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1. Name of Property

historic name  Barleywood

other names/site number

2. Location

street & number  Ambler Road, approximately 1 mile N. of SR 51  □ not for publication
city or town  Charles Town  □ vicinity
state  West Virginia  code  WV  county  Jefferson  code  □ zip code

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

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

Signature of certifying official/Title

Date

State or Federal Agency or Tribal government

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

Signature of commenting official/Title

Date

State or Federal agency or bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that the property is:

□ entered in the National Register.  □ determined eligible for the National Register.

□ See continuation sheet.  □ See continuation sheet.

□ determined not eligible for the National Register.

□ removed from the National Register.

□ other, (explain:)  ______________

Signature of the Keeper  Date of Action
Barleywood

Name of Property

Jefferson County, West Virginia

County and State

5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td>building(s)</td>
<td>Contributing 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-local</td>
<td>district</td>
<td>Noncontributing 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-State</td>
<td>site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-Federal</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

N/A

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/single dwelling</td>
<td>VACANT/not in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/secondary structure</td>
<td>VACANT/not in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE/storage</td>
<td>VACANT/not in use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MID-19TH CENTURY</td>
<td>foundation Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walls Brick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roof Metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Description

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

### Applicable National Register Criteria

(Enter categories from instructions)

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

### Criteria Considerations

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

- **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 of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

### Period of Significance

1842 – c. 1900

### Significant Dates

1842

### Significant Person

N/A

### Cultural Affiliation

N/A

### Architect/Builder

N/A

---

9. Major Bibliographical References

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

**Bibliography**

- preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- previously listed in the National Register
- previously determined eligible by the National Register
- designed a National Historic Landmark
- recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey
- recorded by Historic American Engineering Record
- State Historic Preservation Office
- Federal agency
- Local government
- University
- Other

**Primary location of additional data:**

- Name of repository:
## 10. Geographical Data

**Acreage of Property**  Approx. 58 acres

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 4 1 8 4 1 0</td>
<td>5 5 9 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 4 1 9 4 8 0</td>
<td>5 5 8 8 0 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 1 9 4 6 0</td>
<td>5 5 0 0 0 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4 1 3 5 5 0 0</td>
<td>5 5 8 8 0 1 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbal Boundary Description**  
(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

**Boundary Justification**  
(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

---

## 11. Form Prepared By

name/title  Edie Wallace, Historian; Paula S. Reed, Ph.D., Architectural Historian

organization  Paula S. Reed & Associates, Inc.

date  August 2006

street & number  1 W. Franklin St., Suite 300

telephone  301-739-2070

city or town  Hagerstown  state  Maryland  zip code  21740

---

### Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

**Continuation Sheets**

**Maps**

A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

**Photographs**

Representative black and white photographs of the property.

**Additional items**

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

---

**Property Owner**

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

name  Stacy and Eric Lindberg

street & number  P.O. Box 219  telephone  304-876-3636

city or town  Kearneysville  state  WV  zip code  25430

---

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:**  This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings.  Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et. seq.). A federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**Estimated Burden Statement:**  Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to Keeper, National Register of Historic Places, 1849 "C" Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20240.
Summary and Setting:

Barleywood occupies a ridge of high ground running approximately north to south, about two miles west of Charles Town in Jefferson County, West Virginia. Ambler Road heads due north from WV State Route 51, extending approximately a mile to a point where a lane leads off to the west, approximately one half mile to the Barleywood manor house. The lane passes through woods and open fields to reach a fairly level area where the house is situated. When Barleywood was parcelled off from Harewood in 1841 the land continued to be farmed, and today the remaining 58 acres is used for pasture and crops, and also contains woodland. The open land contributes to the scene and character of the property, providing integrity of setting, location and association. The surrounding properties, also once part of Samuel Washington’s Harewood plantation, are currently undergoing residential development.

The Barleywood complex includes a brick Greek Revival style influenced main house dating from 1842, a c.1900 granary with attached shed, a concrete covered c.1842 brick cistern, a frame pump house and a c.1842 log hip-roofed smoke house. These buildings line the edge of the driveway on the east side of the rear main house yard. Additionally, a frame tenant house and garage ruin dating from c.1900 stands along the entrance lane, on its south side, off Ambler Road. On the west side of the main house yard is a concrete remnant said to have been the site of and incorporating former slave quarters, and to the north is a stone foundation of a Pennsylvania type bank barn also with an attached shed. These two structures are noted as contributing to the overall historic setting but are not counted as contributing to the architectural significance of the building complex.

Resources Description

Barleywood House, 1842, 1 contributing building:

The 1842 brick house stands on fairly level high ground and faces south toward Route 51 and the Harewood manor house about a mile distant. It is a two story, three bay Greek Revival style influenced house following a side hall and double parlor plan. A one room deep service wing of lower height, but still two stories is attached to the east gable end. The house rests on limestone foundations that barely appear above ground level. The bricks are laid in Flemish bond at the front elevation and in common bond with a 5:1 stretcher to header row ratio at the other elevations. The east service wing uses common bonding at all elevations. Characteristics of the brick masonry include flat arches of upright bricks above the openings, a brick corbelled cornice at the front and rear elevations of both the main section and the east wing. An unusual feature is remaining putlog holes around the entire building at a continuous level across the second story. At each end the brick walls extend into two inside end chimneys separated by a parapet. The upper stacks of several of the chimneys have been rebuilt.
Barleywood has been vacant and unmaintained since the 1960s. Deterioration and vandalism over the years resulted in loss of exterior porch systems, but traces remain. There were one story front and rear porches. The most recent front porch extended across the façade, but it may have replaced an earlier entrance porch. In addition there was a back porch that sheltered the back door as well as the cellar entrance into the kitchen.

The main part of the house is three bays wide across the front, and the attached east service wing has two bays across its front elevation. Windows are currently covered with plywood to protect the remaining pieces of window sash. A photograph of the house taken in 1973 shows six over six light sash in place. The sash were held within narrow mitered frames with rounded exterior surfaces. Hinge pintles set into the frames indicate that there were once shutters at all windows, except those at the attic level.

The first story east end window in the main section is a jib door/window with a hinged dado that opened out into the corner formed by the east wall and the south wall of the service wing. The main entrance is located in the east bay of the south or front elevation of the main section. The entrance, like the windows is covered with plywood for protection, but the door and entrance framing and woodwork remain intact behind it. The door differs from the windows in that it has a wide wood lintel with decorated “bullseye” corner blocks. The opening includes the door with a broad transom and sidelights. The transom had four panes and the sidelights three panes arranged vertically. The original four panel door is in place. The rear entrance likewise opens into the stair hall. Entering at the back, under the stair landing, it has no space for a transom, and is not embellished with a decorative lintel like the front door.

