen as important. The early years of preservation revolved around saving houses related to important people and events. Preservation was centered on establishing house museums in memorial. Surveys began under the Historical American Buildings Survey (HABS) during the depression in 1933. This program was established to help trained architects and photographers that were

---

79 Stanley-Price, “The Reconstruction of Ruins: Principles and Practice”.
currently unemployed. While today there exists a standard for the documentation process required by HABS, the early surveys had little requirements. The program was established in 1933 and just a few short years later in 1938, Waterman conducted his survey of the Pinopolis and Santee regions. These early surveys were required to capture a representative sampling of America’s early architectural heritage. This heritage represented the colonial period of America. Preservation has grown over the years, and the field has expanded to include more resources. Different agencies have emerged, HABS, National Trust for Historic Preservation, and various local organizations just to name a few. These agencies have carefully crafted their responsibilities for the preservation of cultural heritage sites. Government entities and regulations have been enacted to safeguard these resources from endangerment. The field of preservation is still growing. As new technologies and means for documentation emerge, the scope of inclusion will also grow. Future preservationists will look back on current surveys and ask new questions. The post hoc survey discussed in the following chapter is a guide for obtaining new information previously thought lost.
CHAPTER THREE

Post Hoc Methodology

The field of preservation has changed drastically in the past eighty years. Now outbuildings associated with the plantation landscapes are of more interests to historians and scholars. This post hoc survey will follow the modern trends of historic preservation. These include using a broader definition for inclusion. It will center on the buildings used to make the plantation function.

The previous sections have outlined the need for conducting a post hoc survey. This need arose from assessing the original survey and determined that some resources were not, but should have been included. These resources, for the purposes of this case study are plantation outbuildings. Over eighty years ago these buildings were seldom recorded. The focus of preservation then centered around high style architecture and nationally important people. The post hoc methodology established here will aid in future research. Many sites are being lost by wars, flooding, landslides, earthquakes, and industry, just to name a few. The need for a post hoc survey arises when access to a historical site is no longer available. It also is a viable method for reevaluating a previous survey. Surveys are often conducted on a contracted basis set with many time restraints and minimum resources. Inevitably, resources are often overlooked or not recorded. This has been established with the Thomas Waterman Survey conducted eighty years ago. Unfortunately, current surveys, as well as future surveys, can fall into this category. All surveys, at one time or another, will be scrutinized for its inclusions or exclusions. When this happens, a reevaluation can take
place. The following method shows how to regain information based on the series of steps provided.

In this section the criteria used to set the parameters for the post hoc survey are discussed first. An assessment of the archival research follows. The analysis of the overall plantations will include the resources used to conduct the survey as well as show the use of the criteria. Following this, chapter four contains the results of the post hoc survey. The final chapters discuss and demonstrate the usefulness of the post hoc survey method.

**Post Hoc Criteria**

The third step in this thesis was establishing survey significance criteria which enables the confines of the research. Since current preservation standards encourage recording buildings 50 years and older this method was considered. This was considered too broad for the time restraints of this thesis and therefore a compromise was created. All buildings within the workings of the plantation dating to 50 years at the time of Waterman’s report were determined significant. Thus allowing for documenting a building built prior to 1880. In addition to this, HABS standards of architectural documentation and recording were followed. The outbuildings associated with the plantations could not follow the protocols set by Waterman. As Waterman had set significance around the high style architecture and craftsmanship of the interiors, this was not applicable to the outbuildings. The outbuildings were evaluated on their unique craftsmanship and how they attributed to the overall history of the plantation.

Since this survey was being conducted from a post hoc perspective some information needed for a full HABS documentation was not obtainable. These are fully
drawn plans and elevations as well as detail photographs. This survey therefore was built around data that was uncovered from archival research. Before archive research was conducted the survey parameters had to be established. As already noted, understanding the criterion that Waterman operated with for his report was necessary to establish what needed to be conducted for the *post hoc* survey. Historical American Buildings Survey prioritizes sites that are in danger of demolition or destruction. Therefore, the survey centered around gaining the most information possible. The information gathered for this *post hoc* survey focused on architectural style, material, form, function, and age of the outbuildings. Significance in this survey followed HABS versus the significance for a National Register nomination. This thesis approaches these outbuildings with the concept of including historic buildings that aided to the development of the plantation landscape while also holding their own architectural significance based on vernacular architecture, rather than high style architecture.

**Post hoc survey significance criteria:**
- Built prior to 1880
- Aided to the history of the plantation
- Exhibited vernacular craftsmanship of the region

**Archival Research**

This survey began with researching for existing photographs of the area. These were limited to specific landscape shots and close ups of buildings. This thesis focuses on using existing photographs to help document the area now submerged under Lake Moultrie. The documentation follows established procedures for that of an onsite visit. For an onsite visit several photographs of the project area are required. Additionally, field documentation which consist of measured hand drawings of the subjects are required. Based on the quality
of photograph, a written description follows discussing the details of the building. Further photographic analysis was conducted if multiple photographs were found on a subject. The photographs are most important in documenting what was on the landscape at the time of the 1938 survey. They time-stamp the existence of such buildings.

Extensive research into several archival resources was conducted to discover photographs. Access was gained to the private archives of Dr. Richard Porcher. These were extensively used alongside public institutions. Dr. Porcher was kind enough to share parts of his book that pertained to this research. His manuscript, entitled *Our Lost Heritage*, was a treasure trove of information regarding the people of Middle St. John’s.\(^8^0\)

There are several photographs that exist along with this report. The materials associated with the original report are available on the Library of Congress website. The Lowcountry Digital Library (LCDL), Charleston Museum, and Historic Charleston Foundation (HCF) archives also contain photographic records of St. John’s Parish. The South Carolina Historical Society (SCHS) and the collections at the South Caroliniana Library as well as the private collection of Richard Porcher, are extensively used.\(^8^1\) Photographs of buildings were chosen for clarity of buildings with consideration given to observability of materials, architectural details, and inclusion of building layout. None of these concepts are meant to be used collectively and can be used separately. The first wave of research used a series of keywords and subjects. The subjects are the individual plantations by name and contain keywords such as outbuildings, smoke house, barns etc.

\(^8^0\) Porcher, *Our Lost Heritage*, Unpublished manuscript, unknown completion date.
\(^8^1\) These list of sources are found in the Bibliography.
Any building known to be located on a plantation was used during the keyword search. John Vlach’s *Back of the Big House* was heavily referred to in order to establish these types of buildings. This was used simultaneous with a broad search of the region name St. John’s Parish, St. John’s, and St. John’s Berkeley Parish interchangeably. Following this extensive search, another keyword search was initiated. For this to occur, major family names associated with the plantations needed to be learned. The purpose of this was to discover family photos of the plantations. Many of the archives visited had extensive family papers donated to them over the years including may containing family photographs. The results of these searches are discussed in detail with the analysis.

Other visual documents used for these research followed a similar strategy. Plats obtained from the SC Department of Archives and History were observed to identify the locations and layouts of the outbuildings within the plantations landscape. Not many of the plantations were identified within the keyword search so again, family names were used to identify correct plats of land. Some plats were located with plantations files contained at the SCHS in Charleston. The plats were obtained to help show the plantation layout and original location of the buildings.

Aerial, soil, and Department of Transportation road maps were considered. These maps identify regions and general layouts of the area in question. Locations of buildings are sometimes discernable. Specific care was given to identifying the outbuildings and locating them within the region of the plantations themselves. A 1938 aerial photograph of the region was also found at the Berkeley County Register of Deed office (RMC). Richard Porcher, who is currently writing a book on Middle St. John’s Parish, had created
individual plantation layouts overlain on the 1938 aerial. This was referred to for the landscape analysis. The 1938 aerial and the original plats were used to show changes in plantation landscape. In the 1938 aerial, buildings location and alignment were identified and compared to that of locations depicted on the plats. It was also used to help visualize the landscape of Waterman’s report. It helps describe the landscape Waterman would have seen directly.

Written records were obtained for information to understand the buildings identified in the retrieved photographs. The archival search for these materials followed that directly, and simultaneously, with that of the photographs. Key words were specific to plantation and family name. These incorporate mostly primary sources such as family records that contain plantation ledger books or accounts, receipts, census records, slave schedules, and labor contracts. Several journals were discovered written by individuals living on these plantations. These documents list slave dwellings and outbuildings contained within the plantation landscapes. These were used to help discern location, dimensions, as well as materials of buildings. Other sources utilized were federal census records and the Freedman’s Bureau records which have information regarding amount of buildings located on plantations.

As mentioned in prior chapters, three plantation houses were relocated. The Rocks Plantation was the only one removed along with several outbuildings. The National Register nomination (NRHP) conducted in 1976 confirms this. Along with the NRHP record are several photographs of the outbuildings. These included three buildings at the time of the nomination. While the main house had burned in 1992, the fate of the
outbuildings was unknown. It was decided that a field reconnaissance should be conducted not only of The Rocks Plantation but also of any other existing plantation in the area. These would help determine the existence of the outbuildings associated with The Rocks Plantation as well as other surviving plantations. These included those removed for the project area and those in close proximity to the project area that were not surveyed by Waterman due to time restraints. The plantations within proximity to The Rocks Plantation are Lawson’s Pond Plantation, St. Julien Plantation, Numertia Plantation, and Walnut Grove Plantation. All are currently on the NRHP. With the exception of The Rocks Plantation and Lawson’s Pond Plantation, these also include those mentioned but not surveyed by Waterman in 1938. These site visits consisted of identifying buildings, applying the determination of significance, photographing, and measuring. The site visits to these locations were useful in obtaining information on extant buildings that best resemble the lost buildings. Since Waterman noted in his report the resemblances all the main houses had with each other, it was discovered this held true for the outbuildings as well. Comparing the early 1938 photographs to the extant buildings show many similar features. By knowing what materials and style were used in the extant buildings, it can be at least inferred what was used in those now lost. The measurements taken from these site visits are useful in scaling the buildings identified only in photographs.

This thesis posed the following questions to build this methodology: What available sources are there to use in recovering this information? What can we learn once a resource has been lost? How is it best represented following a post hoc survey? This thesis considers the problems of documenting already lost buildings through a series of methods using
archival photos. The use of the available sources will be discussed during the analysis of the plantations. The methodology here explains in detail how those sources were found. A more in depth discussion of the sources used and found is conducted in the analysis chapters and will show the breakdown of sources available and used. Also within the analysis is discussed the extent of the history learned. It also shows how the different sources and procedures described above came together. The final question needs to be addressed here. Mainly, what is the purpose of this compilation of data and how is it best represented? This thesis recommends digital reconstruction of the landscapes and outbuildings. This is based on the different types of sources found. The references identified in the bibliography address the most current research and the methods found to be helpful to this particular problem. Virtual reconstruction can also be used for further research that may present itself. It would create a living data set that can be manipulated for new questions.

Analysis of Plantations

The research collected for each plantation lead to the following analysis. The plantations under discussion here focus on those reported in the 1938 survey conducted by Thomas Waterman. It also includes several plantations that Waterman mentions in his report briefly but are not those included in his survey. Other plantations included in this section are those within the surrounding area but which are located outside the flood zone. The following description of each plantation focuses on the individual background history
that pertains only to the existence of outbuildings. The sections here will cover the descriptions given by Thomas Waterman and then give the results of the post hoc survey.

