**United States Department of the Interior**
National Park Service

# National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

## 1. Name of Property

historic name Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House

other names/site number FR-215

## 2. Location

street & number _____ NA not for publication

city or town _____ X vicinity

state Kentucky code KY county _____ code 073 zip code 40601

## 3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,

I hereby certify that this __X__ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property __X__ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:

**___ national ___ statewide __X__ local**

_____
Signature of certifying official/Title **Lindy Casebier/Acting SHPO** Date

**Kentucky Heritage Council/State Historic Preservation Office**
State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

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

_____
Signature of commenting official Date

_____
Title State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

## 4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

___ entered in the National Register

___ determined eligible for the National Register

___ determined not eligible for the National Register

___ removed from the National Register

___ other (explain:) _____

_____
Signature of the Keeper Date of Action

Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House | Franklin County, Kentucky
Name of Property | County and State

## 5. Classification

**Ownership of Property**
(Check as many boxes as apply.)

- [x] private
- [ ] public - Local
- [ ] public - State
- [ ] public - Federal

**Category of Property**
(Check only **one** box.)

- [x] building(s)
- [ ] district
- [ ] site
- [ ] structure
- [ ] object

**Number of Resources within Property**
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

| Contributing | Noncontributing | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | 0 | buildings |
| | | sites |
| 0 | | structures |
| | | objects |
| 2 | 0 | **Total** |

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

N/A

**Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register**

0

## 6. Function or Use

**Historic Functions**
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Domestic/Single Dwelling
Domestic/Institutional Housing

**Current Functions**
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Domestic/Single Dwelling
Domestic/Institutional Housing

## 7. Description

**Architectural Classification**
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Gothic Revival
Italianate
Queen Anne

**Materials**
(Enter categories from instructions.)

foundation: Stone
walls: Log; Weatherboard
roof: Asphalt shingle
other:

## Narrative Description

### Summary Paragraph

The Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House (FR-215) is a pair of houses located _____ in a rural setting along Elkhorn Creek in Franklin County, Kentucky. The main house, built in 3 distinct stages between 1850 and 1890, is being interpreted for its architectural values, especially in how it follows patterns of building and rebuilding on other farms throughout the county. The secondary house on the property reveals information about house renovation, which the main house contains but is harder to see within it. Together, both dwellings provide information on housing design choices during the second half of the nineteenth century. The nominated parcel encompasses the domestic yard with two contributing buildings.

### Character of the Knight/Taylor/Hockensmith House Setting and Changes over Time

Situated less than four miles from the community of Peaks Mill, this farmstead is favorably located on the banks of Elkhorn Creek. The Elkhorn, defined as an Inner Bluegrass stream, runs for 86 miles through Fayette, Scott, Woodford and Franklin counties.

The farm acreage has dwindled over the years while the farmhouse has grown. Though the natural setting remains much the same, the acreage associated with the house from 1850 until 1890 – 142 acres – has shrunk to just under 53 acres under the current ownership. The acreage under single ownership was 600 acres prior to 1850.

The domestic yard is mostly level, with a few mature trees remaining in front of the house, marking the line of a long-vanished fence. The hills rise up behind the domestic yard; trees have reclaimed these steep ridges since the middle of the twentieth century. A small tobacco barn is located to the north of the house; it is located on a separate two-acre parcel. A modern house constructed by the current owners is also located on that parcel.

The Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House now faces Peaks Mill Road, though originally it faced Elkhorn Creek. The log and frame saddlebag house on the south side of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House shows the original orientation of both dwellings, as it faces the creek. Due to the road being straightened and moved during the 1970s, a dry laid stone wall that once defined the edge of the domestic yard alongside the road is now located on the opposite side of the road from the nominated parcel. A barn and agricultural outbuilding on the west side of that wall are not associated with this parcel. The rear of the domestic yard retains its dry laid stone fencing, built around 1850. A spring and pump house are located southeast of the house, on the banks above the Elkhorn. A small roofed pavilion has been built around the pump in the twentieth century.

The property ownership shall be examined in the Description for two reasons. First, aside from a few speculative leaps that the record requires to establish the chain of owners during the 19th century, the deeds contain factual information about the property, which is the descriptive function. This contrasts with the Statement of Significance, where facts are interpreted and value is assigned to those facts. Second, the data on the deeds provide some of the basic information, and sometimes the only clues, about the property's material and design. Thus, the deeds help explain the factual evolution of the house.

The Statement of Significance will explore the way the changes in the nominated farmhouse and its property follow the patterns of change seen in other Franklin County farmhouses. The rises and falls in the local agricultural economy greatly influenced the shaping of the rural built landscape of Franklin County. The rural

areas of Franklin County still possess a number of frame farmhouses from the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Often these houses take the form of a T-plan, with stylistic ornament in the form of imbrication or turned porch posts. The Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House evolved into a good example of this form, the dwelling of choice for many a rural dweller in Franklin County. This nomination seeks to account for those many changes, rather than look only at the final product of change, the house's late-19th-century design. The description follows the construction history of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House, exploring each phase of development, to enable us to evaluate this vernacular resource's meanings.

**Ownership of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House**

The chain of title conducted on this property, never infallible due to the intricacies of farm subdivision and title recordation, shows that Knight began buying land in along the Elkhorn in Peaks Mill in 1851. The first recorded deed dates from January 15, 1851, for 23 acres bought for $23.10 from Thomas and Eliza Marshall of Lexington, Kentucky.[1] Two years later, Knight purchased 100 acres from Gustavus Macy, L.W. Macy, James M. Graham and Samuel Steele for $800.[2] This deed includes a provision for Knight to maintain a portion of the waterway for the passage of horses and wagons. In 1854, this same group of men, under the direction of G.W. Craddock, Franklin County Commissioner, sold Knight 200 acres on the Elkhorn and on the west side of the Peaks Mill Road for $2,500.[3]

The higher price per acre for this tract of land is likely a combination of its acreage, its ample bottom land, and perhaps the existence of an improvement—a dwelling. The deed makes no mention of this, of course, but it is not impossible that one or both of the single log pens were in place at the time Knight purchased the property.

Deeds for the remaining acreage owned by Knight and divided in 1867 could not be located, but it is clear that Knight owned land in the location of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House by 1851. His tenure was not to be long-lasting. The Knight/Hodges Cemetery was documented by local historians in 1992, on site near Knight's Bridge.[4] According to this inventory, one of the legible tombstones belonged to William Knight and was inscribed with the following: Wm. Knight, Born Nov. 27, 1810, Killed by lightning, Aug. 11, 1863. This stone erected by his Administrator and Friend, F.H. Hodges."[5]

Either one of the log pens was already built when Knight purchased the land, or he constructed both during the 1850s. The physical evidence of the log pen does not indicate a construction date before the 1840s. Surviving interior fabric from the log pen in the nominated area includes a mantle with late-Federal stylistic details, including a 45-degree angle molding, and applied rather than planed-out beaded edge molding. These details stylistically point to a date later in the Federal period in Kentucky; the earliest date of the mantle would likely be in the 1820s, but it could have been produced into the 1830s. It is highly likely that the mantle was reused from an earlier non-extant dwelling; there is no evidence of an earlier dwelling on the parcel, but the mantle pre-dates the construction of the log pen. The mantle does fit closely to the chimneystack, suggesting a conscious effort to shape the chimney to the existing mantle. It seems likely that Knight, a bachelor, lived in one of the pens, and his hired help lived in the other pen.