The roofing material is standing seam sheet metal, currently in deteriorated condition.

Interior:

The front door opens into a formal stair and entrance hall. Due to the abandonment of the house since the 1960s, and resulting vandalism, some features such as the stair rail and balusters, locks and plaster work have been removed or have fallen away. Otherwise the doors, window trim, baseboards and some early, if not original wall paper is intact. The entrance hall extends from front to back of the house. The staircase rises along the east wall. Also on the east wall is the jib door and a door beneath the stair landing which opens into the east wing. On the west wall of the hallway are two doors, each one opening into a parlor. The doors and window are trimmed similarly with unmolded, pedimented architraves with decorated bullseye corner blocks. Part of the stair’s newel post remains, a large, turned piece. The hand rail is gone, but a piece survives in the attic to serve as a pattern. The balusters were square, two per step. In the ceiling is the ghost mark of a plaster medallion with a hook in the center for hanging a light fixture. Early wallpaper fragments cling to the wall.

To the west of the stair hall are two rooms, double parlors. They are appointed similarly and separated by a wall with a wide opening with large four panel doors, which can open to make the rooms function nearly as one. The southwest room has two front facing windows, each with a paneled dado beneath the window sill. The central panel in the dado has curved cut corners, a carry over from the federal stylistic period. There are three layers of paper remaining on the wall, the lower two of which appear to date from before 1870. There is a fireplace in the west wall, but the mantelpiece is missing.

The adjacent northwest room has two north facing windows, with dadoes and trim matching those of the front parlor. A fireplace stands in the north wall flanked by cupboards behind four panel doors. All doors and windows have pedimented architraves and decorated corner blocks. The dado
panels have curved corner cuts like those described in the front parlor. The fireplace mantel is missing, but like the front parlor, its outline remains on the wall.

Behind the staircase a doorway opens into the east wing, into a room over the cellar kitchen. The room has two south facing windows and one in the north wall. This room is trimmed much more simply than the other first floor spaces. There are no paneled dadoes beneath the windows and the architraves are flat topped, not pedimented. There are corner blocks, but they are plain, not embellished with bullseyes. This room also retains the only surviving mantelpiece in the house. It is detached from the fireplace and leans against a wall. The mantel is Greek Revival style in character and has flat pilasters supporting a mantel shelf.

Flooring throughout the first floor is tongue and groove pine of fairly uniform width, blind nailed.

The second floor is laid out similarly to the first, except for a small approximately 8’ X 12’ room at the front of the second floor hallway. In this room is a small square opening into the east end wall chimney. Also in this room, detached and leaning against the wall is a four panel door with its original tiger maple grain painted finish. The original ceiling painted finish also remains in the room with painted brush strokes running at right angles to create a pattern resembling linen. Throughout the second floor, baseboard and trim remain in place, but fireplace mantels are gone. Architraves are straight topped and corner blocks do not have decorative carving.

The staircase continues open to the attic. The attic is finished with a rough coat of plaster, which appears to be an original feature. At some later point, hooks were set into the attic ceiling for hanging herbs or other items.

The cellar is likewise divided into three main rooms, with the kitchen being in the east wing. There is a large brick fireplace there and an entrance to the rear exterior of the house. There is a second cellar entrance into the northwest room.

Although deteriorated and damaged by years of abandonment and vandalism, the Barleywood house retains a significant amount of its original materials and characteristics, including original paint finishes and early wallpaper. The plan is fully intact and there were few alterations in its history like the installation of later kitchens or bathrooms. All baseboards, floors, doors, window and door trim remain, and one mantelpiece and well enough of the stair rail to enable reconstruction of it.

Behind the house are a series of domestic and agricultural support buildings:

**Cistern, c.1842, 1 contributing structure:**
Located conveniently to the kitchen is a subterranean brick-lined cistern. Currently it has a concrete slab top, but the brick interior construction with two chambers separated by a brick wall suggests that this structure is older than twentieth century era.

**Pump House, c.1900, 1 contributing building:**

Behind and to the northeast of the house is a small frame pump house with a shed roof. It is sheathed with vertical board siding.

**Smokehouse, c.1842, 1 contributing building:**

North of the pump house, along the farm lane is a square log smokehouse with a hipped roof covered with standing seam sheet metal. The smokehouse is in deteriorated condition.

**Grain Barn/Granary, c.1900, 1 contributing building:**
An unusual building is this frame grain barn or granary. It is a light weight balloon-framed building with horizontal siding. The gable ends face east and west and the entrances are in the gable walls. The interior is divided into stall-like areas or grain bins. The gabled roof is covered with channel drain sheet metal. A gable roofed shed for equipment storage is attached to the north side of the grain barn.

**Barn Ruin, c.1840s, not counted:**

In a field northeast of the house is the ruin of a Pennsylvania type bank barn with an attached gable roofed shed extension to the south. The barn has caved in upon itself and only its stone lower level wall and the ramp at the back remain intact.

**Unidentified Concrete Ruin, c.1920, not counted:**

Behind the main house and to its northwest is a ruin consisting of a poured concrete corner. No information has surfaced to indicate what this building or structure might have been, but stories attached to the Barleywood property say that the slave quarter was in that area. A quarter would not, of course have been constructed of concrete.

**Tenant House, c.1900, 1 contributing building (garage ruin not counted):**

Located on the south side of the farm entrance lane, near its junction with Ambler Road, is a frame tenant house and ruin of a concrete block garage. The house appears to date from approximately 1900 and is a two story, three bay building of lightweight frame construction. It is covered with plain lapped siding and rests on stone foundations. A one story shed extension is attached to the back wall and probably served as a kitchen or pantry. Windows have six over six light sash and the front entrance is in the central bay. There is no second story opening in the corresponding central bay. The roofing material is standing seam sheet metal. There is a shed roofed entrance porch, but it along with the entire entrance bay has been damaged by a fire. Doors, interior and exterior have four panels. The house is in deteriorated condition and damaged by fire.