To analyze the plantation a series of documents were given. For convenience, these documents are listed before the discussion of the plantations. This will give the reader an overview of what information was obtained regarding the existence of outbuildings. The first document is the “status” or current condition for the plantation. This status has been designated as: Removed, Still Standing, Dismantled, and Underwater. Pictures are another assigned document. This is determined based on whether or not photographs existed of outbuildings or the landscape. This will be represented by “Yes” or “No.” Plats are another document determined useful depending on whether or not buildings were noted. If a plat had outbuildings represented, then it was determined useful and will be attributed with a “Yes.” If none were noted, then the plat was deemed not useful with a “No.” The documentation attribute also was determined specifically on written documentation regarding the existence of buildings. Several plantations have documentation regarding the existence of outbuildings.  
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82 Since the scope of this thesis was to create a framework surrounding the outbuildings and their existence, it was not determined to write a full history on the plantation owners and subsequent history of the plantations. It does need to be called out that these sources do exist for those interested. After the inundation of the Santee-Cooper Project many former residents sought to recapture the histories of the families within the region. Some of these were written by descendants of the plantation holding families. *Plantations of the Low Country* discuss brief histories of Hanover, The Rocks, Loch Dhu, Walnut Grove, Lawson’s Pond, Numertia, and St. Julien. *Brief Histories of Pooshee, Eutaw, Springfield, White Hall,* and The Rocks are found in *Lost Plantations of the South.* *Belvidere: A plantation memory* focuses on Belvidere but also mentions Eutaw plantation. *Plantations, Pineland Villages, Pinopolis and its People* focuses on the “malaria” season or summer houses of those living in St. John’s Parish. These summer houses were used by plantation owners used to escape the detriment of what they called “Malaria” season. A soon to be published manuscript titled *Our Rich Heritage,* explores the extensive history of Middle St. John’s Parish. Another good source of history was found in the original 1930’s newspaper articles that discuss the history of the soon to be inundated plantations. These were written by F.M. Kirk. Two other useful sources of information are George Terrys Doctoral dissertation *Champaign Country* and Jeremy Bradham, *The Documentation of Lawson’s Pond Plantation and the Craftsmanship Employed in the Upper St. John’s Parish, Berkeley County, South Carolina,* Master’s Thesis, Dept. of Historic Preservation, (Clemson University, 2007).
plantation as a whole but for the purpose of this thesis’ analysis it will have a specific meaning in this section. If the Documentation discussed specific outbuildings, then it was given a “Yes,” and if it had none it was given a “No.” The “Number of outbuildings identified” section refer to the number of buildings known to be extant at the time of Waterman’s survey.

The analysis of each plantation begins with a brief background including the development of the plantation, notable people (local, state, and national significance if applicable), and history. Following this will be the assessment of the plantation by Waterman. These will also be succinct, as the 1938 report is available for public viewing. The attributes described previously will be discussed in the analysis. This leads to the results or inclusions of the post hoc survey. The result of this will be conclusive of what additional information was on the landscape and not recorded. This analysis serves to add this information on to the original report.

Following this extensive accumulation of data, the analysis of each plantation was achievable. This survey, though post hoc, was conducted much like a field survey with standing buildings. The completion of this results in a more completed documented history. The resulting compilation of materials are used entirely for an analysis of the plantations within the region. The purpose of this thesis shows what forms of archival information work best together, to give a more complete history on demolished and lost buildings. Following the analysis of each plantation are the results of the post hoc survey. This will evaluate the usefulness and availability of information for conducting a post hoc survey.
Belvidere Plantation

Status: Dismantled; Underwater
Plats: No
Number Outbuildings Identified: 5

Discussion:

James Sinkler received Belvidere Plantation as a land grant around 1770. The main house at Belvidere was built some time later (see figure 14). The date of the actual construction is somewhere between 1795 and 1803. Waterman stated that the house was built around 1790 based on the style of the house. Family history states that the house was built around 1803.\(^\text{83}\) During the antebellum period, cotton was the main production at the plantation. Belvidere Plantation was one of the many plantations to stay within its original boundaries.

family for many years. The house was dismantled in 1941 and the flood waters of the lake covered its remaining foundations.

Thomas Waterman’s depiction of Belvidere Plantation confines itself to the main house. Waterman groups the style of the house with what he has deemed the Santee Plan. This floor plan is asymmetric with central hall. Waterman describes the two front facing rooms as unequal in size. Two back rooms were located of the central hall near the rear of the house. It is a frame structure resting on an open brick foundation. The porch and gabled roof are other elements he discusses of the Santee Plan. The other common element are the two entrances located off the front porch. One door led to the larger of the rooms, and the other to the small room.84

In addition to the main house, several other buildings were confirmed to be extant on the plantation. These buildings were uncovered by using the post hoc survey method. The following resources were used to identify the standing buildings.

Written accounts by descendants of Belvidere Plantation were found to be very useful. One is a compilation of letters written by Emily Sinkler (1842-1865). Her letters, discuss the antebellum days of the plantation.85 Belvidere: a plantation memory was written by Anne Sinkler Fishbourne (1886-1983) in 1949 and focuses on her childhood memories of the plantation. These sources were used to identify those buildings standing

84 Thomas Waterman, A Survey of the Early Buildings in the region of the proposed Santee and Pinopolis Reservoirs in South Carolina, 11.
on the landscape over the course of Belvidere’s history. Anne Sinkler’s description of the yard space around the main house best describes what antebellum buildings were still standing in the early twentieth century. Since these descriptions were used in assessing the types of buildings on the landscape, they will be mentioned briefly here.

The descriptions by the women briefly depict the “Negro Street” and the surrounding landscape. Neither mention the styles or materials of the homes in any details. Emily Sinkler mentions that the “Negro Street” was “some distance from the main house.” Anne mentions that there is a Negro quarters, a race track, gardens, and fields. Anne also describes a dairy located near the main house in more detail. She describes the one room dairy as follows:

“with plastered whitewashed interior walls with wide pine shelves kept scrubbed white…there were no windows but a funny square vent located in the steeply sloping roof. Every morning Daddy Lewis brought pails from the stable yard to the dairy...”

Anne Sinkler Fishbourne reminisces that as children they would sneak into the dairy house when Maum Rebecca would “step over to the kitchen house.” She depicts these buildings as being clustered at the rear of the main house “like little chickens around the mother.” Along with these buildings she describes a smokehouse, wash-kitchen, and a
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86 Anne and her sister own the property after their father dies in 1933. Anne Sinkler Fishbourne gives an account of the surrounding landscape of Belvidere Plantation. She includes with this the community of over 100 African American still working on the plantation. Her depiction focuses on the last days of the plantation up to the point of the dams closing and the majority of plantation flooding. In both Anne and Emily’s writings include mentions of Eutaw Plantation, which the Sinkler Family also owned. Both early plantations owners are mentioned to have added thoroughbred racetracks.

87 Fishborne, Belvidere: A Plantation Memory, 6.

88 Fishborne, Belvidere: A Plantation Memory, 7. Daddy Lewis was the name of an African American man working on the plantation.
dwelling. She says that the smokehouse has a shingled hipped roof and remembers the smoke whisping from the top. Further beyond the main house she says that the stables, barns, poultry yard, and rye patches were located.\textsuperscript{89} Anne Sinkler Fishbourne writes that at the time of the Santee-Cooper Project in 1938 the plantation housed 185 African Americans who worked on the plantation. Here they lived in the original houses located on the Negro street as well as built settlements on the lower regions of the plantations named Dorchee. The buildings mentioned in \textit{A Plantation Memory} are probably the ones seen in the photographs taken by Edwin Green on his visit to the plantation in 1938.\textsuperscript{90}

Located within the Edwin Green collection where a few photographs of the surrounding landscape. A plat was also obtained but showed little informative depictions of the outbuildings or landscape. The photographs depict a white fenced in area with a house located closest in the frame (see figure 15). This has the appearance of a typical double house with a centrally located chimney. Its siding is painted white and is composed of irregular boards. Beyond this building is a short small building, most probably a chicken coup of sorts. Further down is a small dwelling with an end chimney. The painted siding appears to be more regular in size than that of the double house. All three of these buildings have metal roofs. In the background of this photograph and in a better close-up is a church (see figure 16). It has the same white painted siding of regular size but the gable roof is clad in split wooden shingles. Atop the gable is a small tower as for a bell. A close up of another house is included in this collection. Based on the close-up of the church, this

\textsuperscript{89} Fishborne, \textit{Belvidere: A Plantation Memory}, 27
dwelling is located some distance behind the church. It appears entirely separate from the other cluster of buildings near the fence. This lone house is more typical of early twentieth century tenant farming housing. It has an irregular shape that resembles an L. More irregularly, the small house had two chimneys. It is a wooden building with similar wood sidings and metal roof as the other buildings. Within the Green file is a photo of a sundial. The sundial appears to be in the vicinity of the main house as it is distinguished in the frame. Beyond the sundial is another building. It is on a raised brick foundation with arches that mimic that of the main house’s foundation. Its purpose is undetermined.91

---

91 Green, 1870-1948 photographer, Green collection, 1938, Photographs 11170 (1-161) box.
It was determined that several outbuildings were still extant and being used in 1938. The total buildings verified to be extant are limited to five. While more were discussed in Anne Sinkler Fishbourne’s book, only these five were verified to be extant in 1938 when photographed by Edwin Green. As no plat dating to the time of the Santee-Cooper Project was found to verify those buildings mentioned by Fishbourne they are designated as undetermined. Fishbourne was writing about her childhood remembrances as well as the current use of the plantation. Between the written documentation and the photographs eight different styles of buildings were identified to have existed on the plantation. These do not include those within the established African American community established on part of the plantation. Belvidere Plantation had a rich and unique history. Along with Eutaw, they are the only two horse plantations. Knowing more about the equine landscape and buildings would have enriched our history of early horse farms within the state.
The outbuildings located on the plantation would have attributed to the overall history and development of the plantations unique significance. Besides the main house there were identified approximately eight types of buildings between 1886-1938. Three types of buildings were clearly pictured by Green. These include dwellings, a chicken coop, and a church. The other buildings he noted, were stables, barn, dairy, kitchen house, smokehouse, and a church. Other features across the landscape are the race track, poultry yard, rye patches, fields and gardens. There is no question that Belvederes landscape and outbuildings would have greatly attributed to the knowledge of the region.
**Bunker Hill Plantations**

Status: Dismantled; Underwater  
Pictures: No

Plats: No  
Documentation: No

Number Outbuildings Identified: 0

**Discussion:**

The earliest history of Bunker Hill Plantation is undiscernible. No plats were found to help establish much of the information regarding the plantation. The earliest known owner of the Bunker Hill was Dr. Edmond Ravenel. The date of his obtaining the property has not been identified. He sold the property to William James Dennis sometime around 1830. The last family to own the property were the descendants of Harluck Huxford Harvey. At the time of Waterman’s report the house was not being lived in but used to store hay.92

Due to the use of the main house, Waterman obtained limited access. This was the first time he mentioned the Pinopolis Plan. This plan differed from that of the Santee group. This plan has a central hall with two rooms on either side. It is two stories and contains two additional rooms on the second floor. Waterman also observed a shed addition on the rear of the house (see figure 17).93

No photographs or plats were found showing evidence that outbuildings were extant during the time of Waterman’s visit. An aerial photograph did not determine the existence of any additional buildings. It is probable that no additional buildings existed on the landscape by 1938 besides the main house. No other information was found to

---

92 Porcher, *Our Lost Heritage*, Unpublished manuscript.
determine the location of outbuildings on the plantation. No additional information was obtained on the history of surrounding landscape of Bunker Hill Plantation.

Figure 17: Bunker Hill main house, Green Collection. Caroliniana Library.
Cedar Springs

Status: Dismantled; Underwater
Plats: Yes

Number Outbuildings Identified: 0

Discussion:

Cedar Springs Plantation was owned by the Porcher Family for its entire existence. Philip Porcher owned the property as early as 1775. He started a plantation ledger for Cedar Springs Plantation that subsequent owners updated. Cedar Springs Plantation passed from father to son until 1904 when it passes to a relative. Isaac de Cherigny Porcher purchases it from the Widow of John Porcher. Isaac transfers the property to his nephew, Richard Dwight Porcher, Sr. and his wife. They had plans to restore the house and live on

Figure 18: Cedar Springs, 1938, Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.