[1] Franklin County Deed Book 4, page 50.
[2] Franklin County Deed Book 5, page 155.
[3] Franklin County Deed Book 5, page 160.
[4] Lucian A. Parker. *A History of Peaks Mill, Franklin County, Kentucky, Revisited*. (Utica, KY: McDowell Publications, 2006), 219.
[5] Ibid, 220.

The bridge that goes over the Elkhorn by the farm has historically been known as Knight's Bridge, though the name was officially changed to Quarles Bridge in 2012. One of the earliest bridges to cross the Elkhorn in that location was built around 1820, when "...John Bartlett, John Crutcher, and James I. Miles were empowered to build a bridge across Main Elkhorn, where Knight's Bridge is now located, and they were granted the right to charge and collect certain tolls, from parties crossing same."[6] In 1863, John Gault was hired to make repairs to the bridge, and perhaps it due to Knight's death that same year that the bridge received its name.[7]

In November 1867, four years after Knight's death, the Franklin County Court divided up his farm, which is recorded as containing 526 acres.[8] The land was carved into eight lots. Lot number 5, containing 40 acres, bordered the turnpike (already noted on the survey, though the turnpike company was not officially mandated by the legislature until 1870) and the Elkhorn, and contained a dwelling. In 1871, one of Knight's heirs, Charles Hall, sold the 50 acres in lot number 4 to Robert C. Taylor for $675.00.[9] Two years later, George and Mary Knight sold lot number 3, which included 52 acres, to Taylor for $180.00. [10] Both of these parcels were located on the west side of the Peaks Mill Turnpike.

It wasn't until April 6, 1882, that Taylor purchased lot number 5 from Thomas Knight for $1,400.[11] The higher price of the parcel indicates the improvements noted on the 1867 division of land. Taylor is included on the 1882 atlas of Franklin County at this location, with a graphic representation of two houses beside his name (Supplemental Image 1). It is not known where Taylor resided in the decade before he bought the parcel with the log pens, but he only retained it for one year.

On January 3, 1883, Taylor conveyed all 142 acres to Jesse Hockensmith for $2,850.00.[12] The deed references the separate tracts of land as bought by Taylor, and attaches the following stipulation (notations in brackets added):

> The first parties [Taylor] bind themselves to have the eastern boundary line, and the line between this tract and the Winters' land run by a surveyor, and to give second party [Hockensmith] immediate possession of the cabin in the yard [log outbuilding] and of the land, that second party may proceed with work on the same and on the first day of March 1883, possession of the dwelling [the main house, presumably a log saddlebag at this point] and all other buildings or any other thing situated on said premises.[13]

From the information contained in the deed from Taylor to Hockensmith, it seems possible that Hockensmith and his family moved into the log cabin in the yard and began farming the land, and moved into the larger log structure the following year. This scenario would suggest that Hockensmith constructed the box-frame addition on the east end of the cabin to accommodate his family, which would have included five children under the age of 17.

[6] L.F. Johnson. History of Franklin County. Page 75

[7] Robert W.M. Laughlin and Melissa C. Jurgensen. *Kentucky's Covered Bridges.* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2007), 72.

[8] Franklin County Settlement Book 5, page 146.

[9] Franklin County Deed Book 11, page 320

[10] Franklin County Deed Book 13, page 344.

[11] Franklin County Deed Book 19, page 129.

[12] Franklin County Deed Book 19, page 420.

[13] Ibid.

Little background information could be found on Jesse Hockensmith, the author of the property's third historic phase of development. Jesse Hockensmith was born in Anderson County, Kentucky, on November 30, 1835. A "Jesse Hockersmith" served in Company C of the 9th Kentucky Calvary (Morgan's Command) during the Civil War. In the 1870 Census, Hockensmith was listed as a farmer, but with no recorded real estate or personal estate. He was married to Bettie, also known as Eliza or Elizabeth Newton Hockensmith.

A record of Hockensmith in the 1880 census or in the tax records was not found. In the August 18, 1894 issue of the *Frankfort Roundabout*, it was noted that "Charley Hockensmith, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jesse Hockensmith" had received his diploma from Kentucky University in Lexington.[14] Kentucky University would change its name to Transylvania University in 1908.

In the 1900 census of Franklin County, Hockensmith was living in Peaks Mill, still farming, with several adult children listed as being part of his household. He died in 1913 and his wife died in 1927. The heirs sold the farm in 1928 to Henry H. Roberts. In 1939, T.N. Arnold purchased the property, and in 1947, sold it to Edmond Thompson, the father of the current owner. The parcel on which the house sits has been in the same family since 1947.

**Exterior Description of the Main House**

The design evolution of the dwelling illustrates the architectural journey that many humble Kentucky dwellings have taken. The exuberant ornamentation of the T-plan belongs to the third main building phase of the dwelling ("D" on floor plan). The first ("A" on floor plan) and second phases ("B" on floor plan) of construction were much more straightforward, though separated from the third by only a few decades.

The main house likely began as a single-pen, v-notched log dwelling, around 15 feet square, perhaps built in the 1850s. A chimney would have been located on the west gable end, and the dwelling probably faced south, toward Elkhorn Creek. No chimney remains today and the date of its removal is unknown; however, the remodeling of the house in the late-nineteenth century likely prompted this change. The log and frame saddlebag located to the south of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House provides a visible portrait of what the main house would have looked like prior to the continuation of its architectural evolution in the 1880s.

It seems from the physical evidence that this first log pen was definitely in place by 1867. Although most of the original finish has either been removed by subsequent renovations, or is hidden under later plaster and drywall, it does not fit the mold of Kentucky log construction from the pre-1840 period.

Due to the numerous additions to this log pen, determining the original fenestration pattern is almost impossible. There are no openings on the east wall, but a later brick flue for a stove is built against that wall, supported by a framework of twentieth-century two-by-fours studs. There is one opening on the north wall that could be original, but was later resized; this is a horizontal opening, approximately 5' 6" wide that now contains two simply-hung twentieth-century single-light casement windows. To the west of this opening is a doorway that leads into the 1978 lateral addition ("E" on floorplan). The original exterior of the north wall has been preserved by the lateral non-historic addition, and the wall is clad in weatherboards, which appear to date from the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

[14] *The Frankfort Roundabout*, August 18, 1894. Kentuckiana Digital Library. http://athena.uky.edu/cgi/t/text/pageviewer-idx?c=franews;cc=franews;g=news;xc=1;xg=0;q1=Jesse%20Hockensmith;rgn=full%20text;idno=fra1894081801_sn86069848;didno=fra1894081801_sn86069848;view=pdf;seq=2;passterms=1

The footprint of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House is a T-plan with an elongated ell and a non-historic lateral addition extending to the north. The front section of the dwelling, oriented in the late-nineteenth century to face the Peaks Mill Turnpike, reads as a two-story, three bay wide T-plan with a central passage (Photo 1). Clad in weatherboards, this portion of the house rests on a cut stone foundation, and its main (west) and side elevations display all the liveliness of the Italianate, Gothic Revival and Queen Anne styles that proved so popular in rural Kentucky after the Civil War.