**Resource Count:**

- Main House — 1 contributing building
- Cistern — 1 contributing structure
- Frame Pump House — 1 contributing building
- Log Smokehouse — 1 contributing building
- Grain Barn/Granary — 1 contributing building
- Barn Ruin — not counted
- Concrete remnant — not counted
- Tenant House — 1 contributing building (accompanying block garage ruin, not counted)
Statement of Significance

The Barleywood building complex is significant under National Register Criterion C as a domestic and agricultural complex representative of the period beginning with the construction of the manor house in 1842 through the construction of the tenant house and grain barn c.1900. The Greek Revival style influenced manor house on Barleywood farm, constructed of brick, is significant for its stylistic expression of the 1840s period in rural Jefferson County. Little of the brick exterior or the original interior woodwork and trim have been altered over the years, primarily due to its abandonment in the 1960s, and it is currently slated for restoration. The house even retains original wallpaper fragments in the parlor. The remaining interior woodwork, specifically the window and door architraves, doors, mantelpiece and dados reflect an architectural interpretation that combines Greek Revival stylistic features in such elements as the pedimented architraves and massive turned newel post, with carried over Federal features like dado panels with curved corner cuts and the smaller more delicate newels at the upper level. Also architecturally significant are structural features such as the exposed putlog holes around the exterior. Other than the affects of abandonment for some forty years, the house is remarkably intact with a high level of visual integrity due to very few alterations during its history. Aside from the architectural significance of the main Barleywood house, perhaps only the granary would rate individual architectural significance, however, taken as a whole, the Barleywood farmstead complex gains architectural significance as a representative group. The domestic and agricultural buildings and structures are representative of regional farmsteads associated with general grain production through the turn the 20th century when the farm was occupied by tenants. The manor house, cistern, smokehouse, pump house, granary, and tenant house aid in the interpretation of farmstead architecture within the architectural and agricultural history of the region.

The Barleywood house, outbuildings, and remaining 58 acres represent an important remnant of a period of cultural landscape development in Jefferson County, West Virginia (then Virginia), largely influenced by the prominent Washington family and dominated by grain farming. The region is under significant residential development pressure with large historic farms quickly disappearing. The period of significance begins with the construction of the Barleywood manor house in 1842 by Millicent Washington and her husband Robert G. McPherson and continues through the subsequent owners, Humphrey Keyes and his daughter Susan Ambler, who appears to have developed the farm as a tenant operation c.1900. The 58 acres remaining of the historic Barleywood farm, along with the foundation remnant of the historic barn, serve as historic setting for the Barleywood building complex.

Historic Context

Among the earliest settlers in what became known as the “Opeckan (Opequon) settlement” of the Northern Neck proprietary of Virginia were a number of Quakers from New Jersey and Pennsylvania “meetings.” The Hopewell Friends Meeting was officially established in 1734 as more emigrants
petitioned their home meetings to transfer to Hopewell in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. Fed by the “Great Wagon Road,” leading from Pennsylvania through Maryland and into Virginia, the lower Shenandoah Valley became a melting pot of Quakers, Pennsylvania Germans, and the sons of English plantation owners on the by then-overpopulated eastern lands of Maryland and Virginia.

The settlers of German descent brought with them a heritage of grain culture. Those that ventured westward from the tidewater region into the mountain and valley region maintained their tidewater tobacco roots but quickly adjusted to more general production including wheat rather than tobacco as the primary cash crop. Such a conversion was probably not as radical as it might appear. Tidewater plantation owners grew a variety of grain and fruit crops in addition to tobacco. Early land leases, which often required at least 100 apple trees be planted in addition to the construction of houses, tobacco barns, and fencing, reveal the importance attached to the cultivation of apple and other fruit trees.

Through the 1750s and 1760s, George Washington – with plantations in Fairfax County on the Potomac River and elsewhere, as well as in Frederick County on Bullskin Run – left detailed accounts of his various crops, preferring corn in particular to feed his slave labor force. George and his half-brother Lawrence began purchasing land on Bullskin Run in then Frederick County, Virginia as early as 1750, and were joined by John A. Washington by 1755 (Lawrence died in 1752). Although throughout the year of 1760 Washington recorded deliveries of “Mountain Tobacco” from his Bullskin plantation, by 1766 and 1768, he claimed “that he raised no tobacco at all except at his dower plantations on the York River…”

Following the interruptions of the French and Indian War, westward settlement continued on the farms of the upper Potomac and lower Shenandoah Rivers. By 1772, when Berkeley County was carved from Frederick County, the extensive Washington plantations dominated the county’s agriculture. George Washington’s Bullskin plantation, centered on the Rock Hall manor house, and John A. Washington’s Prospect Hill were soon followed by their brother’s estates. Samuel Washington established himself at Harewood around 1770, eventually acquiring 3,800 acres, and Charles Washington built his Happy Retreat in 1780 and soon thereafter established the adjoining town of Charlestown (Charles Town today). The large Washington plantations were eventually subdivided as ensuing generations matured, but the tradition of building and naming an elegant manor house at the center of these smaller estates continued. Samuel Washington’s Harewood had as many as six later manor houses including Barleywood, Locust Hill, Megwillie, Sulgrave, Richwood Hall, and Cedar Lawn.

Like many of their Virginia neighbors, the Washington farms were largely dependent on slave labor, but by the late 18th century had begun to shift more to production of grains than tobacco. In 1785, Washington listed among his crops “barley, clover, corn, carrots, cabbage, flax, millet, oats, orchard grass, peas, potatoes, pumpkins, rye, spelt, turnips, timothy, and wheat.” Thomas Jefferson, in his “Notes on the State of Virginia” speculated that climate change and soil depletion were the catalysts for the decline of tobacco in Virginia and Maryland:

---

2 Fairfax Proprietary Papers, Series D, Box 1, Folder 40, Virginia State Library, Richmond, VA.
6 Ibid.
In the year 1758 we exported seventy thousand hogsheads of tobacco, which was the greatest quantity ever produced in this country in one year. But its culture was fast declining at the commencement of this war [American Revolution] and that of wheat taking its place: and it must continue to decline on the return of peace. I suspect that the change in the temperature of our climate has become sensible to that plant, which, to be good, requires an extraordinary degree of heat. But it requires still more indispensably an uncommon fertility of soil: and the price which it commands at market will not enable the planter to produce this by manure…But the western country on the Mississippi [sic], and the midlands of Georgia, having fresh and fertile lands in abundance, and a hotter sun, will be able to undersell these two states [Virginia and Maryland], and will oblige them to abandon the raising tobacco altogether.7

Increased demand for wheat in Europe and the West Indies, dramatic fluctuations in tobacco prices, soil depletion from the demands of the tobacco plant (requiring large tracts of land for continuous rotation), difficulties in transportation of the bulky leaf product, as well as the influence of Pennsylvania German farmers all played into the development of grain, primarily wheat, as the cash crop of choice for western settlement farmers. However, throughout the second half of the 18th century, tobacco continued to be central to the Virginia economy, and was grown from the eastern shore to the western mountains.