---

94 Philip Porcher Account Book, SCHS. This book was transcribed by the WPA and is housed at the South Carolina Historical Society. The original is located at the Caroliniana Library. The ledger covers everything from slave sales to daily plantation operations. Based on the plantation ledger various crops were produced at Cedar Springs. Indigo was an early staple crop. Later rice and cotton became more prolific. In the ledger there is no mention of any of the outbuildings shown on the plats.
the property at the time the Santee-Cooper project was announced. Their dreams never came to fruition.\footnote{Richard Porcher, \textit{Our Lost Heritage}, Unpublished manuscript.}

Waterman places Cedar Spring Plantation in the Pinopolis plan though it smaller in scale than the others. The roof also varied from the typical gable and had a high hyped roof (see figure 18). While still very ornate, Waterman describes the details of the interior as more simplistic than the other homes. He also calls out the paneled dados as being very similar to those seen at Hanover. The interior of Cedar Springs planation house varied in levels of Georgian design.\footnote{Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early Buildings} 33.}

Based on a recovered 1920 Plat there were other buildings surrounding the main house. There are five buildings depicted with a fenced in area. The main house appears to be the larger building in the center. Two buildings are located to the rear of the main house and two structures in front. The 1937 flyover did not lead to any conclusive evidence of buildings being extant at the time of Waterman’s survey. Therefore, it was undetermined whether the buildings depicted on the 1920 plat were still extant. The completeness of Philip Porcher’s ledger book keeps very detailed account of the daily workings at Cedar Springs Plantation. This book helps influence the history of the plantation development of the area. If Cedar Springs Plantation were still standing its significance would be very high on the local level. If the buildings identified on the 1920 plat were still standing in 1938 they would have added to the significance of the plantation landscape and its history. Since
there is no additional data that supports the existence of the buildings past 1920, no conclusive information was obtained.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{97} Plat for Cedar Springs is included with the Appendix page 151
Eutaw Plantation

Status: Dismantled; Underwater  
Plats: Yes  
Number Outbuildings Identified: 3  
Pictures: Yes  
Documentation: Yes

Discussion:

Eutaw Plantation was part of the original land grant that James Sinkler obtained in 1770. From this land grant he established Belvidere and Eutaw. Sinkler gave Eutaw Plantation to his son William to manage. The property remained within the Sinkler family until the onset of the Santee-Cooper Project. The main house was built by William in 1808. One of William’s prized possessions was his thoroughbred horses. On the plantation at Eutaw Plantation he built a race track specifically for his horses.98

Figure 19: Eutaw Plantation main house; 1938, Francis Benjamin Johnson, Library of Congress.

Eutaw Plantations main house is described by Waterman as resembling the Carolina-Caribbean style (see figure 19). At the same time Eutaw is also the archetype for the Santee Plan. The floor plan of Eutaw differs in that it more symmetrical than the others found in the region. Waterman describes the house as retaining its charm while still in a dilapidated state.  

Anne Sinkler Fishbourne briefly mentions Eutaw plantation in her book about Belvidere plantation. She mentions the landscape surrounding the main house.

“It (Eutaw Main house) stood on a gentle slope at the crest of the wide lawns, nestled in red oaks, hickory, and cedars, with gardens to the left and the negro quarters, or street, beyond. To the right were more woods and the long fields of corn and cotton stretching to the river…”

Francis Benjamin Johnson visited the plantation in 1938 and took several photos of the landscape and a Lodge located along the allee leading up to the main house. The lodge is a one story building that appears to have been whitewashed at some point. It has a small porch with four columns across the front. It has a gabled pediment covering the porch. Other photos depict an obscure view of the landscape showing unidentifiable buildings. There is a close up of small fowl box and chicken coup with fields in the background.

Three confirmed buildings were identified to be extant at the time of the 1938 survey. The lodge was included in Francis Benjamin Johnsons photographs during her photographic survey of the south. Three types of buildings were identified on the plantation.

---

100 Fishborne, Belvidere: A Plantation Memory, 6
as well as the fields in the surrounding landscape (see figures 20 and 21). Eutaw Plantation is significant to the local history.

Figure 20: Eutaw Lodge, Johnsons, Library of Congress.

Figure 21: Fowl Houses at Eutaw Plantation, Library of Congress.
Fair Springs Plantation

Status: Dismantled; Underwater
Plat: No
Number Outbuildings Identified: 0
Pictures: No
Documentation: No

Discussion:

No information regarding the initial land grant or settlement of Fair Spring Plantation was discovered. Even more unfortunately it was not visited by Waterman during his survey in 1938. Fair springs was not surveyed due to time restraints. During the research for Fair Springs Plantation a plat and an aerial were obtained. The aerial did not add any useful information and the 1922 plat did not show any identified buildings.

Figure 22: Fair Springs main house; 1938, Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.
**Hanover Plantation**

Status: Dismantled; Relocated  
Pictures: Yes  
Plats: Yes  
Documentation: Yes  
Number Outbuildings Identified: 1

**Discussion:**

Hanover Plantation was originally built in 1716 by the descendant of Huguenots émigré Pierre de St. Julien. Hanover Plantation eventually passed to Henry Ravenel. The house was moved under the suggestion of Thomas Waterman. Hanover house is now located at Clemson University under the care of the Clemson Historic Properties.

![Hanover Main house, 1938, Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.](image)

Outside of Thomas Waterman’s assessment of the main house, there is very little said about the plantation landscape. He mentions how dilapidated the main house is and that the surrounding landscape was overgrown (see figure 23). He briefly mentions that
one “plantation building” was standing. Located on the Library of Congress website there are four photos of the barn. These are attributed to Waterman on his 1938 visit.

Many of the outbuildings were destroyed during the 1752 Hurricane.\textsuperscript{102} Henry Ravenel wrote in his 1752 ledger that the Fowl House was completely demolished by the storm. The Cooper House, three “negro” house, kitchen house and corn house roof were lost.\textsuperscript{103} On the known plat of Hanover plantation there are very few buildings depicted. Based on this plate there appears to be only four buildings on the plantation in 1922.

Figure 24: Hanover Barn, 1938, Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.

By the time of Waterman’s report only one outbuilding was still standing (see figure 24). Older plats do show the existence of other buildings. These would have reflected the production that occurred at Hanover plantation. Based on Henry Ravenel Ledger this would

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{103} Henry Ravenel Ledger, SCHS.
\end{flushright}
not have been a major rice or cotton plantation. Cattle and livestock are mentioned more frequently than crops.\textsuperscript{104}

The significance of Hanover Plantation is not to be denied. It stands today on the Campus of Clemson University located in the Botanical gardens. The fact that this house still stands today is due to Waterman’s persistence. He saw in Hanover the early beginnings of not only Hanover’s History but of St. John’s as well. While no other buildings existed besides the barn it still would have greatly added to the history of the plantation. The surviving picture of the alone barn has proven useful. The Historic Properties at Hanover have incorporated the unique barn door into a current building built to house the house’s new HVAC system. It shows what can be done with the little information that does exist for these plantations.

\textsuperscript{104} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early Buildings}, 6; Henry Ravenel Ledger, SCHS.
Indianfield

Status: Dismantled; Underwater  Pictures: No
Plats: Yes  Documentation: No
Number Outbuildings Identified: 0

Discussion:

The early history of Indianfield Plantation is not clearly defined. Based on early plats, it was originally called South Hampton Plantation and was owned by General William Moultrie. After his death it comes into the hands of William Mazyck in 1816. At this time the name changes to Indianfield Plantation. It was later bought by Dr. Henry Ravenel of Pooshee Plantation. It stayed within the hands of the Ravenel family until Percival Porcher purchases the property. He sells the property to two New Yorkers, Albert Burns and Clarence Dillon. They use the property, along with several other plantations in...

Figure 25: Indianfield Main House; 1938, Green Collection, Caroliniana Library.
the area, for hunting. A portions of the plantation were still being farmed by African Americans.105

Waterman describes Indianfield Plantation house as a larger version of Bunker Hill Plantation. It is the same floor plan as all the other Pinopolis plans. The house itself, Waterman describes, as having been stripped of its finishing’s and deserted. The surrounding landscape was overgrown and scattered with broken trees. The fields were not planted as the plantation had been used a hunting reserve.106

No photographs were found depicting any additional buildings. A 1920 plat was obtained that showed a cluster of buildings located near the main house. This area is enclosed with a fence and contains a total of nine structures. This area was labeled settlement. The aerial added no additional information. It was therefore undetermined whether buildings existed at the time of Waterman’s survey. As the plantation was still being farmed by a community of African Americans it stands to reason that some of the original plantation outbuildings would have been in use.107 This is evidenced by other plantations with similar communities still working them. Unfortunately, while the plat identifies structures in 1920 plat, these cannot be verified as still standing at the time of Waterman’s survey in 1937.108

107 Porcher, Our Lost Heritage, 571.
108 Plat is located in Appendix page 152.
Lawson’s Pond

Status: Still Standing
Plats: Yes
Number Outbuildings Identified: 6
Pictures: Yes
Documentation: Yes

Discussion:

The main house for Lawson’s Pond Plantation was built in 1823 after Charles Cordes Porcher inherited the already established working plantation. Charles unfortunately has no heirs upon his death 1878 and as the entirety of his estate was intestate. It passed to Peter Couturier in 1880 after the settlement of the estate. It remains in the Couturier family today.¹⁰⁹ It was a very successful cotton plantation and has long stood as an example of the wealth and grandeur of this region. This still standing building still expresses this glory.

In Waterman’s assessment of the Lawson’s Pond Plantation he does not mention any of the surrounding landscape. Though it is one of the plantations left untouched by the flood waters, its importance to the region is insurmountable. Waterman describes the weatherboard of the house as discolored by weathering and unrestored. This is in fact untrue. To this day the weatherboard of Lawson’s Pond Plantation house is grey and weathered. This is not due to dilapidation but in fact to precaution. The boards are cypress and does not need to be painted. Cypress has natural repellents to insects and painting can harm the natural elements in the wood. He downplays the elaborate nature of the finishes that make Lawson’s Pond Plantation house so grand.110

Figure 27: Barn door at Lawson's Pond, 1938, Green Collection; Caroliniana Library.

There were several outbuildings on the property that lasted until an unfortunate fire in the 1990’s. These buildings were also identified during the 1977 National Register Nomination. At that time what would have been seen was a commissary, grits mills, barn, smokehouse, cook house, and kitchen house. The kitchen house and cook house fell into disrepair over the years and no longer stand. These buildings were lost to the natural decay of time.111 One photograph was found during archive research at the Thomas Cooper located in the Edwin Green file.112 This photograph, taken in 1938 was labeled “barn door” at Lawson’s Pond Plantation (see figure 27). The door shows similar stiles to those seen elsewhere among the plantation. It is a wooden door with diagonal slates. The side and roof of the building is also visible. The wood siding is a beaded weatherboard and the roof is composed of wooden shingles.

Unfortunately, the six buildings known to be extant during Thomas Waterman’s survey were not recorded either by him or the in the National Register nomination. As evidence by the photograph of the barn taken by Green in 1938 it exhibits the same diagonal sheathed door witnessed across the regions outbuildings. These buildings would have definitely added to understanding the vernacular architecture of the region.

111 Bradham, The Documentation of Lawson’s Pond, 41-43. These were all verified to still be standing up until the 1990’s. There were not mentioned or included on the National Register Nomination in 1977, http://www.nationalregister.sc.gov/berkeley/S10817708006/index.htm.
112 Edwin Green 1938. [Green collection], is a collection of photos that was to correspond with a manuscript discussing the plantations soon to be inundated by the Santee Cooper Project. Green was working along with F. M. Kirk who wrote several newspaper articles on the project and the plantations in the area.
Loch Dhu

Status: Still Standing          Pictures: Yes
Plats: No                      Documentation: Yes
Number Outbuildings Identified: 3

Discussion:

Though this plantation still stands, the majority of the original acreage was lost under the waters of Lake Marion. William Kirk received the original land grant in 1749. The main house was built by Robert J. Kirk in 1812 as witness by inlaid bricks on the chimney.\textsuperscript{113} The property remains largely in the hands of the Kirk family and relatives through its history.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{LochDhuMainHouse.png}
\caption{Loch Dhu main house; Unknown Date, Orangeburg County Plantation Collection; Caroliniana Library.}
\end{figure}

Thomas Waterman’s assessment of Loch Dhu Plantation house is in keeping with the majority of his assessments. He gives no indication as to what buildings are located on the landscape but describes the house in good detail. Loch Dhu Plantation house follows the typical Santee Plan. The roof of the house is different in that it is hipped rather than gabled. This roof, Waterman states, is more representative of those with the Pinopolis plan.\textsuperscript{114}

![Loch Dhu Kitchen house, 1976](image)

Figure 29: Loch Dhu Kitchen house, 1976, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, National Register Nomination Form.