Characteristics of these styles, as interpreted by local builders, include the elongated windows and hoods, a nod to the Italianate influence; the Gothic Revival style occurs in the form of steeply-pitched gables—on the front, on wall dormers, on the front-facing bale of the T-plan houses; while the decorative features of the house, from imbrication to spindlework and the interior woodwork, all belong to the Queen Anne aesthetic (Photo 9).

The elongated, one-over-one double-hung sash windows on the façade, north and south elevations, feature a fairly elaborate surround with fluted pilasters flanking the sash on the sides, topped by an entablature lintel with a fluted frieze, bulls eye blocks to either side, and a delicate scalloped molding (Photo 7). Front gable wall dormers are located on the second story of the façade and north elevation. The dormers feature diamond shingle imbrication in the gable; the dormer on the north elevation has a canted base clad in shingles laid in a diamond pattern.

The gable on the façade also features diamond pattern shingles and a small vent with a decorative star and scrollwork detail (Photo 7). An identical attic vent is located on the south gable end of the front portion of the house. The half-glass half-panel entry door features the same surround treatment of the windows, while the door includes fluting, bulls eyes, and recessed panel details. The upper glass portion of the door is arched. A flat roof porch shelters the entry door and one window on the façade. The porch has fairly typical period characteristics, including fluted and chamfered supports and pilasters, and a frieze featuring spindlework interspersed with carved recessed panels. One of the porch posts is missing, and the porch decking was replaced in the twentieth century with brick. The posts sit on small brick piers.

The side-gable roof is clad in asphalt shingles and pierced by two interior brick chimneys. The stacks are wrapped in plastic above the roofline as the house awaits restoration.

A one-bay-wide one-story hipped-roof addition is located on the west wall of the front portion of the house (Photo 2). Though it sits on a stone foundation like the main part of the 1883 addition, the grade of the foundation is not the same. This small addition – roughly 17.5 by 13 feet – was likely constructed when indoor plumbing was installed at the house. A one-over-one double-hung sash window is located on the south elevation; it is slightly elongated, though not as much as the windows on the main part of the house. Two six-over-six double-hung sash windows are located on the west elevation. A partially-enclosed porch runs the length of the south elevation of the "ell", which includes the two log pens and a transitional framed room located at the east end of the ell (Photo 2).

**Interior Description of the Main House**

While the exterior, wrapped in clapboard and fitted with late-nineteenth-century-stylistic details, provides the impression that the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House was created all of a single piece, the interior more clearly expresses the lengthy journey the house traveled to arrive at that appearance.

The original log pen (A) reveals its origins immediately, with exposed logs on the east wall. The floor is supported by unbarked log joists. An enclosed staircase is located against the south wall; an original batten door leads into storage space under the stair and another original batten door leads up the stairwell. The stair opens into the upper level of the second log pen ("B" on floorplan); the upper story of the original log pen is unfinished, which is not uncommon. An original gable-end window with a fixed upper sash is located on the east elevation. The pen has been re-roofed and little original fabric remains visible with the exception of one original rafter pair at the east gable end. The rafters were milled with straight saw marks; this dates the lumber at an 1830s or later date. Interestingly, the rafters are neither penned nor lapped at the apex, which is a construction technique from the first three decades of the nineteenth century and earlier. There might have been a ridgeboard in the space between the rafters, or over time and with modifications to the roofline to accommodate the later second pen, the rafters may have separated.

The division between the two pens reveals itself on the south wall of the original pen, behind the aforementioned staircase. A clear line separates one corner of notching from the other (Photo 8). A log beam on the south wall cantilevered out to support a porch, or possibly a frame addition on the south elevation of the original pen. This construction technique mirrors the cantilevered beam found on the log pen in the side yard, lending some credence to the supposition that both pens were built during the same period.

On the west side of the original log room is the second log pen ("B" on floorplan), constructed possibly after the Civil War, forming a saddlebag plan with the original pen. This pen, like the T-plan addition, retains a high level of late-nineteenth-century interior finish. Only the thickness of the walls and openings betrays its log construction.

This pen has an elongated Italianate window on the north wall, with one-over-one double-hung sash windows (Photo 5). A shortened six-over-six double-hung sash window is located above it on the second story. A door on the south wall leads into the central passage of the front portion of the house while a second door, located beside a chimneystack, provides access to the one of the front rooms of the late-nineteenth-century addition.

A one-story transitional room ("C" on floorplan), of frame construction, is located at the east end of the house, connected to the original pen (A) by a porch that has been enclosed (visible at the end of the ell in Photos 3 and 4). There is not much interior fabric to suggest a date of construction for this room, yet it was likely built either slightly before the T-plan addition or at the same time. The one-bay-wide room, referred to by the current owner as the "kitchen," likely served that purpose in the twentieth century. It rests on a continuous stone foundation and, according to the current owner, is one of the few areas in the house with a semi-cellar space below grade. There is a six-over-six double-hung sash window on the north elevation and the east gable end.

The room has up-braces, with mill-sawn framing members and the exterior was originally clad in vertical boards, much like an outbuilding. The room sits on a stone foundation that is slightly higher than the rest of the house, and two steps provide access through the door opening. This room bears no evidence of a chimneystack or flue, so perhaps it was utilized as a work room, while cooking took place in the cabin in the yard. It is possible that the cellar space below enabled the room to be used as a combination dry storage space and root cellar, but evidence to support this is inconclusive.

This connector between the two rooms is not the original span; a ghostline on the east gable end of the original log pen shows a much narrower gable that connected the pen to the frame room (C).[15] The ghostline suggests that the original connector was much more of a covered breezeway than the room present today. The current connecting room is one-bay wide, with a six-over-six double-hung sash window on the north elevation.

**Description of the Log and Frame Saddlebag (Contributing)**

This single pen log building, with a box frame addition forming a saddlebag plan on the east side, sits to the south of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House, closer to Elkhorn Creek (Photos 10 and 11). Evidence points to this building being present when Taylor purchased the land, and served as architectural inspiration for the construction of the main house. This building provides a physical link to the original single log pen of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House, as well as a visual reminder of what this humble domestic yard would have looked like early in the POS. The first step of the phased build-out of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House began with this structure.

The log pen rests on a dry-laid stone foundation, while the box-frame pen sits on stone piers. The log pen, which is V-notched, does not appear to have ever been clad in weatherboards. The frame pen is clad in bark stripped from logs. The implications of this building not being clad underscore the motivations of William Knight and the tenor of his domestic landscape.

The sequence of construction of this outbuilding is the same as that of the main house: first a single log pen, and then a lateral addition, using a centrally placed chimney to heat both portions. The stone chimney has a firebox on each side, and cantilevered beams on the east gable end provide evidence that prior to the construction of the box frame pen, the roof cantilevered out past the stack to provide shelter for what was an exterior hearth (Photo 13). This hearth could have been used for cooking or for more arduous tasks such as slaughtering livestock and rendering fat.

The interior of the log pen contains a mantel (Photo 12) with a late-Federal influence, suggesting a construction date as early as the late 1840s, or even the 1850s. A winder stair curves alongside the chimney stack in the box frame pen, providing access to the loft of the log pen, just like the stair arrangement in the main house (Photo 13).