Wheat and corn, and to a lesser extent rye and oats, were processed into flour and meal, or distilled into whiskey. By the last decade of the 18th century, the region was active with grist and flour mills along nearly every water way and stills on most farms. Frederick County, Maryland, located east of Berkeley County, Virginia, was representative of the region with as many as 80 gristmills and 300-400 stills reported.8 By 1810, Jefferson County, Virginia, a much smaller county carved from Berkeley County in 1801, numbered 31 mills along its water ways according to the map drawn by Charles Varlé. These industries show the dominance of grain production through the high number of mills and stills and the degree to which the area had developed marketable finished goods. By 1810, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland led the nation in flour production.9

These commodities were shipped to markets in Alexandria, Virginia, Annapolis and Baltimore in Maryland, and to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Shipping from the Shenandoah Valley and the grain growing regions of west-central Maryland and Pennsylvania was a problem, and hindered the growth and prosperity associated with grain production. But as the century and settlement progressed, although wagon roads, fords and ferries remained the standard, river transport – the traditional form on which transportation in the tidewater counties of both Maryland and Virginia was based – was seen as essential for economic advancement. George Washington, whose western Virginia land would certainly have benefited from such improvements, sought advice and suggestions from colleagues, prominent landholders, and iron furnace operators along the Potomac River.10 The Revolutionary War severely slowed the transportation improvement progress, but by the 1780s the shift from “Waggon

roads” to the Potomac River as a primary artery was in full swing, and the Potomack Navigation Company was officially incorporated in 1785.

The trend toward more wheat production by 18th century farmers in the Shenandoah Valley was justified by greater profits. The American Revolution drastically reduced the export of Virginia tobacco to its primarily British markets. At the same time, foreign markets for wheat were growing. By the 1790s, land sale advertisements in the region rarely mentioned tobacco, but often included references such as, “a good mill seat,” or “particularly adapted to raising heavy grain.”\(^{11}\) The dominance of grain continued in the Shenandoah Valley into the 19th century, ultimately resulting in its designation during the Civil War as “the Granary of the Confederacy.”\(^{12}\)

In 1864, the Shenandoah Valley was devastated by Union General Philip Sheridan’s “Valley Campaign.” In October of that year, Sheridan reported to General Grant, “I have destroyed over 2,000 barns filled with wheat; have driven in front of the army over 4,000 head of stock, and have killed and issued to the troops not less than 3,000 sheep.”\(^{13}\) Less than a year later, the Civil War was over, but difficulty recovering the region’s grain culture dominance lingered. Throughout the 1860s and into the 1870s the railroads, once the savior of mid-Atlantic farmers, spread across the prime farming regions to the west. Soon these same railroads were bringing grain from the west to the eastern markets and lowering grain prices.

It was this competition that encouraged experimentation with alternative commercial agricultural production. In the west-central counties of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, and in the panhandle counties of West Virginia, the combination of the soils, water, and climate were long known to be conducive to orchard growth. Experimentation with commercial orchard production in Berkeley and Jefferson Counties began prior to the Civil War with William S. Miller’s farm near Gerrardstown.\(^ {14}\) Apples in particular, but also peaches, pears, plums, cherries, and grapes were planted, their produce shipped by railroad to the burgeoning urban markets.

The orchard industry in West Virginia grew in the 20th century along side dairy and other livestock specialty products like beef and poultry. Like all agricultural goods, sales of fruit and animal products were subject to the whims of the market and the interruptions of WWI, the Great Depression, and WWII. Although orchard production throughout the region diminished significantly through the second half of the 20th century, the eastern panhandle counties of West Virginia continued to rank among the highest producers of apples and peaches in the state. “Today [2004], West Virginia ranks 9th or 10th in apple production and 13th or 14th in peach production in the U.S., with a combined crop value that has averaged almost 15 million dollars over the past 10 years.”\(^ {15}\) The state ranked 41st in livestock and livestock products in 2004 with more than 50% of that in “broilers” or 9-12 week old chickens, and cattle (beef), while dairy accounted for only 7.5% of the total.\(^ {16}\)

After World War II with the advent of the post war booming manufacturing economy and the emerging Cold War, population began to shift once again. This time with the encouragement of the federal government’s new interstate highway system, the defense highways developed in the Eisenhower administration, upwardly mobile and automobile owning city dwellers left the region’s urban environments, particularly Washington D.C. and Baltimore, to create suburban neighborhoods

\(^{11}\) *The Potomak Guardian, and Berkeley Advertiser*, 1791-1799, microfilm collection, Martinsburg & Berkeley Public Library, Martinsburg, WV.


\(^{15}\) Ibid.

beyond the edges of the cities. Since the late 1940s, suburban development has sprawled outward into and throughout mid-Maryland, northern Virginia, and into the eastern panhandle counties of West Virginia, substantially reducing agriculture and profoundly altering the rural landscape.¹⁷

Architectural Context

Samuel Kercheval, writing in 1833 about the lower Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, described the “Mode of Living of The Primitive Settlers” in the valley, first in their dwelling construction:

The first houses erected by the primitive settlers were log cabins, with covers of split clapboards, and weight poles to keep them in place. They were frequently seen with earthen floors; or if wood floors were used, they were made of split puncheons, a little smoothed with the broad-axe. These houses were pretty generally in use since the author’s recollection. There were, however, a few framed and stone buildings erected previous to the war of the Revolution. As the country improved in population and wealth, there was a corresponding improvement in the erection of buildings.¹⁸

Kercheval described the German houses with central chimney and a “large cellar beneath.” However, he noted that, “their dwelling-houses were seldom raised more than a single story in height.”

Germanic settlers, emigrants from Pennsylvania and beyond, were common in the lower Shenandoah Valley; many initiated by the speculators Jost Hite and the Van Meter brothers. But many early settlers were English Quakers from Pennsylvania as well. Much of the land purchased by the Van Meters and sold to Hite was claimed by Thomas Lord Fairfax, a five million-acre proprietary grant known as the “Northern Neck.” The disputed land was surveyed in 1786 as part of an ongoing lawsuit between Hite and Fairfax, which resulted in a detailed description of the land and improvements in that part of northwestern Virginia. All of the buildings listed in the Lick (Elk) Branch area still claimed by Hite were log or timber-framed construction, many described as “old” or “very old” The most prevalent construction material found in the Jonathan Clark survey was “round log.” Dimensions from house to house were similar as well, as was the common roof covering of “clap boards.” Stone or brick chimneys are common, although in other areas surveyed the “cat & clay” (wattle and daub) chimney was more often described.¹⁹

During the century from 1763-1860, this first period architecture was gradually replaced or enlarged into more substantial and permanent forms. Small log houses were improved with siding and additions, or replaced with stone, brick or larger log or timber frame dwellings. The large “Swisser” barns with cantilevered forebays and a ramp or bank at the back, hallmarks of the non-tidewater mid-Atlantic region, replaced small log-crib stables and shelters for livestock and crops.²⁰

The people built according to the materials that were available to them, sometimes drawing upon long-established traditions based upon European and British patterns and upon their own interpretations of current styles and construction techniques, adapted to local conditions. Elements of fashionable styles were incorporated into the region’s buildings along with traditional features. With

the exception of exterior applications of stylistic door treatments and symmetrical fenestration, typically, the more fashionable architectural elements were found on the interior in the form of moldings, mantels, and stairs. Although there are pure stylistic examples, particularly dating from the later 19th century, the vast majority of the region’s buildings are vernacular structures.