As listed on the 1977 National Register Nomination there were several outbuildings associated with plantation. Based on photos taken by Waterman located on the Library of Congress website, there was a barn, smokehouse and kitchen still standing. These photos are not included in his report but in the photos associated with the survey.

\textsuperscript{114} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early}\ 19.
Based on the site visit of December 15, 2017 the original kitchen house located at the rear of the main house is still standing. This kitchen house is a small building approximately 10’x10’. It rests on a brick foundation. The siding and roofing have been replaced in recent years. The siding now is a painted wood weatherboard. The current roof is metal cladding. Located behind the Kitchen house was a small scattered brick foundation that may have been the smokehouse. The other buildings were lost to decay and are no longer standing.

While only one building was identified to be an original building, two others were also extant. These were a barn and shed added at a later date. The National Register nomination confirms that the kitchen observed on the site visit in December 2017 is the same pictured in their report. The nomination also verifies that two other buildings would have existed at the time of Waterman’s survey which are the smokehouse and a barn.

Figure 30: Loch Dhu smokehouse; 1976, HABS Survey, Library of Congress.
Northampton

Status: Dismantled; Underwater          Pictures: Yes
Plats: Yes                           Documentation: No
Number Outbuildings Identified: 9

Discussion:

The first known owner of the property was Pierre de St. Julien II who gave it to his son Pierre de St. Julien III. Pierre III built the house on the property in 1715, along the same time as Hanover Plantation house was constructed. It passed to Pierre III son Benjamin. After Benjamin’s death it passed to Elizabeth Moultrie who at the time was married to General William Moultrie. When Moultrie passed away in 1805, his son obtained the property. He too died without anyone to take over the plantation and the plantation was sold. Eventually, Percival Porcher obtained this planation in the early 1900’s and sold it to New Yorkers, Albert Burns and Clarence Dillon. At the time of the Santee-Cooper Project, the plantation was still being used by local African Americans.¹¹⁵ Many of the people living on the plantation were descendants of enslaved workers. This community was serving to work as tenant farmers and still lived in the existing slave quarters.¹¹⁶

Northampton Plantation is exceptional. It is one of the only two plantations that Waterman discuss in his report having existing outbuildings. Waterman describes these buildings as “complete.”¹¹⁷ It appears that he is insinuating that all the buildings required

for a working plantation are in existence. More importantly that the original grouping still exists. Research into Northampton Plantation uncovered a plat an aerial from around 1937 that confirms the placements of these buildings. The buildings that Waterman describes include slave dwellings, cottages (additional slave dwellings?), a smokehouse, barn, and shed.\textsuperscript{118}

Waterman describes the two “cottages” as being the closest to the house. These were located behind the main house and faced one another. He notes the large eaves that hang over the main entrance doors. The cottages are whitewashed and have split wood shingled roofs. The cottages, from Waterman’s depiction, seems to be that of a double house. The fireplace is centrally located and two separate rooms exist on either side. He

\textsuperscript{118} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early}, 5.
speculates that in one of the cottages would have contained the kitchen for the main house. The photographs that Waterman takes of the outbuildings are not all located in the report but are located within the Library of Congress online database. Other photographs were obtained in the Edwin Green file.\textsuperscript{119}

Figure 32: Northampton Outbuildings; 1938, Thomas Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.

Northampton Plantation was at one time the house of General Moultrie. The plantation is significance not only to the local community but to the state as the home of a Revolutionary War General. The outbuildings located within the plantation landscape exhibited unique features and vernacular architecture. While no additional information was found on the outbuildings, the pictures taken by Waterman proved useful.

\textsuperscript{119} Green collection, 1938, Photographs 11170 (1-161) box.
Ophir
Status: Dismantled; Underwater          Pictures: No
Plats: Yes                              Documentation: No
Number Outbuildings Identified: 5

Discussion:

Peter Porcher II obtained the property at an unknown date. Upon his death in 1781 he left the plantation called Ophir to his son, Colonel Thomas Porcher. Ophir plantation stayed within the Porcher family until the onset of the Santee Cooper project. Col. Thomas Porcher built the main house on the plantation in 1810. Rice was one of the early produced crops at Ophir Plantation. In later years, bricks were made on site. In the Diary of Isaac

Figure 33: Ophir main house; 1938, Thomas Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.
DuBose Porcher, a later owner of the plantation, purchased a brick making machine from Medway.¹²⁰

Waterman does not include in his brief description of Ophir Plantation mention of the landscape or outbuildings. Ophir Plantation, Waterman describes, as being one of two plantations in the Pinopolis region that follows the Santee plan. Waterman describes the two story, gabled roof house as maladroit or barn like. The lack of architectural refinement appears to be the cause of this description by Waterman. The simplicity or bulkiness of the house stems more from its need as shelter rather than fitting into an ideal pattern or plan. The house follows a more logical approach, or as Waterman described:

“they are result of native solutions to native problems. The general trimness that the house possesses in mass and details results from logical design of decorative features and the logical relation of the details as a whole.”

¹²⁰ Anne S. Ball, Pinopolis: history of a pineland village, [publisher not identified], 1984, 85; Porcher, Our Lost Heritage, 634.
A plat from 1922 was obtained. This plat depicts five structures besides the main house labeled residence. The buildings are located to the west of the main house. Only one is clearly defined as tenet. The other four are illegible. Also included north west of these buildings is a labeled dog lot.

Ophir Plantation has quite a bit written of the daily operations on the plantation. Several Journals exist of describing these. The first known journal or ledger was written by Col. Thomas Porcher in 1824-1831. After this a journal written by his son, Henry Francis Porcher, continues it briefly in the 1850’s. Henry’s son, Thomas Courtier Porcher, even more briefly writes about the plantation during 1866. Their written descriptions also include mentions of other plantations in the region. These include, Gooshen Plantation, Pooshee Plantation, Cedar Springs Plantation, White Hall Plantation, and Sarazin (Sarrasin) Plantation. Col. Thomas Porcher’s journal is the only one to specifically reference outbuildings on the plantation. The majority of these discussions reflect crop production. In Col. Thomas Porcher’s journal dated August 24, 1824 he commissions a new wash house to be constructed. He also mentions that the several buildings need to be shingled. These are a school house, fowl house, and stable. The remaining entries are limited to daily rice and cotton production on the plantation. Unfortunately, in Col. Thomas Porcher’s description he does not give locations of the structures and therefore identifying them on the plats is difficult.\textsuperscript{121} The 1922 plat still shows the existence of the school house located near the southwest corner of the property.

\textsuperscript{121} Porcher Family, 1783-1872, Col. Thomas Porcher Ledger, SCHS.
While the last plat obtained was made in 1922, the existence of African American communities working the plantation confirm the existence of structures on the plantation. This community was referred to in an interview conducted by Richard Porcher for his book *Our Lost Heritage*. Therefore, the six identified structures on the plat, which exclude the main house, are deemed to be extant. These are clearly labeled as being used by tenant farmers on the 1922 map.\textsuperscript{122}

This plantation is significant on the local level for its history to the region. The outbuildings that existed and that were still being used would have shown the development of the plantation as a whole. Based on the journal of Col. Thomas Porcher, there is knowledge of these inner workings.

\textsuperscript{122} Porcher, *Our Lost Heritage*, 567.
**Pond Bluff**

Status: Dismantled; Underwater  
Pictures: Yes  
Plats: No  
Documentation: No  
Number Outbuildings Identified: 8

**Discussion:**

Pond Bluff Plantation was originally granted to William Flud in 1758. In 1773 Francis Marion purchases it and surrounding property to create the 1452 acre plantation. Following Marion’s death in 1795 his wife, Mary Esther Videau Marion, runs the plantation until her death in 1814. At that time, the plantation passes to Colonel Keating Lewis Simons, a relative. It passes to his sons following his death.¹²³

![Figure 35: Pond Bluff main house; 1938, Thomas Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.](image)

This is the second plantation that Waterman gives a description to the outbuildings in addition to the main house. In addition to this he brings to attention the detail of the barn

---

doors. Which are diagonally sheathed. These are seen elsewhere to some degree and variation. He also points out the large hand wrought door hardware. The only buildings individually mentions are the smokehouse and kitchen. The majority of the photographs of the outbuildings exist within his report and also on the Library of Congress website. Several barns are observed from the obscure landscape shots. In these photographs a fence is seen around portions of the yard. No plats were found and the aerials did not confirm any additional information. The three buildings closest the main house resemble that of those seen at other plantations. The smoke house, chicken coop, and kitchen house have unpainted wood siding and wood shingled roofs. The doors on both the kitchen and smokehouse have the diagonal sheathing that is mimicked across the region.\textsuperscript{124}

\textsuperscript{124} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early Buildings}, 15.
Based on the photos recovered, Pond Bluff Plantation much like Northampton plantation, shows a complete set of outbuildings. These buildings show the uniqueness of the vernacular nature of this region’s outbuildings. Its main significance rests on General Francis Marion of Revolutionary fame. Waterman restrained the importance of this site because the main house built by Marion had burned and new building was built in later years. Research did not uncover any other photographs or documents on Pond Bluff plantation or its surrounding landscape. The descriptions and photographs included in Waterman’s report serve as very useful sources of information regarding these features of Pond Bluff Plantation.

Figure 37: Pond Bluff Outbuildings; 1938, Thomas Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.
Pooshee Plantation

Status: Dismantled; Underwater                    Pictures: No
Plats: No                                           Documentation: Yes
Number Outbuildings Identified: 0

Discussion:

Pooshee Plantation was obtained by land grant in 1704 to Pierre de St. Julien de Malacre II. He conveys the property to Henry Le Noble who give it to his daughter, Susanne, and her husband, Rene Louis Ravenel. In 1716, construction of the main house at Pooshee Plantation is completed. Pooshee Plantation eventually passes to Henry Ravenel of Hanover Plantation. From him, it passes to his son Rene. It stayed within the Ravenel until 1906 when it came into Porcher ownership.125

Figure 38: Pooshee main house; 1938, Thomas Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.

Much is known about the inner workings of the plantation due to many diaries and records that were kept of the property. Life at Pooshee Plantation was extensively written about by Henry William Ravenel around 1876. In his article titled “Recollections of Southern Plantation Life” he includes much of the intricate workings and social life on the plantation. This also reached to the enslaved African-American community on the plantation based on what he witnessed. He describes roughly the landscape and buildings within Pooshee Plantation. At the time of his writing, plantations in the St. John’s region were no longer high functioning plantations but still retained their extensive legacies. Henry William Ravenel discusses the Negro yard in great detail. He describes the yard to be near to the main house. He goes on to give descriptions of the houses located within the yard:

“The houses were built plainly, but comfortably, of sawed boards-about 30’x18’ with a central brick chimney in the center, giving a large fireplace on each side. A partition in the middle divided the house, either for one large family or two smaller ones, the sleeping rooms being partitioned off from the sitting place near the fire.”

Henry Ravenel goes on to say that the houses are whitewashed and lined in a row. He does not give an amount of houses located on the “street.” He does mention that they are about fifty yards apart. Located closer to the main house was a sick house or hospital for the enslaved workers. Ravenel mentions how on some plantations, “in later years”, a chapel was added in the yard. He goes on to mention that in front of every house in the yard had a chicken house and barn and towards the back of the houses would be a vegetable

126 While written in 1876, Henry William Ravenel writes exclusively about the social and working interactions during slavery. These are meant to be reflections of the height of antebellum plantation system.
garden. These gardens would extend around the house and cover all the ground except for small foot paths connecting the houses. These gardens were “private” gardens used extensively by those enslaved on the plantation. The items grown in the garden, as well as other items hand crafted by those enslaved, would be sold or bartered for other necessities. Ravenel discuss how in the early days of the plantation system, enslaved workers would be able to sell items at local community stores. When the masters found them to be buying items they considered contraband, they began plantation stores were the enslaved workers could purchase approved items. 127 Throughout this article, Ravenel discusses daily operations and how the plantation system at Pooshee Plantation worked. The labor system was a task-based system and the main production was long staple cotton. The enslaved field workers had an overseer as well as a driver. Though he does not mention it, there would have been several buildings associated with cotton production including a gin. There were have been housing provided for the overseer as well. Other buildings that he does mention on the plantation are a meat house, barn, and poultry house. As state economic changes influenced the plantation operations, Pooshee Plantation at its height, was a self-sustaining plantation. Production sources included on the plantation included brick making, saw milling, weaving and spinning, and tanning. For these production sources, Ravenel mentions that individual buildings would have contained these processes. A major landmark of Pooshee Plantation, and other plantations in St. Johns Parish, were the springs.