The south elevation (facing the Elkhorn) is two bays wide, with a door going into each pen (Photo 11). Originally, a beam cantilevered out on the south wall of the log pen and supported a porch roof; a shed roof porch extends the length of the elevation today, covering the entrances to both pens, but this porch is an extension of the main roof (which has obviously been redone). This cantilevered beam feature is not commonplace in historic Kentucky log construction. The north elevation is three bays wide with a door/window/window fenestration pattern (Photo 10). The windows are six-over-six double-hung wooden sash.

This secondary dwelling has experienced very little change (neglect and the installation of tobacco presses in the frame pen aside) and provides a powerful balance to the main house and its journey of accretion.

[15] The ghostline is visible only by climbing out of the original gable window opening in the log pen to the unfinished space above the connector room.

Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House | Franklin County, Kentucky
Name of Property | County and State

## 8. Statement of Significance

### Applicable National Register Criteria

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

### Criteria Considerations

Property is:

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

### Areas of Significance

Architecture

### Period of Significance

Ca. 1850-1890

### Significant Dates

1850, 1883

### Significant Person

NA

### Cultural Affiliation

NA

### Architect/Builder

Unknown

**Period of Significance:**

The Period of Significance encompasses the years of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House's stages of development and evolution. A single year is not the appropriate choice to consider the architectural messages of this vernacular dwelling, which embodies the means, desires and values of many rural landowners in Franklin County in the years leading up to the Civil War, and before the turn of the century. The house's changes in form and design parallel changes in agriculture and social life in Franklin County, as the settlement era ended and people in this part of Kentucky were establishing a more complex and enduring social system.

**Criteria Considerations: NA**

## Statement of Significance

## Summary Paragraph

The Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House (FR-215) is a pair of houses that meet National Register Criterion C, embodying the distinctive characteristics of three types of construction over a passage of time. The pair of houses illustrates the common housing types of the average rural resident of Franklin County during a specific period. This nomination uses the term "type" to refer to both plan and style. However, this nomination does not follow the conventional view of many nominations, where the value of the property's design resides in one fixed point in time. Neither house on the property is high-style nor is either being interpreted as a static, frozen-in-time dwelling. Rather, the change apparent both within and without each house provides a way to look at a socioeconomic class that is infrequently explored or celebrated in terms of lasting architectural value. The journey of the house and secondary dwelling, from log pen to saddlebag, is a story that is seldom told, though was common on the landscape. These were not elite farmers, landed gentry or progressive gentleman farmers. The first part of this story belongs to the middling and subsistence farmer that lacked the disposable income to improve his housing stock, and thus could not raise his perceived local status. By the time the house achieved its final historic appearance, its owner had not climbed much higher on the socioeconomic ladder, but he chose to indulge in an outward display of success – albeit, success measured on a vastly different plane than most Criterion C National Register listings in Franklin County. The Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House is locally significant for providing good example of a common sequence of housing changes that defined residential architecture on non-elite farms through most of the nineteenth century.

While the analysis uses examples from Franklin County, it probably extends to most farms in Kentucky's Outer Bluegrass Region, those counties that surround the Inner Bluegrass Region, a cluster of 7 counties, centered on Lexington, which contain the Kentucky's richest farmland. Farms in the Outer Bluegrass counties had less fertile land and more hilly land to convert from woodland into farmland. The Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House began with the county's most common initial building plan, a single log pen. Its second construction phase adopted the saddlebag plan. Following the purchase of the farm by the Hockensmith family in 1883, the log saddlebag became the ell of a new frame T-plan dwelling which exhibited a formal central-passage front facade.

The building campaigns of this dwelling illustrate the way that rural folk used architectural design to transmit social messages. Rural owners would start with an often-modest initial construction, and then add on during an era of agricultural success. The enlarging of the house was one way the nominated property spoke to passersby that the owner was successful. The owner had builders dress the T-plan form with local interpretations of nationally popular styles such as the Italianate, Queen Anne and Gothic Revival. These housing choices also illustrate a period of optimism and expansion in rural Kentucky, as counties recovered from the Civil War, new crops redefined the agricultural economy, and new technologies made innovation and change possible for a rising demographic—the rural middle-class.

## Historic Context: Agriculture and Rural Life in Franklin County, Kentucky, 1800-1900

### Research Design

While this property is considered according to the first term of Criterion C, the analysis of design is more concerned with a vernacular understanding than high style, seeing design in relation to the culture of farming and rural life in Franklin County, both before and after the Civil War. Most previous research, which has led to National Register listings in Franklin County, has focused on farmers of the upper-middle and upper classes, the so called "gentleman farmers," whose dwellings and land holdings tended to be larger, more substantial and thus more likely to be extant.

An in-depth study of Franklin County's more average farming resources has not been conducted previously, nor has it been undertaken within the scope of this nomination. However, a comparative analysis is possible. The author of this nomination undertook a survey of rural dwellings in Franklin County in 2012, recording 107 rural resources, which forms a valuable sample study of the county's typical resources. Over half of the resources documented in the survey were located in the Switzer and Bald Knob quadrangles; the northern half of the county is home to the Bald Knob and Peaks Mill communities, and despite being divided by the Kentucky River, resources in northern Franklin County share a very similar terrain and soil type. All of the dwellings were either frame or log (or a combination thereof).

This survey found that while the central-passage plan had taken root in Franklin County several decades before Jesse Hockensmith built his version of the type, the T-plan reigned supreme in rural areas during the last quarter of the nineteenth-century. In the 2012 survey, of the 13 dwellings attributed to the period 1875-1899, eight were T-plans.[16] These dwellings all combined elements of the Italianate, Gothic Revival and Queen Anne styles, to various degrees of effect.

Also consulted was the Kentucky Heritage Council's (SHPO's) Historic Sites Database, which contains information on 63 documented log houses in the County built between 1800 and 1874. The historic landscape contained many more log houses and outbuildings than in the database's small catalogue. Still, having this study group was useful, not only because extant log dwellings are often difficult to access, but they lie hidden behind modern siding, or as with the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House, disguised by modern additions.

What the previous survey reveals, and the recent fieldwork confirms, is that log houses in Franklin County grew by accretion, either by additional log pens, such as the saddlebag, or frame additions. The box-frame addition to the log outbuilding is one such example. Another example is the "Mud Tavern" (FR-386) located at 3324 Sulphur Lick Road in Franklin County (Supplemental Image 2). This single pen log house stands northeast of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House, though in the same (Switzer) quadrangle, has a one-story frame ell addition extending to the rear of the log pen, and another one-story frame addition extending laterally. The Henry and Zach Church House (FR-69, Supplemental Image 3), built in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, predates the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House. The Church family was close neighbors of the Knights in Peaks Mill (see Supplemental Image 1). The scale of this two-story central passage log dwelling

[16] For reference purposes, 107 rural sites were surveyed in Franklin County, and 60 extant dwellings recorded with a range of construction from 1800 to 1960. Three additional T-plans were surveyed, but they were built post-1900.

somewhat dwarfs the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House; the original house appears even larger with its later frame additions built to the rear.

**Settlement-era Dwellings**

Franklin County, formed in late 1794 from portions of Mercer, Shelby and Woodford Counties, was the 18th county created in the new state. Located in central Kentucky, the county's terrain is mostly rolling to hilly, with the most fertile land located in the southern part of the county.