Farmhouses: Farmhouses from the 18th through the mid 20th century exhibit great variety, yet all are readily identifiable to the region. Little housing remains from the settlement period. Dwellings that do survive represent the more durable buildings and not the general population of houses. Log was the preferred building material, although probably a disproportionate number of early period survivors are of stone construction. These very early stone houses use the type of stone found in the nearby landscape, often limestone in the Cumberland Valley/Shenandoah Valley region. Later farmhouse builders introduced brick and lightweight framing systems with various milled sidings or shingles. Brick houses were much less common in the 18th century than they were in “urbanized” areas like Shepherdstown, Charles Town, or Winchester. When 18th century brick farmhouses do occur they are distinguished by the presence of water tables, Flemish bond facades and common bond secondary walls with three or four courses of stretcher rows to each header row. Much more common among brick farmhouses are those from the 1820-1900 period. Those constructed before approximately 1850 display Flemish bond facades and thereafter, common bond or all-stretcher facades.21

Farmhouse form followed several traditional paths. Among the earliest buildings were Germanic central chimney dwellings with one or two stories and three or four rooms clustered around a massive group of fireplaces. British settlers more frequently constructed one or one and a half story buildings with a hall and parlor plan, one-room deep with inside or exterior end fireplaces. Generally farmhouses spanned three to five bays, sat on cellars and had side gables. By the second quarter of the 19th century porches begin to appear with frequency, either across the entire front or recessed in an inset containing two or three bays along the front elevation at the kitchen wall. Another variation is an L-extension to the rear of the main part of the house, almost always with a recessed double porch along one side. This L configuration accommodates a kitchen wing, and these rear wings were consistently referenced in 18th and 19th century records as “back buildings,” even though they were attached to the main part of the dwelling.22

Typical floor plans consisted of center passages with one or two rooms on either side, or a two or four room plan where the main entrance opened directly into a room. A common arrangement attributed to Germanic traditions exhibits two central front doors, side by side, which open directly into two front rooms. Houses were almost universally roofed with wooden shingles, often long and double-lapped, top to bottom and side to side. This shingle type seems to be associated with German traditions. Otherwise, top-lapped thin wooden shingles prevailed with staggered joints and there is evidence that thatch was used, along with “cabbin” or clapboard roofs. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries roofs of slate or standing seam metal appear.23

The Barleywood farmhouse dates from 1842, at a time when brick construction was in its ascendancy. It follows a frequently encountered version of the passageway and parlor plan with a side hall and double parlors, three bays wide. It had an entrance porch and a service wing extending not to the rear, but to the side. The tenant house is typical of turn of the region’s 20th century farmhouses,

---

21 Reed & Assoc., p. 113.
22 Reed & Assoc., p. 113.
23 Ibid.
with the three bay central entrance covered by a porch, and two bays above, metal roof, and back building.

**Smokehouses:** Associated with domestic groupings, smokehouses, essential components of the domestic assemblage, stand small and windowless behind the farmhouse. The predominant type in mid Maryland have hipped roofs over square buildings made of log, stone, brick or framed construction. Even twentieth century examples exist made of concrete block. Less frequently these important support buildings are rectangular with gabled roofs. The smoke house door opens into a small room, usually with a large post extending from the ground to the peak of the roof. The post had “arms” extending outward from it upon which hams and sides of bacon hung on hooks. The post pivoted so that smoked meats swung into the hands of someone standing just inside the entrance. Some smokehouses, particularly those with gable roofs, did not have the pivoting post. Rather, meats were hung from the bottom cord of the roof truss or from rafters. Smokehouses did not have chimneys. Their function was to provide an enclosed spaced where a small fire would provide smoke to permeate meats hung within. The smoke both flavored and preserved the meat previously cured with salt, sugar and saltpeter.

The Barleywood smokehouse is regionally typical constructed of logs with a hipped roof.

**Barns:** Mid-Atlantic barns originated in Pennsylvania, springing from German and English precedents. The region’s first barns were the small log structures, described in the 1786 Jonathon Clark survey and other 18th century documents. By the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the barns familiar to us as hallmarks of the region appeared. These bank barns, built of log, stone, brick, or frame covered with vertical siding typically, have a ramp at the back providing access to the upper threshing floor and an overhanging forebay at the front. Animals stayed in the lower level in stalls arranged in rows perpendicular to the front and rear walls. Designed for grain farming, bank barns accommodated threshing and grain processing as their primary function. In a large area of the central upper floor, farmers threshed grain with flails or later with horse or steam powered threshing machines. “Flailing walls” or boards nailed about four feet high, to interior bents bordering the threshing floor kept loose grain and chaff from drifting uncontrolled across the barn floor. Heavy tongue and groove planks floored the threshing area, often double layered battened at the joints to prevent grain and dust from sifting through the floor during threshing as well as to support the vibration and weight of the threshing activity. In advertisements and other descriptions from the 19th century, bank barns appear to be referred to universally as “Swisser” barns regardless of whether or not their forebays are extended or integral, enclosed or open. The term “Swisser” leaves little doubt as to the origin of these large farm buildings.

Barleywood’s barn ruin is regionally typical for the mid 19th century. It was a framed Pennsylvania type bank barn with the lower level of limestone. The design and type of the second barn which retains no visible above ground remains is unknown.

**Grain Barn/Granary:** Barns usually have built-in or attached granaries, box-like rooms for grain storage located on either side of the threshing floor or in outshots extending back from the rear wall.

---

25 Reed & Assoc., p. 117-118.
26 Ibid.
An alternative to this is the stand-alone granary in which the building is divided into heavy-walled storage rooms. To date, the stand-alone granary has not been found to be a common building on mid-Atlantic farms.

Barleywood thus has an unusual freestanding grain barn dating from c.1900.

Resource History

In 1771, Samuel Washington, brother of then Col. George Washington, purchased a tract of 542 acres from Isaiah Pemberton (Fred. Co. Deed Book 14, p. 80). Pemberton, son of George Pemberton and a member of the Hopewell Friends Meeting, had acquired the tract by a grant from Thomas Lord Fairfax in 1750 (N.N. Grant Book G, p. 446). The land adjoined his father’s tract of 473 acres, also a 1750 Fairfax grant (N.N. Grant Book G, p. 445). When George Pemberton died in 1757, he passed his tract “whereon I now live” to his son George Pemberton. Samuel Washington purchased this second tract from George and Judith Pemberton on the same day in 1771 (FC DB 14, p. 86). Washington added these two tracts to his already substantial holdings inherited from his brother Lawrence, part of Robert Worthington’s 3,000-acre Quarry Bank grant of 1734 (VA Grant Book 15, p. 339), where he settled in his house called Harewood.