127 Henry William Ravenel discusses the “evil” that these contraband items brought to those enslaved people. The masters saw these contraband items as causing “trouble and annoyances.” Good sold at the plantation store were bought wholesale by the masters and sold at cost to the workers. These items were deemed beneficial to the “negroes” and included cloth, food stuffs, tinware and other items. This way the masters felt safer and controlled what was in these “private” homes; Ras Michael Brown, *African-American Cultures and the South Carolina Lowcountry*, (Cambridge University Press, 2012), 286.
These springs were valuable resources to the plantation owners and enslaved workers. For the enslaved African Americans these springs had special meaning connecting to their African Heritage. They believed that a water spirit, or cymbee, was a watchful guardian who controlled the water. Disturbing the cymbee would result in a vengeful spirit. According to *African-Atlantic Cultures of the South Carolina Lowcountry*, When Henry Ravenel went to construct a wall, or enclose, around the spring he was warned that it would upset the spirit. When he did not heed their warning, they believed this to be the reason for an eventual drought brought on the plantation. Unfortunately, for this research, the springs were not identified on the plats but are still considered an intricate part of the landscape.

Since Ravenel does not mention how many houses were located within the yard, a number of different types of buildings will be given. He mentions twelve different buildings located on the plantation during his time on the plantation. While evidence of extant buildings in 1938 is still a mystery what is gained from this written description is its account of the type of buildings. Waterman did not give an account of the landscape or the buildings thereon in his report. While plats or photographs were not found for Pooshee Plantation, the information regarding the size of the slave housing and their location to one another can possibly be attributed to those found for other plantations in the region. This will help in identifying commonality across the plantations landscapes.

---

Unfortunately, whether the building described by Ravenel existed at the time of Waterman’s survey is unclear. What is obtained from this research is a clear indication of what the environs in St. John’s would have contained during the height of the antebellum period.

Figure 39: Pooshee Allee, 1938, Green Collection, Caroliniana Library.
The Rocks

Status: Moved; Burned
Plats: Yes
Number Outbuildings Identified: 3

Discussion:

Thomas Middleton was granted the property known as The Rocks Plantation in 1732. When he died in 1745 the plantation was sold off to pay his debts. It is not until 1794 that Peter Gaillard purchases the property. By 1794 he had turned the plantation into a successful cotton operation. It was not until 1803 that he constructed the main house on the property. It passed through family hands until 1907 when it was sold to T. L. Connor. It has remained in the Connor family since that time.129

---

Waterman provided much detail into the beauty of the main house located at The Rocks Plantation and calls for its being saved. Not much is mentioned about the surrounding landscape. The main house is described as the best example of the “Santee Plan.” Waterman describes The Rocks Plantation as a full development of the architecture of the region. It is due to Waterman’s careful consideration of the attributes of The Rocks Plantation that it is relocated.

The Rocks Plantation was dismantled and moved before the construction of the reservoirs. It was also one of the only ones to be moved along with several of its outbuildings. On the National Register Nomination conducted in 1976 it lists a smokehouse, slave quarters, and several other outbuildings. During this time two photos of the smokehouse and slave dwelling are taken. These are currently located on the Library

![Image: The Rocks Slave Dwelling; 1977, HABS Survey, Library of Congress.](image1)

Figure 41: The Rocks Slave Dwelling; 1977, HABS Survey, Library of Congress.

---

of Congress website. The plantation continued to survive as a working plantation until the 1980s. In 1992 the main house was lost to a fire. The slave dwelling was no longer on the property at the time of the site visit. While the plantation is no longer a working farm several of the original buildings still stand.132

A site visit was conducted on December 16, 2017 and three buildings were identified as still standing. The smoke house still stands roughly behind the location of the original house. It’s a small building roughly 12’x 12’. It’s a wooden building currently painted red and has a metal roof. The door was off its hinges and stored inside. The door has diagonal slates that compose its building. A large potato or “tator” house was also identified. The building had two wings added on to its sides. Originally it would have been a long rectangular building with an open floor plan. The building measures approximately 17’x 60’. Its original door is gone and replaced with a plywood door. The siding is painted red and the roof has been replaced with metal. The last remaining building was an overseer’s house. Because of the dilapidated state of the house only rough measurements were allowed. The house is no longer in a stable condition. Its measurements are roughly 38’x 30’. It has a porch that does not expand the length of the house. It is two stories and has an addition added on the rear that is only one story. Like that of the other buildings it is painted red and has a metal roof. No other features of the house were able to be assessed due to its condition. Based on a photograph of an overseer’s house located at Wantoot

---

132 Matrana, *Lost Plantations of the South*, 74-78.
Plantation the styles are very similar. Wantoot was a plantation located within the Middle St John’s inundation area not surveyed by Waterman.¹³³

The house was placed on the National Register in 1976 but removed once it burned in 1992. The remaining original outbuildings still exist and consideration should be done to place them back on the National Register. These are some of the few surviving building from the region now inundated.

Figure 42: The Rocks Overseer’s house; 2017, Kristina Poston

**Somerset**

Status: Dismantled; Underwater

Pictures: No

Plats: Yes

Documentation: No

Number Outbuildings Identified: 0

Discussion:

Somerset Plantation originated as part of an 804 land grant made to John Stewart in 1696. Stewart sold the land two years later to a Rev. William Scraven. In 1704, he sold the property to Rene Ravenel. It eventually passes to the Cain family. Unfortunately, documentation on the plantation was lacking for the details regarding the outbuildings. A 1920 plat was obtained that shows at least twenty-two buildings on the property.  

The house at Somerset Plantation keeps with the Santee Plan as described by Waterman. The house is two story with a gable roof. Unlike the other houses in the region,

---

Somerset Plantation house is square. Waterman describes the house as being awkward in other regards as well. Many of its attributes are not symmetrical. Especially the windows along the sides of the house. These windows are spaces specifically to light the interior rooms and therefore unevenly spaced.\textsuperscript{135}

The 1938 aerial flyover did not confirm the existence of the identified buildings on the 1920 plat. On the plat are two distinct separate areas. Within a fenced area there were eight buildings. This area is labeled settlement. Thirteen other buildings are located within the labeled fields and close to a marl pit. As the plantation was still being worked up until 1940, right before Santee-Cooper closed the dam, it probable that the buildings observed on the 1920’s plat would have been on the landscape in 1938.

\textsuperscript{135} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early Buildings}, 25.
**Springfield**

Status: Dismantled; Underwater  
Pictures: Yes  
Plats: Yes  
Documentation: No  
Number Outbuildings Identified: 1

Discussion:

Exact dates of the original land grant for the property is unknown, but Isaac Courtier and Thomas Palmer are the earliest documented owners. In 1776, they both sell their rights to the property to Captain John Palmer. It remained in the Palmer Family until the onset of the Santee-Cooper Project.\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{136} Matrana, *Lost Plantations of the South*, 68-70.

Figure 44: Springfield Main house; 1938, Green Collection, Caroliniana Library.

The main house at Springfield Plantation is less elaborate than those found within the Santee Plan. Waterman describes Springfield as having less refinement. The house fits the typical two story gable roof design but lacks any additional ornamentation. Waterman
does not include any information about the landscape or outbuildings in his description of
the main house. He does include a photograph of a Dutch oven associated with a ruined
kitchen house. This is part of a chimney ruin with little other definable features. No other
photographs were found of the Dutch oven or other possible outbuildings.\textsuperscript{137}

Based on a 1914 plat there are four buildings located to the east of the main house.
These are located within a fenced area that includes the main house but distinguished by a
label of “yard.” To the west of the main house outside the fenced area is a barn.

As the information was inconclusive, it was undetermined what buildings would
have remained at the time of Waterman’s visit. No other information regarding the Dutch
oven was uncovered but will be counted as the only documented outbuilding existing at
the time of his survey. The Dutch oven was probably the remains of a Kitchen that stood
on the property. As it was in ruins, it is probable that no other outbuildings were standing
in 1938.

\textsuperscript{137} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early Buildings}, 21.
Wampee
Status: Still Standing, Owned by Santee-Cooper
Pictures: No
Plats: No
Documentation: No
Number Outbuildings Identified: 0
Discussion:

John Stuart was the first to obtain the plantation. In 1696, his land grant included around 1,000 acres. From this the plantations acreage fluctuated over the years eventually giving acres to create both Somerset and Somerton Plantations. It passed through several hands over the years until it finally came into the Cain family sometime around the turn of the century. While the flood waters of Lake Moultrie inundated the majority of the property, the main house still stands and is currently used by Santee-Cooper as their Conference Center. Santee-Cooper restored the home for their use in 1944.\textsuperscript{138}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{wampee_main_house_1938_thomas_waterman_survey_library_of_congress}
\caption{Wampee main house; 1938, Thomas Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.}
\end{figure}

Waterman offered no description of the landscape in his report. He does describe
the house as keeping with the Pinopolis plan while it is smaller in scale. Waterman
describes the house as resembling those in the British West Indies. Waterman makes this
conclusion based on the large windows, close-cut eaves, and pronounced bellcast. The
interior of the house also has a lack of elaborate trim detail as seen at the other plantations
in the region.\textsuperscript{139}

An 1805 plat exist of Wampee Plantation that show general layouts of the
plantation. On this plat the main house is flanked by five structures lined in a row. Directly
behind the house are two other structures. A later plat was not found that added any new
information. A photo was found in the SCHS collection that shows an obscure view of the
Wampee Plantation enslaved houses. These are rather small buildings made of wood
framing. They are covered in wood siding and the roofing material is undiscernible. They
are in an arbitrary line and it appears to be two rows facing each other. From the picture
these buildings look close to a rice field or swamp of some sort. The date of the photograph
was not obtained and no other information was gleamed.

Since there was no other documentation that confirmed the existence of the
buildings identified on the 1805 plat, it was determined inconclusive. Therefor it is
unknown what buildings if any existed during waterman’s survey.

\textsuperscript{139} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early Buildings}, 30.
White Hall

Status: Dismantled; Underwater Pictures: No
Plats: Yes Documentation: No
Number Outbuildings Identified: 15

Discussion:

Earliest documentation of White Hall Plantation is not very clear. Sources depict a travel stop or tavern. The name originated from the owner’s surname, White. The first mention of White Hall as a plantation appears in 1714. Thomas Porcher eventually purchases the property and builds a house on the property for his son, Thomas Porcher Jr. It comes into the hands of the Lucas family through a marriage and remained there until the Santee-Cooper project. The plantation was visited by Basil Hall in 1828 when he visited several plantations in the low country as well as Charleston. While at White Hall Plantation, he made a sketch of the field slave houses near the rice fields. In this you can see the buildings double rowed leading to a rice field. The buildings are small with end chimneys. The roofing appears to be wood shingles and the enclosed with weatherboard.

Waterman describes the house at White Hall Plantation as having been transformed from its original Pinopolis plan. Additions to the house created a larger mansion style home, more so than any other Waterman describes. It does retain its two story layout with gable roof. The addition to the building creates a T-footprint. Waterman goes on to describe

---

140 Basil Hall Was born in the United Kingdom and was a Scottish explorer after having been in the Royal Navy. He wrote a book on his travels entitled *Travels in North America in 1827-28* (1829). He visits South Carolina in 1828 and wrote about many of the plantations that he visited. The sketching done at White Hall is housed in the collection at Lilly Library Manuscript Collections in their collection of Basil Hall.

the interior decorated spaces of the house to further his description of its elaborate nature.\textsuperscript{142}

On the 1929 plat obtained for the plantation, the main house is listed as new and stands alone among a heavily forested area. To the North of the property are the “negro” houses. These are located in the cleared fields. These are separated by a creek called Ball branch. On either side of this creek are located the housing for the workers. To the west of the creek are five buildings lined in a single row running east to west. Across the creek are a double row of houses running in a similar fashion. The two rows are divided into four houses in each row. Located to the southeast from this row of houses is a building labeled barn. North from the barn, but offset from the row of houses, is an unidentified building.