Settlement-era agriculture in Franklin County (1785-1800) focused primarily on subsistence. The primary task of the settlement-era farmer was to prepare land for productivity. As soon as land was cleared, farmers planted corn, as it fed both people and livestock. Few, if any, outbuildings were constructed, and almost none from that period survives today.

Subsistence agriculture persisted through the first quarter of the nineteenth century, with farmers raising crops of wheat and corn for consumption; livestock included milk cows, swine, a few working cattle and a horse or two. More prosperous farmers, especially those benefitting from land grants and farms in prime locations, quickly expanded beyond a provisional type of farming. The 1820 census enumerated 11,024 residents in Franklin County; 2,051 were engaged in agriculture.[17] Twenty years later, the population shrank to 9, 041, with 1,700 residents reporting agriculture as their main occupation.[18]

As in most parts of developing Kentucky, log construction was the primary method of building houses in Franklin County until the middle of the nineteenth century.

Log houses could be clad with siding or left exposed, but the former technique decreased maintenance and increased the comfort level inside the house. Siding also denoted an attention to appearances and status level, as siding required a large investment of labor and money. From the outside, a log house with siding could be indistinguishable from a balloon-framed house built later.

**Later Antebellum Dwellings**

Between 1830 and 1860, Bluegrass farmers increased their agricultural output. Kentucky became a major supplier of livestock to the south and the east – hogs, mules, and horses were major exports. Hogs constituted a vital role in Kentucky agriculture. Swine could be found on almost every farm in the Bluegrass regardless of farm size, because hogs were hardy animals that required less care than other livestock, and could transport themselves to available markets, eking out sustenance in the most unlikely of spots. Unlike beef, pork would keep once it was salted and cured, making it a valuable protein source in the days before home iceboxes and refrigerators.

In 1850, there were 850 farms in Franklin County, valued at $1,740,210. The ratio of improved land to unimproved land was about equal, though the definition of "improved" land changed slightly with each agricultural census. There were 61,895 improved acres of farmland in Franklin County in 1850, and 52,969

[17] University of Virginia Census Library, Geospatial and Statistical Data Center:, Historical Census Browser, 2004. 1820 Population Census. Online at http://mapserver.lib.virginia.edu/collections/
stats/histcensus/index.html.
[18] Ibid, 1840 Population Census.

acres of unimproved land. Some Franklin County farmers participated in the general improvement of livestock bloodlines, but only the upper echelon of farmers, and at a lower rate than in other Bluegrass Counties.

Accumulation of acres enabled the antebellum farmer to make a living and to provide for his family. It was also the key to assuring his place in society. Riesenweber, in her nomination of Hamilton Farm in Washington County (NRIS 93000695), defined a Middling Farmer in the Outer Bluegrass as one who "owned over 100 acres of land, a substantial log, frame or masonry house, and a few slaves." [19] Another Kentucky writer suggested that "in the Bluegrass, no man was considered a well-to-do-farmer unless he owned at least five hundred acres of good land." [20]

During 1830-1860, middling and upper-class farmers in the Bluegrass began to construct farm outbuildings with specialized purposes. Detached kitchens, meathouses, ice houses, spring houses and servants' quarters were built. The growing market in mules and horses meant that some farmers were dedicating stock barns to their stabling. The spatial configuration of domestic yard and agricultural yard began to take differential shape as well. Wealthy farmers manipulated their landscape to present the best possible view of their property to the public.

The Henry and Zach Church House, previously mentioned, not only helps illustrate the different scale of log construction in Franklin County during the antebellum period, but its plan and exterior appearance point to the different lifestyles and social choices made by the Church family and William Knight. The Church family, described as "one of the most prominent families in the region" was among the first Euro-American settlers in Franklin County, receiving a land grant in 1782.[21]

The introduction of the central hall house plan in rural Kentucky not only gave rise to a new housing type, but also was an evolution in the idea of space. Spaces "are powerful entities to the people who build and occupy them, and for that reason changes in spaces are sensitive indicators of changes in their occupants' attitudes."[22] The central passage affected accessibility, visibility and rearranged the domestic spatial hierarchy. Single pen or saddlebag dwellings afforded their owners little space that could be dedicated to various social functions. The activity of the household in these smaller dwellings was open to all, an arrangement that fostered inclusion, which was not always welcome.

This became particularly true in the slaveholding south. The central hall plan allowed a separation of space and social order within the house that echoed the separation of space elsewhere in the landscape. Among middling and gentleman farmers, the "symmetrical two-story house became an emblem, and passages became a social necessity." [23] Beginning in the 1820s, many builders in Franklin County in the antebellum period followed two house forms – the "I-house and its single-story counterparts."[24] The central hall plan has become associated with

[19] Riesenweber, 1.
[20] Francis Garvin Davenport, *Antebellum Kentucky: A Social History, 1800-1860* (Oxford: The Mississippi Valley Press, 1943), 5.
[21] FR-69, Kentucky Historic Resources Inventory Form, on file at the Kentucky Heritage Council.
[22] Dell Upton. "The Origins of Chesapeake Architecture," in *Three Centuries of Maryland Architecture: A Selection of Presentations Made at the 11th Annual Conference of the Maryland Historic Trust* (1982), 50.
[23] Edward Chappell, Unfinished manuscript on the survey of Montgomery County (Frankfort: Kentucky Heritage Council, 1978), 11.
[24] Ibid., 9.

the ubiquitous I-house, which dominated the Bluegrass landscape. As it moved southward, the I-house "became symbolic of economic attainment by agriculturists."[25]

**Communities in Franklin County**

People in northern Franklin County, linked together by a series of poorly maintained roads and waterways, depended on their hamlets and crossroad communities for a variety of social and economic exchanges. Peaks Mill, located in northeastern Franklin County, is around 12 miles from Frankfort. During the Euro-American settlement period in Kentucky, stations near the area included McClelland's Station at Georgetown, established in 1775, and Lindsey Station near Stamping Ground, established in 1790.[26]

Like many rural communities in the Bluegrass, Peaks Mill, favorably situated on the Elkhorn, developed around a local industry—the mill from which the community takes its name. Started in 1819 by Thomas H. Gouldman, the mill was run by his wife and her second husband following Gouldman's death in 1825. They sold the mill to Virginia native, John J. Peak, in 1838.[27]

Peaks Mill grew by 26.6 percent between 1870 and 1880; although many of these residents located in the village proper, "a substantial number of residents also lived along Cedar Creek Pike and Peaks Mill Pike."[28] Changes to the boundaries of the rural precincts resulted in population fluctuations over the next decade; the population of Peak's Mill decreased by 24.7 percent between 1880 and 1890. These dramatic shifts make it difficult to accurately gauge the trends in rural areas and why exactly the numbers swing so sharply from one decade to another. After the depression of 1873, there was vigorous growth in almost all sectors of the economy. Population growth in Franklin County fluctuated greatly from 1880 to 1900, perhaps following the ups and downs of the economy.[29]