Washington family lore, as passed on by present-day (2001 interview) descendant John A. Washington, relates the story of Samuel Washington and the Harewood plantation:

He moved here in 1770 with his wife and children, and during this whole period, both before and after he lived at Harewood, he was buying more and more land until eventually, by adding to what he inherited from his half-brother Lawrence, he held a total of 3800 acres that stretched in a long zig-zag north-to-south and includes, of course, the site of Harewood. This land over the years was divided and subdivided among children and grandchildren. The Harewood house and 260 acres there are still owned by his descendants.

When you think about Col. Sam Washington, it’s hard not to think of him as the one that was married five times and died at the age of forty-seven. It wasn’t his fault - or maybe it was - that his wives died at such a rapid rate. It’s pretty clear that he had tuberculosis which we now know is a contagious disease and tuberculosis and pregnancy and childbirth do not go well together. The strain of pregnancy is very difficult for a woman who has tuberculosis. I’ve always thought that his young wives who kept dying so quickly had caught tuberculosis from him, became pregnant, and soon died as a result of the combination.

Be that as it may, he was a good deal more distinguished man than we usually think, for we tend to contrast him with his famous brother. Col. Sam was a leading citizen in Stafford County before he moved to what is now Jefferson County and here he at once became vestryman and warden of the church, a member of the county court, colonel of the county militia and very much a leader of the community.

His son by his fourth marriage, George Steptoe Washington, followed him at Harewood. Again we think of this Washington first because of his marriage. In 1793, he married Lucy

Payne, the attractive sister of Dolly Madison…George Steptoe Washington, like his father, died of tuberculosis rather young, in his thirties….Their son, Dr. Samuel Walter Washington - that is, George Steptoe Washington and Lucy Payne's son - followed his father at Harewood….The Washington family has continued generation after generation at Harewood and still owns the house.

Out of the 3800 acres that Col. Samuel Washington eventually owned, more farms and houses have come than just Harewood: Barleywood, Locust Hill, Megwillie, Sulgrave, Richwood Hall, and Cedar Lawn.\(^{29}\)

In all, the extended Washington family constructed eleven named manor houses in what would become Jefferson County (in 1801), including General George Washington’s Rock Hall on his Bullskin Run plantation, John A. Washington’s Prospect Hill, Charles Washington’s Happy Retreat at Charles Town, and Bushrod C. Washington’s Claymont Court (see attached map).

George Steptoe Washington, son of Samuel Washington, inherited the extensive Harewood plantation. In 1809, George S. Washington died at an early age and in his will devised to his sons Samuel, George, and William Temple Washington the Harewood property, “to be divided between them.”\(^{30}\) But it was not until February 1828 when the partition “by mutual consent” was made, by which time all three men were married and likely already living on their respective tracts. In three consecutive deeds the division was made: to Samuel Walter Washington and his wife Louisa, 598 acres including the Harewood mansion; to George and Gabriella Washington, 586 acres; and to William Temple Washington and his wife Margaret, 586 acres (Jeff. Co. DB 15, pp. 67-72). The tract given to William T. Washington was largely located on the former George Pemberton grant land. William T. called his plantation Megwillie, a combination of his wife’s and his own names, and around 1830 he built his manor house there. By 1834, the buildings on Megwillie were valued by the Jefferson County tax assessor at $2,600.\(^{31}\)

It was following the death of George Washington, son of George Steptoe Washington and brother of William T. Washington, that another division of the former Harewood property occurred in 1832 (see attached plat). The division plat showed Gabriella A. Washington, widow of George Washington on a 139-acre dower tract that included their mansion house. Lucy P. Todd, the remarried widow of George Steptoe Washington, was given her dower of 165 acres. William T. Washington added a 165-acre parcel adjoining the western edge of his Megwillie tract and adjoining his mother (Lucy P. Todd) on her northern border (JC DB 15, p. 50).

William T. Washington’s new western parcel of 165 acres, plus an adjoining woodlot of 12 acres, was situated on part of the Isaiah Pemberton grant land (see above). Two years later, in an 1834 settlement of Lucy Todd’s estate, William T. added an 80-acre parcel that extended his western tract southward and included a right-of-way to the “Turnpike” (Middleway-Charles Town Road/Route 51; see attached plat).\(^{32}\) Along with an additional 13-acre woodlot on the northwest corner of the whole tract, the new W.T. Washington parcel, soon to be known as Barleywood, totaled approximately 270 acres (see attached annotated plat). In 1841, Washington sold this western parcel as 250 acres to his daughter Millicent’s new husband, Robert G. McPherson (JC DB 25, p. 272). McPherson married

\(^{30}\) As cited in Jefferson Co. Deed Book 15, p. 67.  
\(^{31}\) Jefferson Co. Land Tax, 1834, microfilm collection, Berkeley Co. Historical Society, Martinsburg, WV.  
\(^{32}\) Jefferson Co. Deed Book 20, p. 609.
Millicent F. Washington on December 10, 1840 in Charlestown, Virginia (Charles Town, West Virginia).  

McPherson’s purchase of land from his father-in-law in November 1841, nearly a year after his marriage, and the purchase price of $4,000 for 250 acres, indicates that there may have been a house already in place on the property. But whatever was there, it was likely not the brick manor house known as Barleywood. Tax assessment records for the year 1843, listed the 250 acres under owner Robert G. McPherson with a building value of $2,500, a total land with buildings value of $11,250, and a notation “$1,250 added for New House.” This final notation indicating that the “New House” accounts for only half of the building value implies that some other building or buildings (earlier house and/or barns?) also valued at $1,250 was already in place, although not previously identified.

The McPherson’s “New House” indicated in the 1843 tax assessment was undoubtedly the brick manor house called Barleywood, apparently constructed during the previous year. In that year, 1842, their first child, Maria Washington McPherson was born. On the 1850 U.S. Population Census, Robert G. McPherson, Jr. was a 31 year old “Farmer” and Millicent was 26; their property was valued at $13,000. The McPherson children included daughter Maria aged eight, William aged four, and Ida just one year old. Also in the household were two girls, Hannah E. and Ann C. Maddox, aged 17 and 15 respectively, and a free black named Sarah Thompson, aged 24, likely a domestic servant. Robert McPherson also owned slaves, listed separately on the Slave Schedule of the 1850 census. There were ten slaves on the Barleywood farm in 1850, four of them adult males probably occupied in agriculture, and three adult females (one of them aged 16), with three girls under the age of five.