Figure 46: White Hall main house; 1938, Green Collection, Library of Congress.

\textsuperscript{142} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early Buildings}, 31.
Based on the plat there were 15 identified buildings probably standing at the time of Waterman’s survey. As there was still an African American community working the plantation at this time these buildings would have been utilized. Richard Porcher notes that these buildings were moved to establish a new community called Frasier Hill outside of the inundation area.\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{143} Porcher, \textit{Our Lost Heritage}, 639.
Woodlawn

Status: Dismantled, Moved  Pictures: Yes
Plats: No  Documentation: No
Number Outbuildings Identified: 2

Discussion:

Originally identified as Fountain Head, it was owned by William Doughtery in 1796. When it was purchased by Edward Edwards in 1800 it was renamed Woodlawn Plantation. It was purchased by Stephen Deveux in 1820. When Devaux’s son inherits the plantation he sells it to Percival Porcher in 1910. Woodlawn Plantation was dismantled and moved to Dover Plantation in Georgetown, SC.144

Figure 47: Woodlawn main house; 1938, Thomas Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.

The main house at Woodlawn Plantation is another that Waterman emphasized the architectural value. The house follows that of the Pinopolis plan that Waterman described.

Waterman reported the porch set the house apart. The porch columns are extended beyond the porch line and set on brick columns. He also noted that the porch is set back from the columns by four feet. Waterman offers no reason for this porch design.

No plat was found that listed any outbuildings. Inevitably, no conclusive information regarding the existence of outbuildings was found. While the plantation was still being worked at the time of the inundation, no record of extant buildings exists.\textsuperscript{145}

\textbf{Results}

The following results are gained from the information obtained in the \textit{post hoc} survey. These include archival information as well as information obtained from site visits. The \textit{post hoc} survey included all eighteen plantations originally surveyed by Waterman in 1938. The \textit{post hoc} surveyed used several resources to add to Thomas Waterman’s 1938 survey. In addition to the plantations surveyed by Waterman, other plantations were included for the \textit{post hoc} survey.

Thomas Waterman mentions that he was unable to visit three plantations, Fair Springs Plantation, St. Julien Plantation, and Walnut Grove Plantation. Waterman intended to include these for his survey but did not due to time restraints. Fair Springs Plantation was completely inundated by the project. St. Julien Plantation and Walnut Grove Plantation, however, are located outside the inundated area.\textsuperscript{146} Since these two plantations still stand, they were assessed by a site visit. The historic outbuildings identified at these extant plantations are used to help determine stylistic commonalities with buildings

\textsuperscript{145} Waterman, \textit{A Survey of the Early Buildings}, 34.

\textsuperscript{146} This is Waterman’s accession of “out of bounds.” For Waterman, if the main house was out of the reach of the water it was not considered in danger. For instance, Walnut Grove lost acres of agricultural fields while the main house was never in danger.
inundated. These extant buildings were compared to those that were only photographed to help determine if styles varied or were retained through the region. Site visits also obtained measurements of several buildings and these were useful in assessing common dimensions.

Numertia Plantation was also located outside of the inundation area. Numertia Plantation was also considered for this *post hoc* survey along with these standing buildings due to its close proximity to Loch Dhu Plantation, Walnut Grove Plantation, and several other plantations that were inundated. The plantation was photographed by Waterman on his visit in 1939 but it was excluded from his survey because there was no fear of inundation. Research determined that several outbuildings did exist on the property until 1989 when Hurricane Hugo demolished the buildings. A site visit was not obtained to verify the information and therefore Numertia Plantation offers no comparable outbuildings for this study. As Walnut Grove Plantation and St. Julien Plantation still have

Figure 48: Kitchen house at Walnut Grove, 2017, Kristina Poston.
standing buildings and maintain their location, they were assessed on a site visit conducted on December 15, 2017 and January 10, 2018 respectively. Upon the site visit to Walnut Grove Plantation only two buildings were identified to be within the age range established in the methodology. These are the kitchen house and smoke house. The kitchen house dates to 1820, the date of the construction of the main house. The smokehouse was built later, circa 1850s-70s. The kitchen house was in the process being reconstructed at the time of the site visit. Its front wall, roof and one side was all that remained of the original building. Since the building had been raised to support a new concrete floor only a rough footprint of the building was obtained. The building measurement was approximately 13’ x 13’. The height of the building was not obtained as the roof and remaining wall

Figure 49: Smokehouse at Walnut Grove, 2017, Kristina Poston

147 The date range of “eligibility” was 50 years from the time of Waterman’s assessment placing any qualifying structures at 1880 or younger.
148 Since the structure had been lifted and only three walls remained, only a rough assessment of the Kitchen House was obtained.
were raised on a new foundation.149 The remaining original material included wood framing, wood beaded weatherboard siding, and brick.

The smoke house was intact and rather large, measuring measures 16’x 20’ and is 17’ in height. The building is a wood framed building cladded in beaded weatherboard and currently has a metal roof. The smokehouse has a brick foundation and brick floor. Two work benches made of wood located along the walls. The benches have cut marks where the smoked meat would have been prepared. There is also evidence of beam ties across the ceiling where meat would have been hung. Two aerials were obtained of the plantation taken in 1960 and 1980, showing that the kitchen and smokehouse still remain in their original locations (see appendix b). Two double house dwellings are also pictured as well as several other barns located on the property.150 By the early 1990s only one of the dwellings was still standing. The owner of St. Julien Plantation recognized the need to preserve this building and had it moved to his property.

Five historic outbuildings remain at St. Julien Plantation. A warehouse, a mule barn and two slave dwellings are original to St. Julien Plantation. A slave dwelling was moved there from Walnut Grove Plantation.151 The oldest building is the warehouse built circa 1854, prior to the main house. It is possibly the earliest building still extant on the plantation. It is built with wooden logs segmented by split wood beams. The timbers are

---

149 The new foundation was a new cinder block construction with a concrete floor. According to a brief conversation with on-site contractor, the area will be used as a fire pit, grill area.
150 Based on the site visit as well as research the other buildings dated to a much later time period or were no longer standing. The property had been abandoned for many years and the property had fallen into disrepair.
151 One of the dwellings being moved from Walnut Grove.
all hand hewn and are connected by mortise and tenon joints. Faded scribe marks remain on some of the interior beams. This building is currently used as storage but was originally a warehouse. It is rectangular and measures 24’x45’.

The mule barn is 28’x 53’. The door is framed with two tack rooms that measure 9’x9’. There is evidence of individual stales located on the interior and probably contained
six stalls on either side. The building rests on a brick foundation and it built of wooden members. The barn is built in the carpenter gothic style which include lattice covered windows and large expansive eaves.

Located to the rear of the main house is a servant’s house. The measurements of the building are 18’x 16’ but has a shed addition. It is wood framed building enclosed with board and batten siding and rests on a brick foundation. Visible along the outside eaves are round rafter logs. Further along the yard behind the house is the kitchen house. This building rests on brick pillars and measures 18’x 16’. Like the servant’s house, the kitchen house is a wood framed structure with board and batten siding which rests on brick piers. The other dwelling located on the property is original to Walnut Grove Plantation. It was constructed in 1820-30, around the time of the kitchen and main house at Walnut Grove Plantation. It is a typical double house with a fireplace in the center and two separate entrances. It measures 36’x 18’. Currently it is resting on brick piers and is cladded in beaded weatherboard siding. Along the interior are evidence of newspapers and wallpaper used by residents over the years.
Other Plantations

Thomas Waterman does not discuss several plantations in his report. These plantations eventually were, completely or largely, inundated by the Santee-Cooper Project. Waterman’s reasons for not exploring these plantations is simple: the main plantation homes no longer existed. In Waterman’s eyes there was nothing there to document. Since most surveys at the time consistently surveyed only the high style architecture, the vernacular buildings were often overlooked. Waterman excluded these specific plantations because the main house, which exhibit high style architecture, were no longer extant. The existence of the vernacular buildings located on the property are now unknown. Waterman mentions Moorfield Plantation, Saracens (Sarrazin) Plantation, and Chelsea Plantation which he says “are of a central hall plan, but no longer standing.”152 In fact this are only mentioned because of his knowledge to their layout which he deems important. Waterman excludes from his survey several plantations that were later inundated. These plantations are: Brunswick Plantation, Chapel Hill Plantation, Chelsea Plantation, Goshen Plantation, Moorfield Plantation, Sarrazin Plantation, Somerton Plantation, and Wantoot Plantation. 153

152 Waterman, A Survey of the Early Buildings, 35.
153 Waterman, A Survey of the Early and Porcher, Our Lost Heritage.
CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis

One of the research goals pursued was the identification of what outbuildings existed at the time of Thomas Waterman’s Survey. Next a new survey needed to be created that included these buildings. The following is an analysis of what data was best used for these purposes and what was most available to conduct this post hoc survey. The results here show the usefulness of a post hoc survey. It also includes information on the variety of buildings identified among all the plantations. The data, as it will be referred to here, is composed of the amount of plantations reviewed, how many buildings were identified, and what sources were best used.

The data is comprised of the eighteen plantations surveyed by Thomas Waterman as well as four additional plantations. Walnut Grove Plantation, Fair Springs Plantation, and St. Julien Plantation were originally meant to be included with Waterman’s survey but he ran out of time to include them. Fair Springs was inundated by the Santee-Cooper project.154 This brings the survey to include 22 plantations.

Extant Buildings Identified

The results of the post hoc survey varied by availability of information eighty years after Waterman’s survey. Some plantations produced more information than others. The post hoc survey discovered outbuildings at fifteen of twenty-two plantations. Waterman identified outbuildings at three plantations. Waterman describes Northampton Plantation

---

154 Numertia was considered due to its close proximity to the other plantations but access to the plantations was not obtained.
as having the most complete set of outbuildings. These outbuildings consisted of five different types of buildings. Two servants’ cottages flank the rear of the house. One of these cottages housed the kitchen. Behind these buildings was another slave dwelling, a smokehouse, and a barn. In Waterman’s report he identified a smokehouse and a kitchen house at Pond Bluff Plantation. However, Waterman’s photographs show several other outbuildings located within a fenced area. At Hanover he mentions a building but does not include a description but included with his survey are pictures of a barn. Waterman’s report includes a photograph of a Dutch oven kitchen ruin at Springfield Plantation but he briefly describes the structure in the body of the report.\footnote{This Dutch oven ruin is listed on the HABS website as being a kitchen ruin. The Dutch oven itself was most probably part of the baking oven used in a kitchen house.}

Thomas Waterman’s identified eight outbuildings at three plantations. The \textit{post hoc} survey determined that outbuildings at another twelve plantations were present. In addition to these fifteen determined to have standing buildings in 1938, another five plantations were identified as probable of having outbuildings in 1938. These five plantations were identified to have standing buildings as late as 1920-1922 as noted on plats drawn up in those years.\footnote{See Appendix for Plats.} Though the outbuildings could have been removed from the plantation landscape between 1922-1938, it is likely that some of these buildings, or remnants of them, would have endured until 1938. Two plantations were determined inconclusive for any data. For these plantations no plats, photographs, or documentary evidence the plantations existed to evaluate for extant structures. Therefore, this thesis cannot say whether buildings were or were not standing at the time of Waterman’s survey.
Of the four plantations Waterman did not visit, three contained standing buildings in 1938. These three plantations ended up partially inundated or fully outside the flood zone. Numertia Plantation was located outside the flood zone but lost the majority of its outbuildings during Hurricane Hugo in 1989. St. Julien Plantation and Walnut Grove Plantation still maintain some of their original buildings. Others were lost.