Between 1870 and 1880, the agricultural sector of Franklin County rebounded from the painfully low production levels recorded in 1870, which were lower than the same sectors 20 years earlier. Although the Panic of 1873 impacted the larger agricultural economy, production levels in livestock soared to new levels in 1880.[30] The number of farms in the county almost doubled, from 664 farms in 1870 to 1,296 farms in 1880. More acreage came under cultivation in the county, and livestock and crop production shot upward. Improved strains of cattle, swine and sheep found their way into middling farmers' herds, improving their stock and their profit margins. The value of farmland and farm buildings continued to rise from 1879 to 1890 – increasing from under $2.9 million in 1879 to more than $3.2 million by 1890.[31]

[25] Fred Kniffen, "Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion," in *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture* Eds. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1986), 9.
[26] Lucian A. Parker. *A History of Peaks Mill, Franklin County, Kentucky - Revisited*. (Utica, Kentucky: McDowell Publications, 2006), iii.
[27] Carl Kramer. *Capital on the Kentucky: A Two Hundred Year History of Frankfort and Franklin County.* (Frankfort, Kentucky: Historic Frankfort, 1986), 78.
[28] Carl Kramer. *Capital on the Kentucky: A Two Hundred Year History of Frankfort and Franklin County.* (Frankfort, Kentucky: Historic Frankfort, 1986), 182.
[29] Kramer, 222.
[30] Ibid, 183.
[31] Ibid, 223.

## William Knight's Position in the Rural Hierarchy

The 1850 population census records a William Knight, born in Virginia around 1811, in Franklin County District 1. His occupation was constable and his real estate valued at $2,000. The elected office of constable was an office established by the Kentucky constitution in 1850; the constitution mandated the election of a constable from each magisterial district. Constables have the same law-enforcement powers as a sheriff.

In the 1860 population census, William Knight, 45 years old (born in Virginia) was listed as a farmer. His real estate was valued at $2,000 and his personal estate at $5,000. Three other individuals were listed as part of his household: Thomas Long, 23, a laborer; B.F. Long, 21; and F. Mifford, 12 years old.

The 1860 agricultural census gives us additional information about William Knight's life as a farmer. Most farms in Franklin County in 1860 were 100 acres or smaller, and only 21 farms were between 500-999 acres. The 1860 Agricultural census records Knight as owning 600 acres. This fact places Knight into an elite group, but only on the surface. Though recorded as owning 600 acres in the 1860 census, Knight's farm contained only 300 improved acres, which was defined as the "acres of land under cultivation for the year ending June 1, 1860.[32] This cultivated land likely lay along the Elkhorn Creek, with the unimproved land on the ridges of the farm.

William Knight appears to have been a lower middling farmer. He could not afford the great financial outlay that would provide him profits through the concentration on crops or livestock. Knight's farming operation in 1860 included 8 horses, 16 milk cows, 4 working oxen, 40 other cattle and 30 sheep (with a wool production of 150 pounds). Most of the sheep found on Kentucky farms at the time were western sheep, "hardy, fecund, and thrifty, but they were deficient in both carcasses and fleece."[33]

Additionally, Knight is recorded as having 120 swine. It is possible that Knight was raising feeder hogs, which he would sell after weaning and reaching a weight of 30-40 pounds, to farmers with the grain to fatten them up for slaughter. Hogs ready for slaughter were appraised in the Franklin County tax records as hogs over six months of age. Knight's total livestock was valued at $3,000 in 1860.

William Knight owned no slaves, nor did he embark on an ambitious building scheme after settling down along the Elkhorn in the 1850s. Additions to the log house could well have been his intention, but his death in 1863 prevented any such progress. The improvements of his neighbors would not have been unknown to him, neighbors such as his contemporary Henry Giltner, living just down the road (FR-71, supplemental image 1).

Giltner's 750-acre farm, all improved land, was valued at $21,000 in 1860, while his personal estate was double that of Knight's, at $10,000. Giltner's personal wealth included six slaves, and he also raised eight tons of

[32] Michael R. Haines, and the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. Historical, Demographic, Economic, and Social Data: The United States, 1790-2000, Database 2896. Hamilton, NY: Colgate University/Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producers], 2004. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2005.
http://www.icpsr.umich.edu

[33] Thomas Clark. *Footloose in Jacksonian America: Robert W. Scott and his Agrarian World.* (Frankfort, KY: The Kentucky Historical Society, 1989), 124.

hemp—a labor-intensive and highly profitable crop–in 1859. His farming operation far outstripped Knight's in both production and diversity.

Henry Giltner bought his land from the Innes family in 1858, and lived in an existing log dwelling while building his two-story frame house with its imposing two-story portico. It is highly likely that the two men knew each other, and Knight would have been aware of Giltner's reshaping of his domestic landscape. Knight was better off than many of his neighbors, judging from the agricultural census and tax records – but perhaps he was not motivated to construct and groom his social image by building a larger and more fashionable dwelling. A larger house, after all, with social division and separation at the core of its design, was not necessary for a man who didn't interact with his workers.

**Italianate, Gothic Revival and Queen Anne Styles in Franklin County, 1860-1900**

During the late-nineteenth century, styles such as Italianate, Gothic Revival and Queen Anne emerged across Kentucky's farmhouse landscape. These styles in particular took advantage of the industrial advancements of the time, for they contained machine-made stylistic elements such as brackets and textured shingles, which were applied to traditional house forms. All three styles were adopted in the third building phase of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House.

Modeled after Italian villas, the Italianate style begins to show up in Kentucky around the 1840s, and its influence extends until the turn of the twentieth century. Characteristics of the Italianate style in Kentucky include an emphasis on verticality: tall and narrow windows, use of brackets at cornice lines and hood molds, low-pitched or flat roofs with box gutters, and double entry doors. One of the earliest houses in Franklin County to employ the Italianate style was Weehawken (FR-233), located in the southern half of the county, where the better farm land was located. Weehawken not only ushered in the Italianate style in the county at an early stage – 1860 – but also illustrates the way in which its owner, a wealthy lawyer, used the house to "exhibit architecture for prestige."[34]

The Gothic Revival, along with the Italianate, was another style echoed in lower-style dwellings in the survey area. Many Gothic Revival houses in Kentucky do no more to invoke the style than employ a single feature, such as a steeply-peaked cross gables on the façade. The plan of the Gothic Revival house can be very basic, "one to two stories tall, a single room deep, and two or more rooms wide with one, two or three steeply-peaked cross gables or dormers. More often than not, the main part of the house is augmented with shed or ell appendages stretching behind them. Minus the front gables they have the same basic forms as many of the non-Gothic contemporary examples nearby, whatever their style might be."[35]

The style proved popular across northern Franklin County, with examples such as FR-332, located closer to the community of Peaks Mill. Although unsympathetically remodeled, the two-story frame house retains its three cross gables on the façade. Another central passage house with Gothic Revival detailing and identical gable imbrication to the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House is the C.V. Bailey House (FR-236) in the Switzer quadrangle, built around 1880 and overlooking Flat Creek.

[34] Cynthia Johnson. "Weehawken." *Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places*. Copy on file at the Kentucky Heritage Council. Listed 2007. Section 8, page 3.
[35] Macintire, 57.