Relative to the other Washington family farms around them, the Millicent (Washington) and Robert McPherson appeared to be only modestly wealthy (see attached 1852 S. Howell Brown map). Jane C. Washington, widow of John A. Washington (II), owned over 1,500 acres centered on the Blakeley manor house, valued on the 1850 census at $87,000. Jane Washington listed 32 slaves on the 1850 slave census. Bushrod C. Washington, on his 700-acre Claymont plantation valued at $40,000, listed 25 slaves in his household. Neighbor Braxton Davenport listed 31 slaves on his property valued at $100,000. Millicent’s father William T. Washington, at age 49, was still living on the Megwillie farm with his wife Margaret (43) and their five remaining children – the youngest age five. William T. also listed 15 slaves; his land (609 acres) was valued at $30,000.

In 1853, Robert and Millicent McPherson sold the 250-acre Barleywood farm to Humphrey Keyes, a local Charlestown merchant, for $12,203 (JC DB 33, p. 175). Keyes also purchased the adjoining Washington farm known as Megwillie in 1855 from the aging William T. Washington who had recently defaulted on a loan from Keyes. At least part of the Megwillie house had burned in 1845, reducing is assessment value that year from $1,800 to just $200.

By the 1855 tax assessment Humphrey Keyes was in possession of over 1,000 acres, including a saw mill and his two recently purchased farms, Megwillie and Barleywood. In 1860, Keyes’ real estate value listed on the census record was over $65,000, compared to $10,000 in 1850. Humphrey Keyes lived in Charlestown, according to census records, so it appears that Barleywood was likely his country estate, and was shown as Keyes’ most valuable country property on his tax assessments. The Keyes occupation of the Barleywood manor house is probably represented by the second layer of fancy

37 1850 U.S. Population Census, slave schedule, microfilm collection, Shepherd University, Ruth Scarborough Library, Shepherdstown, WV.
38 JC DB 33, p. 83 (Kennedy and Washington to Keyes, 1852), includes reference to 1843 Deeds of Trust; JC DB 35, p. 116
wallpaper in the parlor. Tenants likely worked the farm, perhaps living on the adjoining Megwillie property.

Humphrey Keyes wrote his will in 1860 dividing his estate among his four children, to be held in trust by his wife. Keyes additionally devised to his brother John Keyes “an annuity of $150…during his life,” and a $5,000 lump sum payment to his nephew William Kearsley, “after the death of his Aunt Jane H. Keyes.”39 In 1865, Humphrey Keyes added a codicil to his will, in which he revoked the devises to his brother and nephew, noting “…my Estate being so much reduced by losses during the war…” But in 1869, Keyes added another codicil to the will reinstating his devise to his brother John, “In consequence of the infirmities of my Brother…” Humphrey Keyes lived another six years, until 1875, time enough perhaps to recover some of his war losses.

The American Civil War in Jefferson County and particularly in the Charlestown (later Charles Town) area was an ever-present danger. Located along the Potomac River, the border between North and South, the county saw constant movement of troops throughout the war years both Union and Confederate. Jefferson County began the war in Virginia, a Confederate state, but ended the war in West Virginia, a Union state created in 1863. But Jefferson County citizens were mostly not willing participants in the creation of the new Union state and had petitioned, along with Berkeley and Morgan Counties, to be allowed to remain part of Confederate Virginia. Charlestown, the county seat and the site of the John Brown trial, was a frequent target often occupied by Union troops.

The farms along the roads leading to and from Charlestown witnessed numerous troop movements and a number of engagements. In September 1863 a Confederate detail of 50 men on a mission to obtain horses from the north side of the Potomac River, found a Union regiment in Charlestown blocking their route to the river. Recalled Confederate Colonel Harry Gilmor: “I camped in the woods on William Washington’s place [Keyes’ Megwillie] and, being determined not to go back without some game, sent scouts to watch the road leading out of Charles Town.”40 They followed a group of Union cavalry to Summit Point where they captured 29 horses after a fierce engagement. Then in August 1864, just prior to the start of Union General Sheridan’s destructive Shenandoah Valley campaign, the war engulfed the farms around Harewood and Keyes’ Barleywood and Megwillie properties. “The Engagement Between Early and Sheridan at Packett’s Farm,” here as told by the Jefferson County Chapter of the United Confederate Veterans in a commemorative booklet published in 1911, took place on August 21st, 1864 (see attached Union battle map and 1852 Brown map for reference):

…General Early marched from the vicinity of Bunker Hill toward Charles Town, driving the Federal cavalry before him until he reached Cameron’s Station on the Baltimore and Ohio railroad [Winchester and Potomac R.R.], where he encountered the infantry. He engaged them about nine o’clock in the morning, and drove them toward Charles Town. The Federals threw up fortifications in front of his line and prepared to resist his advance. The cavalry under Vaughn, Johnson and Jackson advanced by way of Leetown and joined Early in front of Charles Town. McCausland marched by way of Summit Point and Fitz Lee by way of Berryville and engaged the enemy on the road. Early planted his cannon on the hill around the house of John R. Flagg, and formed his line of battle north and south of this point, while Sheridan formed his line a short distance east, the center being around the house of John B. Packett [Locust Hill]. Severe skirmishing and cannonading took place at

this point, and quite a number of Federals were killed and wounded in and around Mr. Packett’s house. The house was occupied at the time by Mr. Packett and his family [wife Lucy Elizabeth Washington] and quite a number of visitors, among them several of the Misses Washington, whose home was about two miles distant. The Federals declined to allow them to leave until the shelling became too serious. With Lieutenant H.G. Nichols, they made their escape, under fire, across the fields toward the Federal lines and in the direction of Charles Town. Fortunately they all escaped without injury. The house of Mr. Packett to this day bears the evidence of the cannonading and musketry firing, a number of shells being lodged in the walls.  

Whether the other houses standing in the way of the battle suffered damage is unknown. However, the farms of Jefferson County suffered losses in agricultural production as well as loss of land value after the war. On the 1860 Jefferson County tax assessment, Humphrey Keyes’ 930-acre Barleywood farm (centered on the Barleywood manor since the Megwillie manor house had burned) had a total value of $41,850, including the $3,050 building value. In 1872, the total value was listed as $38,688. Additionally, Keyes’ reduced estate value, as noted in his 1865 codicil (see above), was likely due to the loss of his slaves, considered property (chattel) by slave owners and counted in the value of the estate. Keyes owned nine slaves in 1850 as enumerated on the slave schedule of the census for that year.