![Table 1: Plantations with Structures Extant in 1938](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Not Enough Data</th>
<th>Total Plantations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Types of Buildings Identified**

The types of buildings discussed in this section reflect those that were standing at the time of Thomas Waterman’s survey in 1938. These do not reflect every aspect of the plantation production or the plantations social complex over the years. While only a portion of the plantations history is reflected in those extant buildings, we know other buildings aided to the production of the plantation landscape. Because of this, a brief understanding of the production that took place in the region was considered. The agriculture of the region had varied over the years. Much of the early production in the area centered around indigo and rice production. Indigo declined in the region following the American Revolution. Cotton became more prevalent in the upper regions of St. Johns Parish. Rice was remained the prime agricultural crop in the Lower region of the parish. The middle portion of St. John’s contained a mixture of both but relied more on cotton production. Many of these plantations were still being worked up until the dams closed in 1942. By this time production did not resemble that of its antebellum days. These plantations saw a variety of
uses leading up to the Santee-Cooper project. Many of the plantation were still producing crops and selling timber.

Some of these plantations still produced crops, therefore, many of the antebellum outbuildings may have been in use. Some antebellum period buildings were possibly repurposed. The following buildings reflect those that were positively identified. Therefore, this thesis can make no assumptions about what buildings would have been on a rice or cotton plantation for their production uses. It assesses only those clearly identified to extant in 1938.

Out of the fifteen plantations surveyed, sixteen different types of extant buildings were identified. For the purpose of this thesis an exact number of outbuildings by individual plantation was not obtained. In the written documentation found, types were discussed more than the exact numbers. For instance, documentary evidence would only suggest dwellings on the landscape but not refer to how many. This was especially true for those refereed to exist along the “negro” street. Photographs used for this analysis were also these were limited to picturing only the area surrounding the main house and did not include the further reaches of the plantation. All of the buildings completely identified were those located within the yard space. Very little are representative of the field buildings or other landscape features. The following lists identifies sixteen types of buildings found to be extant at the time of the 1938 survey in order of frequency mentioned.
Table 2: Identified Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Smokehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kitchen/Kitchen House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-room House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overseer’s House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fowl house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Chicken coops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Barns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mule Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undetermined use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Chapels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Others[^157]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smokehouses

Several smokehouses were mentioned to be extant during the 1938 survey. Two still exist. These are located at The Rocks Plantation and at Walnut Grove Plantation. Both of these smokehouses have are square have a square floor plan with a single entrance, the dimensions of the building vary at both plantations. The ones pictured from Pond Bluff Plantation and Northampton Plantation also differ. There are similarities among the smokehouses (see figures 54-57). Those pictured from the inundated plantations have wood shingled roofs. The extant buildings currently have metal roofs. The roofs of the smokehouses are pyramid hipped. The door to the smokehouses, with the exception of Northampron Plantation, all have a variations of the diagonally sheathed wood door. The

[^157]: The “other” category will be mentioned in the analysis located in this chapter.
doors are hinged with large cast iron strap hinges. The doors are located roughly in the center of the wall of the building. No other openings exist within the smokehouse. The smokehouses rest on a bricked foundation ranging from 10” to 1’ in height. Typically, no flooring system is found in a smokehouse. The brick foundation locked in the base of the

Figure 54: Smokehouse Loch Dhu, National Register, Library of Congress.

Figure 55: Smokehouse Pond Bluff, Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.

Figure 56: Smokehouse The Rocks, National Register, Library of Congress.

Figure 57: Smokehouse, Northampton, Waterman Survey, Library of Congress.
structure with the framing resting on top. Walnut Grove Plantation smokehouse is unique in that it has a bricked floor. This was probably added at a later date as there was no evidence for the central fire pit or source as typical with a smokehouse. Walnut Grove Plantation still had its original butcher blocks along the wall to the right of the door and directly to the left of the main door. The rafters at both Walnut Grove Plantation and The Rocks Plantation have the large pegs where the meat would have hung. The interior walls of the smokehouses at Walnut Grove Plantation and The Rocks Plantation are bare. The brace framing and exterior weatherboarding are visible. For the smokehouses at Northampton Plantation and Pond Bluff Plantation, the interiors are not pictured. Only the exteriors are visible of these buildings. All the smokehouses are clad in wood weatherboard. Most smokehouses were located in close proximity to the main house. At Walnut Grove Plantation, Northampton Plantation, and Pond Bluff Plantation, the smokehouse is also located near the kitchen house.

**Kitchen House**

There are 2.5 kitchen houses still extant. A complete kitchen house exists at St. Julien Plantation. The kitchen house at Walnut Grove Plantation retains 50% of its original material and was in the process of being renovated during the site visit. This kitchen house still retained its original footprint, two walls, and roof. The remaining walls had been lifted for a new concrete floor to be poured and the foundation to be rebuilt. The wall of the kitchen house that would have contained the fireplace had been removed and the bricks were retained separately. A front porch or portico had been added to the building at some point and also had a loft space. The kitchen house at St. Julien Plantation was observed
only from the exterior. The kitchen house at Loch Dhu Plantation is a small building with evidence of a chimney. Kitchen houses were photographed in 1938 at Pond Bluff Plantation and Northampton Plantation. The kitchen houses observed were all rather small one room buildings. Only the kitchen house at Walnut Grove Plantation had the loft space above. Loch Dhu and Walnut Grove Plantations both had an addition of a front porch.

The typical kitchen house in the region rests on a brick foundation or brick piers. The only kitchen house observed on a solid brick foundation was at Walnut Grove Plantation. This foundation had been reconstructed with new cinder blocks. The structure appears to be wood brace framing. The exterior walls are cladded in wood beaded weatherboard. The exception to this, is the kitchen house at St. Julien Plantation. It is cladded in wood board and batten. All the doors, except for those observed at St. Julien and Walnut Grove Plantations, had diagonally wood sheathed doors with large cast iron strap hinges. The door at Walnut Grove Plantation was not observed and the one at St. Julien Plantation was wood without the diagonal sheathing. The roofs of the kitchen houses are hipped. The kitchen house at St. Julien Plantation is clad in metal with a large overhang. The kitchen house at Pond Bluff Plantation is wood shingled and have a moderate overhang. The kitchen house at Northampton Plantation was located in one of the cottages described by Waterman, that flanked the main house. The roof of this building was gabled and covered in wood shingles. The overhang of the roof toward the front of the building is so large that it creates a shed like covering. The building is covered in wood weatherboard and contains a centrally placed chimney.
During the post hoc survey conducted for this thesis, an example for three types of dwellings were identified. These are a double house, single house, and an overseer’s house. Pictures of dwellings exist for Pond Bluff Plantation, Northampton Plantation, Belvidere...
Plantation, and The Rocks Plantation. The site visits also included examples of all three types.

The double house was the most common. The extant double house that was observed was moved from Walnut Grove Plantation to St. Julien Plantation. The dwelling is rectangular with the entrances along its length side. The dwelling would have been separated on the interior by a partition and each side has its own entrance. The doors are typical wood sheathed. The current roof is clad in metal sheathing. This is very similar to the ones that Henry William Ravenel describes in his article depicting plantation life.\textsuperscript{158} The typical double dwelling rests on brock pier foundation. The wood framing structure is cladded in wood beaded weatherboard. Early buildings were clad in wood shingles, but the one observed at St. Julien was clad in metal. The roof shape tends to be gabled with the exception of the one pictures at The Rocks Plantation (See figure 62). This dwelling had a hipped roof. The chimney was located in the center of the building.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{stjulien_dwell.jpg}
\caption{Slave dwelling at St. Julien. 2017, Kristina Poston.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{158} Ravenel, “Antebellum Plantation Life”.
A small one room dwelling, still stands at St. Julien. This is a very small dwelling with a square floor plan. It varies among those pictured at other plantations. It does not exhibit some of the other features found in photographs of other plantation included in this thesis. For an example, the dwellings pictured at Belvidere Plantation had end chimneys with irregular wood siding cladding. Those pictured at Northampton Plantation also resemble those at Belvidere Plantation. In contrast, the dwelling at St. Julien Plantation currently did not have a chimney and was clad with board and batten. All the dwellings...
have a typical gable roof. Due to the angle of the photographs no other details of the building were obtained.

While not many of the plantations specifically called out overseer’s houses, they would have been prevalent among the plantations. Besides the extant overseer’s house at The Rocks Plantation, there is one pictured at Wantoot Plantation. This plantation was not surveyed by Waterman but does lie within Middle St. Johns Parish. It was inundated by the Santee-Cooper project. The picture of the overseer’s house is very similar to that of the one observed at The Rocks Plantation. John Michael Vlach describes a very similar building.\textsuperscript{159} Vlach describes an overseer’s house significantly larger than those of the enslaved housing. The overseer’s house could be as large as four to six rooms with a centrally located chimney. This dwelling would be very similar to a small farm house.\textsuperscript{160} The overseer’s house at The Rocks Plantation is a four room structure with a central chimney. The is an addition to the rear of the building. This appears to be a small kitchen house that was added to the building, possibly after it was relocated to its current location. The dwelling is a wood framed structure clad with wood siding and currently has a metal roof. The house rests on brick piers. Only a rough footprint was obtained from the overseer’s house. A closer inspection of the building along with access to its interior was

\textsuperscript{159} Vlach, \textit{Back of the Big House}, 20-22.
\textsuperscript{160} Vlach, \textit{Back of the Big House}, 153-154.
not allowed based upon the owner’s request. The current condition of the building is unsafe.

![Figure 64: The Rocks Overseer's House. 2017, Kristina Poston.](image)

**Barns**

Several barns were identified among the plantations. Many were photographed without specific barn use mentioned. Two barns are still extant at St. Julien Plantation. One barn was identified at The Rocks Plantation to be one that was relocated. A stable was mentioned in written sources at Belvidere and Eutaw Plantations. One stable was identified at Northampton Plantation both in a landscape shot and an aerial.

A seed barn was recorded at St. Julien Plantation upon the site visit. This barn predates the construction of the main house. The current standing main house was constructed in 1854. The plantation has been established since 1736. This barn reflects the early construction methods of the settlers to the region. It is constructed of wood logs and exhibits early joinery techniques. There were also scribe marks observed on connecting
beams. The current roof is clad in metal. The building was used to store seed and grains for planting on the plantation. The building is a long rectangular building resting on brick piers. It has a gabled roof with large overhanging eaves.\textsuperscript{161}

A mule barn was identified at St. Julien Plantation as well. This building closely dates to the structure of the main house. It has influences of Carpenter Gothic revival style. It has a large gable roof with decorative lattice work over the windows. It is clad in a vertical wood siding. The interior has two tack rooms located off to the right and left of the main entrance. Beyond this were evidence of stalls located on either side of the barn. The wood frame structure rests on a brick foundation.\textsuperscript{162}

A potato barn was recorded at The Rocks Plantation. This potato or “tator” house was originally a long rectangle building but currently has two additional sheds located off both sides. The barn is a simple wood framed structure clad in wood weatherboard. The

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{potato_house}
\caption{Potato House at The Rocks, 2017, Kristina Poston.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{161} See Figure 49.
\textsuperscript{162} See figure 50.
front door has been replaced with a plywood sheet but small side doors show the familiar diagonally wood sheathed doors with cast iron hinges. The interior was not accessible during the site visit.

![Image of a building with plywood sheet on the front door](image)

Figure 66: Potato House at The Rocks, detail photograph of the potato house. 2017, Kristina Poston

**Fowl House and Chicken Coops**

Among the plantations visited no existing fowl houses or chicken coops were observed. These buildings appear in several written sources as well as photos of the plantations. Eutaw Plantation pictures both fowl house and a chicken located beside each other. Where these are located on the landscape was not determined but probably would have been located in the yard space of the main house. Belvidere Plantation and Pond Bluff Plantation have pictures of chicken coops. Fowl houses were used for birds of flight. These would have been pigeons or doves. These buildings were typically raised off the ground by a few to several feet. They would be relatively small buildings. The fowl houses differ from chicken coops as they have small holes located around the perimeter for the birds to perch and enter the structure. Chicken coops are most distinguished by ramps attached to
the structure that lead to a small door for the chickens to enter through. These structure are wood framed cladded with wood siding. The roofs are gabled and clad in wood shingles.