The Queen Anne style found wide favor in Franklin County, popularized through pattern books, and made available to lumber yards through the ever-expanding railroad network."[36] Frankfort, the capital city, has numerous Queen Anne style dwellings from the last quarter of the nineteenth century, most with an asymmetrical footprint. Other characteristics of the style, as interpreted in the county, include patterned wood shingles, decorative spindle work, and prominent rooflines. The most decorative elements of the Queen Anne include bays, turrets, wrap-around porches which are covered in different colors and textures, giving complexity and interest to the facade.[37]

The typical expression of the Queen Anne style in rural Franklin County was in details such as turned and chamfered porch supports, fretwork and spindles. Elements of the style were often combined with Italianate and Gothic Revival influences so that the three nationally popular styles blend to create an easily recognizable rural farmhouse from the late-nineteenth century. The Penn House (FR-147), located in the Bald Knob area, has an asymmetrical shape, wrap-around porch and brackets.

Weehawken, as a high-style example of the Italianate style in Franklin County, is almost as far removed socially and economically from the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House, as it is distant from it in space. It is unlikely that Jesse Hockensmith's addition to the log saddlebag was much influenced by Weehawken. Closer to home in Peaks Mill were a number of houses to inspire the update and renovation of his log home. These homes combined elements of popular national styles in a manner that was fashionable and affordable.

The Giltner-Holt House (FR-71) embodied the central passage I-house with a blend of Greek Revival and Gothic Revival influences. The Hodges family, located even closer on the Peaks Mill Road, built a one-and-one-half story T-plan dwelling (FR-326) with the familiar polygonal bay window on the façade showing the builder's embrace of the Italianate and Queen Anne influences in a modest interpretation. The George Washington Parker House (FR-36) in nearby Cedar Creek, has a central cross gable, brackets and front porch festooned with detailing.

As Jesse Hockensmith set about enlarging, reorienting and updating his home, he was in good company with other rural dwellers in Franklin County. His addition of the T-plan to the existing log saddlebag confirmed his knowledge of the agricultural hierarchy, the current styles, and his desire to be part of the recognized and understood landscape of status.

**Evaluation of the Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House within the context Agriculture and Rural Life in Franklin County, Kentucky, 1800-1900**

Only when Jesse Hockensmith incorporated the two log pens into his central passage T-plan dwelling of the 1880s, did those earlier house forms survive, to provide a glimpse into the life of an average antebellum farmer in Franklin County. The later house that now envelops the log structure illustrates a more conventional statement of status and self on the landscape, but a statement that is often not explored within the structure of the National Register. The Hockensmith family was not wealthy, but they are typical of the majority of small landowners in Franklin County, especially those in the more marginal rural parts of the county.

[36] Virginia and Lee McAlester. *A Field Guide to American Houses.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), 268.
[37] Ibid.

The log-and-frame second dwelling on the site provides a mirror with which to assess the changes in the main house – changes not apparent from the exterior, but clearly present upon an in-depth inspection of the interior of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House. So, while one portion of Jesse Hockensmith's domestic yard conceded to the demands of social standing and perception, he left the humble log-and-frame saddlebag intact, to testify to the origins of both dwellings, indicating the means and motivations of the houses' previous owners.

During William Knight's tenure of 10-12 years, the property operated more or less as a lower-middling diversified farmstead. Knight owned a sizeable amount of acreage for the time, but only half of it was improved, and even that half could not measure up in productivity and fertility to farms in the southern part of Franklin County. His livestock holdings were valued more than many of his neighbors, but he wasn't producing the type of animals for a large profit margin, such as horses and mules. Rather, it is likely he concentrated on selling excess stock within his own neighborhood and county, and lived off of the rest.

The turnpike had not yet been chartered, and the conditions of the road tended to be poor, so a great deal of travel passed up and down the Elkhorn and its branches. Knight's houses, both the main house and the cabin in the yard, faced the creek. Neither log structure appears to have been clad in weatherboard during Knight's tenure; the general appearance of the domestic yard would have been humble, yet completely average for the time.

In this way, Knight represents the majority of farmers in Franklin County at the time. He was not an owner of his workforce, though he possessed enough income to employ hired hands who lived at the farm. He did not have a cash crop nor did he produce the type of stock designed for the southern market and for economic gain. His house, too, whether single pen or saddlebag, was average, and not the outward statement of status, fashion or prestige. It was a house for living.

Jesse Hockensmith participated in the popular trend of home improvement, as the house itself demonstrates shifting attitudes toward transportation as well as to changes in the messages of social status that houses transmit. His additions to the house followed patterns of building and rebuilding that were taking place all across northern Franklin County. In choosing the T-plan as the vehicle for his domestic improvements, Hockensmith was proclaiming his familiarity with current trends and acceptable forms.

Based on archival research, prior to purchasing the 142-acre farm from Robert Taylor, Hockensmith was not a man of property. He farmed, but likely farmed land owned by others. His stride toward improving his fortunes, both in the acquisition of property, as well as by managing and shifting the physical landscape through the structure of his dwelling to announce his rise in status, and take his place as a part of the commonly understood landscape of rural Franklin County.

## Evaluation of the Integrity of the Architectural Significance of the Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House

A house in Franklin County evaluated to be a good example of a particular style or of continued architectural development will be eligible for the National Register if it retains integrity of feeling. While the primary integrity factors that support integrity of feeling are design, materials, and workmanship, all seven integrity factors of the Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House are discussed here.

The Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House retains a high level of integrity of *location*. The dwelling has not been relocated and it retains its general relationship with the Elkhorn to its south and the original turnpike road of Peaks Mill to its west. The siting of the house on a gently sloping hill above the Elkhorn was a shrewd decision by William Knight. Not only did the Elkhorn provide water for drinking, at low-water times of the year, it became a footpath for humans and livestock, always a positive attribute in rural Kentucky where reliable overland road networks developed slowly and haphazardly.

The house retains its integrity of *design, workmanship* and *materials* sufficiently so that its three building campaigns can be discerned and understood. Though the original log portion has experienced obvious changes, including changes in fenestration and the removal of the chimney, these changes are ones of addition, and help tell the story of the house's evolution from a single pen to a late-nineteenth-century Victorian dwelling. The secondary dwelling provides a stable balance to the changes of the main dwelling, and illustrates without the veneer of clapboards or additions, the first two design stages of the farmstead. The secondary dwelling is an integral part of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith story and vernacular landscape. It retains its original design, unclad logs, and bark clad box frame section. The interior is remarkably intact as well.

The interior of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House reveals not only the original log core, but the fascinating architectural journey of the log pen and the subsequent saddlebag. The historic floor plan has been unchanged since the early twentieth century, and charting the phases of building—enclosing and adding—allows a more-nuanced understanding of this type of farmstead and dwelling. Modern intrusions on the interior are minimal, and in all cases, merely covered the original fabric, which is easily uncovered.

Changes since 1900 to the Jesse Hockensmith's original materials, floor plan, shape and form are minimal. The late-Victorian-era detailing is unmistakable, from the easily recognizable T-plan footprint to the front porch with its spindlework and turned and chamfered porch supports; the interior also retains its circa 1880s finishing. The house retains its weatherboard cladding, original windows, window surrounds, and imbrication. The one-story lateral side addition from the 1970s detracts from the house's historic form, but does not camouflage nor obscure the historic nature of the main house. It is easily understood as a modern addition, and one that follows in the path of historic additions.

The Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House retains a medium level of integrity of *setting*. The agricultural pastures across Peaks Mill Road and to the north and east of the domestic yard provide a sense of the rural setting that defined the property during its Period of Significance, though the substantial acreage once associated with the Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House has dwindled to only a 52.67-acre parcel. The land that was once part of the original farm's holdings remains in agricultural use. Despite the loss of domestic outbuildings, the property is easily recognizable as a rural farmhouse.

The Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House retains a high level of integrity of *feeling* and *association*. Though one would not suspect the presence of the log saddlebag while viewing the house from the façade, the interior provides a clear path from the 1880s addition to the single pen. Additionally, the secondary dwelling in the yard provides an additional layer of understanding and association with the historic precedent of the T-plan. The integrity of design, materials and workmanship, as discussed above, help provide the feeling and association of an evolving farmstead in Franklin County in the nineteenth century.

The historic Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House and its proposed boundary are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as a well-preserved, significant example of vernacular log and frame architecture in Franklin County, Kentucky.

## 9. Major Bibliographical References

**Bibliography** (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form.)

Abernethy, Thomas Perkin. “Frontier in Perspective,” in *The Southern Frontier: An Interpretation* Eds. Walter D. Wyman and Clifton B. Kroeber. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.

Amos, Christine. *The Bluegrass Cultural Landscape: A Regional Historic Overview*. Frankfort, Kentucky: Kentucky Heritage Council, 1988.

Chappell, Edward. Unfinished manuscript on the survey of Montgomery County. Frankfort: Kentucky Heritage Council, 1978.

Clark, Thomas. *Footloose in Jacksonian America: Robert W. Scott and his Agrarian World.* Frankfort, KY: The Kentucky Historical Society, 1989.

----. "Livestock Trade Between Kentucky and the South, 1840-1860." *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* XXVII (September 1929): 569-581.

Davenport, Francis Garvin. *Antebellum Kentucky: A Social History, 1800-1860* (Oxford: The Mississippi Valley Press, 1943), 5.

Feller, Daniel. *The Jacksonian Promise: America 1815-1840*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Franklin County Deed and Settlement Books.

Franklin County, Kentucky, Tax Records.

Glassie, Henry H. *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia: A Structural Analysis of Historic Artifacts*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975.

Haines, Michael R. The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. Historical, Demographic, Economic, and Social Data: The United States, 1790-2000, Database 2896. Hamilton, NY: Colgate University/Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producers], 2004. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2005. http://www.icpsr.umich.edu

Harris. Cyril M. *American Architecture An Illustrated Encyclopedia*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1998.

Harrison, Lowell H. and James C. Klotter. *A New History of Kentucky*. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1997.

Johnson, Cynthia. "Weehawken." *Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places*. Copy on file at the Kentucky Heritage Council. Listed 2007.

Johnson, L.F. *The History of Franklin County*, Kentucky. Evansville, IN : Unigraphic, 1975.

Kniffen, Fred. "Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion," in *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture* Eds. Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach . Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1986.

Kramer, Carl. *Capital on the Kentucky: A Two Hundred Year History of Frankfort and Franklin County.* Frankfort, Kentucky: Historic Frankfort, 1986.

Lancaster, Clay. *Antebellum Architecture in Kentucky*. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1991.

Laughlin, Robert W.M. and Melissa C. Jurgensen. *Kentucky's Covered Bridges.* Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2007.

Macintire, William J. *A Survey of Historic Sites in Rural Marion and Washington Counties, Kentucky.* Frankfort: The Kentucky Heritage Council, 2009.

McAlester, Virginia and Lee. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.

Parker, Lucian A. *A History of Peaks Mill, Franklin County, Kentucky, Revisited*. Utica, KY: McDowell Publications, 2006.

Perrin, William Henry, J. H. Battle and G. C. Kniffin. *Kentucky: A History of the State.* Louisville, Kentucky: F. A. Battey and Company, 1888.

Troutman, Richard. *The Social and Economic Structure of Kentucky Agriculture, 1850-1860.* Lexington, Kentucky: Dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1958.

United States Census Returns. Agricultural Census of 1860, Franklin County.

The University of Virginia, Geospatial and Statistical Data Center Historical Census Browser. Electronic document,
http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/collections/stats/histcensus/index.html/, accessed 2013.

Upton, Dell. "The Origins of Chesapeake Architecture," in *Three Centuries of Maryland Architecture: A Selection of Presentations Made at the 11th Annual Conference of the Maryland Historic Trust* (1982)

Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House | Franklin County, Kentucky
Name of Property | County and State

**Previous documentation on file (NPS):**

___preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67 has been requested)
___previously listed in the National Register
___previously determined eligible by the National Register
___designated a National Historic Landmark
___recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #_____
___recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # _____
___recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey # _____

**Primary location of additional data:**

___State Historic Preservation Office
___Other State agency
___Federal agency
___Local government
___University
___Other
Name of repository: _____

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned): FR-215

## 10. Geographical Data

**Acreage of Property** Two acres
(Do not include previously listed resource acreage.)

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

| | Zone | Easting | Northing | | Zone | Easting | Northing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | 3 | | | |
| 2 | | | | 4 | | | |

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

**Boundary Justification** (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The property proposed for inclusion on the National Register by the current nomination includes a two-acre parcel of the overall 52.67-acre acre parcel associated with the Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House. This boundary includes the domestic yard and the two contributing buildings that convey the story of this rural farmstead. The proposed boundaries provide an appropriate setting for understanding the significance of the design and construction of this house within its historic context in Franklin County. The boundary includes the domestic yard and maintains the historic setting in which the contributing features were constructed.

## 11. Form Prepared By

name/title Janie-Rice Brother, Senior Architectural Historian
organization Kentucky Archaeological Survey date March 2013
street & number 1020A Export Street telephone
city or town Lexington state KY zip code 40506

Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House Franklin County, Kentucky
Name of Property County and State

e-mail

**Photographs:**

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map.

## PHOTOGRAPHY LOG

All photos:
Knight-Taylor Hockensmith House, FR-215
Franklin County, KY
Janie-Rice Brother, Photographer
2012-2013
CD at Kentucky Heritage Council (SHPO)

1. Façade of the Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House, facing northeast.
2. South elevation of the house, showing bathroom addition and ell. Facing northwest.
3. Rear of the house, facing west. The kitchen addition (with enclosed porch on the south side) is at center of photo; the non-historic lateral addition is at right.
4. East and north elevations of the ell and lateral addition.
5. This photo illustrates the junction of the lateral addition (far left of photo), the north elevation of the second log pen, and the T-plan addition.
6. Detail of the canted wall dormer on the north elevation of the T-plan addition.
7. Detail of the second-story window and gable on the projecting gable of the T-plan addition, west elevation.
8. Juncture of the two log pens on the interior, south wall.
9. Central passage stair hall in the T-plan addition. Facing east.
10. North elevation of the log cabin in the yard, facing south.
11. West and south elevations of the log cabin in the yard, facing northeast.
12. Interior of the log section of the cabin, showing late-Federal style mantle.
13. Interior of the box frame section of the cabin, showing winder stair at left in photo and original exterior hearth.
14. Stone wall located at east edge of domestic yard, facing east.

Knight-Taylor-Hockensmith House | Franklin County, Kentucky
Name of Property | County and State

**Property Owner:**

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

name

street & number telephone

city or town state