Despite these apparent losses, the 1870 census listed Humphrey Keyes in Charles Town at age 77, a “Retired Merchant,” with an estate valued at $89,000. Living in the household were his wife Jane married daughter Susan, her “Clergyman” husband Charles Ambler with their three young children, unmarried daughter [Sarah] Margaretta, and nephew William Kearsley. Keyes died in 1875 and was followed in 1879 by his wife Jane. At the time of his death, only two of Humphrey Keyes’ children survived him, Sarah Margaretta and Susan, both of whom would then have inherited the Barleywood property.

Although Susan Ambler and her sister Sarah Margaret Keyes retained the Barleywood/Megwillie properties throughout their lives, passing it on to Susan’s children, it does not appear that they ever occupied the manor house. It seems likely that the farms shown as “Barleywood” and “Macwillie,” both under the name “Humphrey Keyes’ Heirs,” (see attached) were occupied by tenant farmers throughout this period (1875-1952). A tenant house was constructed on Barleywood ca.1900 probably to accommodate additional leaseholders or laborers. Historic USGS maps (1916 and 1940, see attached) show that the two farms were not converted to orchard production, unlike many of the nearby farms. Apparently still producing grains for market as well as for livestock feed into the mid-20th century, it was during this period that the large granary was constructed on the Barleywood farm.

41 Military Operations, p. 45.
43 1850 U.S. Population Census, Slave Schedule, microfilm collection, Shepherd University. Unfortunately the 1860 slave census for Jefferson Co. was missing from this collection at the time of this documentation effort.
44 Rev. Charles Ambler, minister of the Mt. Zion Episcopal Church and husband of Susan Keyes Ambler, died in 1876 leaving Susan with five children. In 1880 Susan Keyes Ambler lived on Washington Street in Charles Town with her children and her unmarried sister Sarah Margaretta Keyes. By 1900, she had moved to 208 George Street in Charles Town with her sister and her two daughters. In 1920, the census listed Susan Ambler, age 80, sister Margaret Keyes was 88, daughter Letty was 49, and daughter Lucy was 44; son Humphrey Keyes Ambler, was a 52 year-old “Government Clerk” lodging with George Lightner, and son Charles, age 48, was occupied in a railroad office in Essex County, New Jersey, living there with his wife Elsie and son Humphrey.
When Susan Keyes Ambler died in 1925, the remaining property passed to her surviving children Letitia C., Humphrey K., Charles E., and Lucy J. Ambler. In 1952, Letitia having passed away, H.K. (Humphrey), Charles, and Lucy Ambler sold a 37-acre parcel of Barleywood farm to Ernest O. Ware (see attached plat). However, the parcel did not include the right-of-way (now called Ambler Lane), which the Amblers retained along with the remainder of Barleywood and Megwillie. In September 1956, Lucy Ambler being then the sole survivor, sold part of “Meg-Willey” to Roy and Melvin Magaha (JC DB 214, p. 157 and 168), and two months later she sold 422 acres, probably parts of Barleywood and Megwillie but known as “Barleywood Farm,” to Ernest Ware along with a contract for timber rights on a 58-acre woodlot on Barleywood for $24,000.

It is not clear what the Wares used Barleywood farm for other than timber. Roy Magaha, owner of part of the adjoining Megwillie farm, reportedly lived in the Barleywood house into the 1960s, but by 1973 the Barleywood manor house and its associated farm buildings were abandoned and already in decay (see below).


---

45 JC DB 186, p. 290.
46 JC DB 215, p. 381. This deed cites several out-sales of parcels on the west edge of Barleywood by Humphrey Keyes and later Susan Ambler, 110 acres of which was sold to Ernest Ware in 1941 by Cecelia Ware (JC DB 153, p. 459), and part of which is included in the current 58-acre nominated boundary.
47 Walter Washington, telephone interview, August 2006.
Today (2006), the bulk of the Barleywood farm acreage is subdivided into lots for residential development. In 2005, Ernest and Edna Ware sold Lot 24, 25 ½ acres with the house, outbuildings and barn sites, along with a 33-acre “Residue Area” to Eric and Stacy Lindberg. The 58-acre remnant of Barleywood farm now serves as pasture for the Lindberg’s livestock; the buildings are slated for rehabilitation and restoration.

48 JC DB 1018, p. 71.
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Verbal Boundary Description

The Barleywood nominated boundary is defined by the two parcels that now make up the Barleywood farm of 58 acres, known as Lot 24 (25 acres) and the “Residue Area” (33 acres) of the residential development called The Preserve at Barleywood. (see attached boundary map)

Boundary Justification

The nominated boundary includes the remaining intact historic acreage of the Barleywood farm as setting with the associated historic manor house, domestic, and agricultural buildings. Surrounding Barleywood acreage, outside the nominated boundary, is now part of a residential development.
LAND OWNED BY SAMUEL WASHINGTON

SUPERIMPOSED ON PLAT ARE APPROXIMATE LOCATIONS OF VARIOUS PRESENT-DAY LANDMARKS (ROADS, STREAMS ETC.).

SUBDIVISIONS REPRESENT TRACTS SEPARATELY BOUGHT.

1. Aug. 3, 1748, Robt. Worthington To Lawrence W.
2. May 15, 1751, Robt. Worthington To Lawrence W.
3. 1752, Patent To Lawrence Washington
5. Feb. 5, 1771, George Pemberton To Saml. W.
7. May 7, 1771, Saml. Pearson To Samuel W.

Plat of Samuel Washington lands
Barleywood
Jefferson Co., WV
1834 Partition of Lucy P. Todd estate (widow of George S. Washington; JC DB 20, p. 609)
Barleywood
Jefferson Co., WV
1834 Partition of Lucy P. Todd estate with overlay of tract given to William T. Washington in 1832.
Barleywood
Jefferson Co., WV
Map of the Engagement at Charlestown (Official Atlas, Plate 82, p. 204)
Barleywood, Jefferson Co., WV

Sketch of Engagement at Charlestown, VA...
Sunday, Aug. 21st, 1864.
To accompany Report of
Jed. Hotchkiss, Top. Eng'.
A.N.D.
Scale

Confederate
Federal

Winchester and Potomac R.R.

Charlestown

Linden

Cedar Lawn
that H. K. Ambler, unmarried, Charles E. Ambler, widower, and Lucy J. Ambler, unmarried, whose names are signed to the foregoing writing bear it this day acknowledged the same before me in my presence.

L. C. Brisce

My Commission Expires: May 27-1956

1952 Plat of Barleywood
(JC DB 186, p. 391)
Barleywood
Jefferson Co., WV

State of West Va., County of Jefferson, ss.

IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF COUNTY COURT: JANUARY 30TH, 1952

This Deed of E. & S. dated Jan. 30th, 1952 from H. K. Ambler, et al., to Ernest Osbourn Ware was produced in this office and duly admitted to record.

Test,

Emily A. M. Stanley, Clerk of said Court