Lodge

Only one plantation lodge was identified at Eutaw Plantation. This building is pictured along the main allee that led up to the main house. The building is Greek revival style with a portico and columns. It is a one story building and has a chimney located on the gabled end. This building was used to house a plantation office or for visiting guests.
There may have been more of these buildings located along the allee at some point but only on is pictures in 1938. Another example observed on a site visit was a Doctor’s office. The original location of the office is unknown. It was used by Doctor Waring whose family came from Chelsea Plantation. Chelsea Plantation was not included in Waterman’s survey as no main house was extant at the time of his survey. This building rests on a brick foundation. The lodge is constructed of wood framing with a gabled roof. The walls to the office is clad in wood weathered board and currently the roof is clad with metal. Similar in size and form, the office resembles the Greek Revival style of the lodge at Eutaw Plantation.

**Chapels**

During the *post hoc* survey a chapel was identified at Belvidere Plantation. It was most probably constructed during the late antebellum to post bellum period. Chapels were referenced by Henry William Ravenel to have been built in “later years.” These were typically built when plantation owners wanted to influence the ideology of their

![Figure 71: Chapel at Belvidere, Green Collection, Caroliniana Library.](image)

enslaved community.\textsuperscript{164} The chapel located at Belvidere Plantation was pictured with the fenced in area surrounded by dwellings.

**Other Buildings**

Other types of buildings were identified to be extant at the time of the 1938 survey. These were most notably at Lawson’s Pond Plantation. Until an unfortunate fire in the 1990’s Lawson’s Pond Plantation contained six outbuildings. It had a commissary, grist mill, cook house, kitchen, smokehouse, and several barns. The smokehouse, kitchen and cook house were unfortunately lost to decay. One photo exists of door to one of the buildings. No other photographs or descriptions exists of these buildings.

Besides these buildings, others were known to be extant in years prior to 1938. These buildings were called out on plats from the 1920’s or in sources recalling the landscape written in the 1940’s. These buildings include, diary, schoolhouse, and unidentified barns. The School house mentioned on Ophir’s plat of 1920’s may most probably be the same school house referred to be Col. Thomas Porcher in 1824.

**Assessment of Buildings**

Since Thomas Waterman noted the two different style of floor plans for the main houses, this thesis considered the same possibility for outbuildings. These floor plans he distinguished between the Santee Plan and the Pinopolis Plan. The sample size did not represent each group significantly for this to be represented. Available buildings for the Santee Group exceeded those for the Pinopolis Group. Therefore, the outbuildings cannot be assigned into any major grouping.

The most common identified building on the plantation landscape, besides the main house, are the smokehouse and kitchen house. These buildings each have at least one example still standing on a surviving plantation. The most interesting attributes identified among all the identified buildings is the diagonally wood sheathed doors. While some of the buildings have unique features, the buildings typically fall into a typical scheme

Assessment of Post Hoc Sources

This thesis includes an examination of available sources needed to conduct the *post hoc* survey. This itemizes the information used to conduct the *post hoc* survey which was described in the methodology. Since the sources used for this research was discussed in the methodology, this section will focus on data availability and its usefulness. The data included here are comprised of the sources needed to evaluate the plantations. These include whether or not plantations had outbuildings based on evidence from photographs, plats, any form of documentation, and extant buildings. It was also noted whether the plantations or buildings were not inundated or relocated. The sources are referred here as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plats</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>45.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>36.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Documents Available
documents. These documents attributed to what information was obtained for each plantation.

Of the twenty-two plantations discussed for the purpose of this thesis 13.6% contained no attributing information on outbuildings. Plats contained 50% of information regarding buildings. Photos attributed to 45.4% of the information. Plantations that contained some degree of documentation were 36.3% of the plantations. Of the twenty-two plantations 18.1% still have extant buildings. Plantations that still contain the main house total 36.4% of the plantations. While plats contributed to 50% of the data regarding outbuildings, many of these buildings were not identified or labeled on the plats. The other issue with the plats were that many were obtained after 1922. Therefore, these had to be verified with other information to confirm extant buildings. Photographs contained the most useful information. A drawback of this source was its limit to the yard space of the main house. The photographs were also contained no interior depictions or all major details. The photographs were the most useful in determining the existence of buildings during the period of Waterman’s survey. Documentary sources were helpful in determining what buildings, if any, were still standing and if they were buildings built prior 1880. Some of the documents regarding the extant buildings come from interviews conducted by Richard Porcher on the African American communities living and working on the plantations. Plantation journals, letters, and ledger books helped establish when some of the buildings were constructed or their approximate age.

From this it was determined that the combination of resources contributed the most information. Another useful source of information was the extant buildings recorded on
site visits conducted in 2017. This will be added here to discuss the usefulness of total documents. Here the data discusses the percentage of plantations that had one or more sets of attributes. Plantations that had only one attribute total 40.9%. Those that had two attributes totaled 22.7%. Of the twenty-two plantations to have three or more attributes total 18.2%. Those plantations that contained no information totaled 18.2%.

While a combination of attributes was ideal, those sources only containing photos contributed the most. These paired better when compared to extant buildings and documentation. It was determined that when conducting a *post hoc* survey an ideal history would come better from a series of data. If limited sources exists, photographs are the best to represent a variety of information.

**Table 4: Documents Per Plantation**

of attributes. Plantations that had only one attribute total 40.9%. Those that had two attributes totaled 22.7%. Of the twenty-two plantations to have three or more attributes total 18.2%. Those plantations that contained no information totaled 18.2%.

While a combination of attributes was ideal, those sources only containing photos contributed the most. These paired better when compared to extant buildings and documentation. It was determined that when conducting a *post hoc* survey an ideal history would come better from a series of data. If limited sources exists, photographs are the best to represent a variety of information.
CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion and Further Study

This thesis began by reevaluating the report that Thomas Waterman wrote in 1938 covering St. John’s Parish. It was uncovered that several cultural elements of the plantations landscapes were not included in Waterman’s report. As historic preservation has broadened to include additional cultures and social elements, this post hoc survey added to the plantation landscapes of St. John’s Parish. This thesis began by ferreting out why these exclusions happened during the 1938 survey. Today the field is still evolving and beginning to include more sites that have not been previously considered. As the discipline of historic preservation grows, so does our knowledge.

In 1938 the National Park Service sent architectural historian Thomas Waterman to record resources soon to be inundated by Lake Marion and Lake Moultrie. This project was initiated by Santee-Cooper and while it met with local opposition, proceeded despite these objections. Waterman followed normal protocols of the time for recording historic buildings. Early survey’s initiated focused on identifying buildings that represented famous people and events. Early architectural historians, such as Waterman, also focused on the architectural value of high style. While Waterman was adamant about saving Hanover Plantation’s main house, he gave very little regard to other plantations houses within the region. He also showed very little interest in identifying any plantation buildings another than the main house. With the conclusion of his report Thomas Waterman called for a more in-depth survey. This would have included HABS standard drawings and more detailed photographs of the main houses along with written histories. Unfortunately, no
further study was conducted before the construction of the reservoirs began. Waterman’s report did not stress the importance of this further study. Throughout his report he consistently belittles some of the main houses architectural value becomes of the obscure dates he placed on them. For Waterman, any house built after 1800 was not very valuable. The outbuildings located on the plantation landscape found no favor with Waterman. These mundane structures were not deemed important enough for Waterman to include. Waterman throughout his career focused on high style architecture, which is attested by his own writings.165 Along with these grand plantation houses were mundane buildings. These are often forsaken due to their ordinariness. But without these buildings the plantation itself would not have existed. The buildings contributed to the day to day workings of plantations on the landscape. The production of crops and other goods which was facilitated by these outbuildings are what gave the owners of these plantations the means to build those grand homes. It is the history and information of these structures that deeply attribute to the plantation landscape. Thankfully, the field of preservation has grown tremendously since 1938. By 1966 new laws began to regulate the field. These regulations also lead to better inclusion of sites. The field began to include more diverse histories.

Because the reevaluation of Waterman’s report showed a gap in the recorded history, a post hoc survey was needed. This survey was needed in order to identify the plantation outbuildings still extant in 1938. These structures were not deemed important enough to be mention by Waterman and were not the focus of early preservation. Today, extensive architectural and archaeological investigations would be invested in evaluating

165For instance, see Thomas Waterman’s book entitled, The Mansions of Virginia, 1706-1776.
these structures. By studying these outbuildings, scholars can learn more about the workplace and social landscape of the enslaved people.

The methodology established the steps to be followed in order to successfully conduct a post hoc survey. These methods should be considered when access to a historic resource is unobtainable or restricted. It was determined that the best information to conduct a post hoc survey. A combination of information sources is obviously the best to reconstruct structures no longer on the landscape. Without excessive information sources, the single most useful source of data come from photographs. From this source, a variety of information can be obtained and therefore recreated.

Additional information regarding the history of these plantations was successfully added to the original survey. It added information that enabled further understandings of the outbuildings located on the plantation during the 1930’s when the area was under threat of inundation. It also created a set of data that can be used for further studies and understanding the broader cultural landscape. St. John’s Parish was a well-established community of planters. Locals would say that it rivaled any other Lowcountry plantation community. Since several plantations contain ledger books and production accounts and plats they could easily be compared to other well documented Lowcountry plantations.

This post hoc survey arose from a concern with the criteria used for early surveys. Future scholars may look back on current surveys with the same concern. The field of preservation is adapting to new methods and more interests. Unfortunately, some things may still be overlooked. This can happen when projects are rushed. The post hoc survey methodology shows the most useful information to be gained when reevaluating a survey.
First, photographs of a site are the most useful. Current and future surveys should continue to be adamant about taking many photos of the project site. Second, if a survey is reevaluated and further study is required, the post hoc survey should be followed. The issue that arose with the Santee-Cooper is not the only one of its kind. Everyday resources are being threatened. Historic preservation has done well to bring attention to the need save them.

With this compilation of data more details about how the landscapes of St. John’s parish were laid out can be determined in further studies. Henry William Ravenel gave a detailed account of workings and layout of Pooshee Plantation during the height of the antebellum period. Data could be compared with his descriptions to discover commonality among the plantations. During the post antebellum period, African American communities sprang up on these plantations where they continued to work and live. This was done through purchasing parcels and establishing separate communities or by working as tenant farmers. It was established that several of these plantations were still being worked and lived on up until 1942.

The post hoc survey proved to be beneficial in adding to the survey conducted by Waterman in 1938. While a product of his time, Waterman did acknowledge some of the outbuildings on the landscape. Unfortunately, since early methods did not focus on such buildings, much was disregarded. The usefulness of assessing Waterman’s 1938 survey helped establish the need for reevaluating these early surveys. The methodology presented here, establishes that conducting a post hoc survey will produce additional information.
Appendix A: Maps and Plats
Figure 72: General plan of the canal and its environs between Santee and Cooper Rivers in the state of South Carolina: commenced in the year 1793 and finished in the year 1800
Figure 73: Ophir Plantation, Richard Porcher Private Archives.
Figure 74: Springfield Plantation, Richard Porcher Archives.
Figure 75: Chelsea, North Hampton and Indian Field plantations, 2006, 32-100-09, S.C. Historical Society maps/plats, http://libcat.cofc.edu/record=b2196938~S13.
Appendix B: Aerial Pictures
Figure 76: Northampton Plantation Aerial, Charleston News and Courier, 1935.
Figure 77: Aerials of Walnut Grove in their Private Collection. Above 1967, Below 1980.
Appendix C: Site Visit Photographs
Figure 79: Detail Elements of Smokehouse door from Walnut Grove; Kristina Poston.

Figure 78: Smokehouse door lock from Walnut Grove; Kristina Poston.

Figure 80: Smokehouse butcher block from Walnut Grove; Kristina Poston.
Figure 81: St. Julien Plantation Seed barn. Front (below) and side (above) views. Kristina Poston.
Appendix D: Sketchup Renderings
Figure 83: Renderings of a Outbuildings based on the photo from Library of Congress, Sketchup 2018©.

Figure 82: Ophir Plat with Sketchup 2018© renderings showing massing and locations of outbuildings in relation to the main house.
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