

**CULTURAL RESOURCES OF THE ELKMONT HISTORIC DISTRICT,
GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK,
SEVIER COUNTY, TENNESSEE**

NOT FOR SUBMISSION TO NTIS

ARPA PERMIT GRSM 02-002

Submitted to:

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK
107 Park Headquarters Road
Gatlinburg, Tennessee 37738

In Partial Fulfillment of Contract
GS-00F-0006L
D546001A120

Submitted by:

TRC GARROW ASSOCIATES, INC.
3772 Pleasantdale Road, Suite 200
Atlanta, Georgia 30340

TRC Project No. 02387

Under Subcontract SC-2000187-6554 to:

TN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
124 S. Jefferson Circle
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Authored by:

Todd Cleveland, Larry McKee, and Paul Webb
with contributions by David S. Leigh, Steve Gaddis, and Tasha Benyshek

September 2002

Note: Certain information (i.e., site locations, maps, etc.) were excluded from this report under exemptions found within the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 [43 CFR 7.18-Confidentiality of archaeological resource information].

I. INTRODUCTION

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Elkmont Historic District is located in southeastern Sevier County, Tennessee, within the boundaries of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park (GRSM) (Figures 1.1 and 1.2). The Elkmont District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) on March 22, 1994, and contains two hotel buildings, a social clubhouse, and more than 70 dwellings and outbuildings (Thomason et al. 1993; Figure 1.3). Although the district was the site of a thriving lumber community from 1908 to 1926, the surviving structures relate to two neighboring resort communities that flourished between about 1912 and 1992, and were known as the Wonderland Club and the Appalachian Club. The Wonderland Club is located in the northern portion of the district, on the east side of the Little River south of its confluence with Catron Branch (Figure 1.4). The 12 structures in this area, including the Wonderland Hotel and Annex, were constructed between 1912 and ca. 1930. To the south, the Appalachian Club area extends along the Little River and Jakes Creek, its tributary, and includes the Appalachian Clubhouse and 60 cabins and outbuildings (Figure 1.5). Most of those were constructed between 1910 and 1930, although one, the Levi Trentham log cabin, is a nineteenth-century structure that was moved to its present location about 1932. To the south and outside of the district, the Avent Cabin (ca. 1830) is listed on the NRHP as an individual structure and is not included in the project area.

When the states of North Carolina and Tennessee began acquiring land for GRSM in the 1930s, one of the options available to landowners was to receive a lesser cash settlement and a lifetime lease to their property. Most of the Elkmont landowners chose this option, although a few cabins in the Wonderland Club area were bought by GRSM and demolished in the 1930s (Thomason 1993:20). By 1950, a desire to bring electric service to the enclave was hindered by the impending expiration of leases, so an agreement was negotiated in 1952 with the Secretary of the Interior, under which lifetime leases were exchanged for a common expiration in 1972. The fixed leases gave the power company a 20-year amortization period with a stable customer pool. In 1972, the Elkmont Preservation Committee (EPC) was formed to negotiate with the federal government for an extension of the leases, which was successfully accomplished.

The 1982 GRSM General Management Plan (NPS 1982) called for the removal of these structures when the leases expired in 1992 (NPS 1982:21). On December 31, 1992, EPC's lease for use of the hotel and all but three of the cabins expired, and the occupants were required to vacate the buildings. The remaining three cabins were not included under the EPC lease but were occupied under individual leases, which expired upon either the lessee's death or on December 31, 2001. Sixty-seven of the structures at Elkmont were determined to be contributing resources to the proposed Elkmont Historic District in late 1993, however, and the Elkmont Historic District was listed on the NRHP in 1994.

NPS has proposed three plans for management of the Elkmont Historic District since 1993. First, In September 1994, GRSM notified the SHPO of their intent to remove all of the structures in the enclave and outlined plans to perform the mitigation actions required by the NHPA for removal of historic structures. The SHPO objected to the NPS plan. Subsequently, in October 1996 GRSM proposed a compromise calling for preservation of three structures to be used to interpret the history of the district and removal of the other buildings. The SHPO rejected the proposal, suggesting that GRSM submit a three-party draft agreement (i.e., between the NPS, SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation [ACHP]) describing its preferred action of retaining three structures and proposed mitigation for those to be removed. GRSM submitted a draft agreement in March 1997, but again the SHPO objected to this agreement and ended consultations with the NPS. Finally, in 1998–99 GRSM, along with NPS

Washington and Southeast Region officials, developed a second compromise that proposed to preserve 17 cabins and the Appalachian Clubhouse. At the same time, the NPS provided to GRSM a total of \$160,000 over FY 98–99 to be used to stabilize the Clubhouse and the 17 cabins proposed for preservation. That proposal was sent to the ACHP and the SHPO in October 1999. The ACHP responded that the NPS proposal constituted a new action and required new consultation.

As a result of this decision, the NPS developed a Request for Proposals (RFP) and subsequently contracted with TN&A to prepare an EA and Amendment to the GMP concerning the Elkmont District. The NEPA process requires the development of a series of alternatives for management of the District through the NHPA and NEPA consulting agency and public participation processes. The present cultural resource investigations of Elkmont were conducted by TRC in April and May of 2002 under contract to TN&A. The goals of the present work were to develop baseline information, in accordance with NEPA and Section 106 of the NHPA, concerning the archaeological resources known and suspected to be present at Elkmont, and to update previous information (Thomason 1993; Thomason et al. 1993) concerning the condition and National Register eligibility of the structures present. These data will be used in the development of the proposed management alternatives, and will also be useful in estimating the impact of the proposed alternatives and in developing strategies to mitigate any adverse effects that might result. After the range of alternatives is developed for intensive evaluation, additional investigation will be conducted as necessary. The results of that further work will be reported in the analysis of impacts section in the EA.

CULTURAL RESOURCE INVESTIGATIONS

Archaeological and Geomorphic Reconnaissance

The present archaeological investigations were intended to supplement previous work carried out by GRSM (Yu 2001), and included background research, a geomorphic reconnaissance, and a subsurface archaeological reconnaissance. The geomorphic reconnaissance was conducted by Dr. David S. Leigh of the University of Georgia, and provided a preliminary characterization of the landform types present at Elkmont and their potential to contain intact prehistoric and historic period archaeological deposits. Five main landforms were identified, including: (1) the floodplain; (2) a low terrace; (3) high terrace remnants; (4) alluvial/colluvial hillslope deposits; and (5) rocky upland slopes. The alluvial/colluvial hillslopes and low terrace areas have the highest potential to contain buried prehistoric deposits, due to the apparent Holocene age of the deposits. The floodplain also has potential to contain in-situ historic deposits or artifacts. The high terrace remnants and rocky upland slopes offer virtually no potential for containing deeply buried artifacts, but could be covered by more recent hillslope deposits in some places.

The archaeological fieldwork included a pedestrian reconnaissance of the entire Elkmont Historic District, as well as shovel testing of selected locations. The shovel testing focused on a sample of the various landform types identified and included additional assessment of the two prehistoric sites previously identified by Yu (2001). The reconnaissance identified six previously undocumented archaeological sites (40SV120, 40SV121, 40SV122, 40SV123, 40SV124, and 40SV125) and one isolated find. All six sites contain prehistoric components, and three contain historic components as well. Given the limited nature of this baseline study, none of the sites were fully delineated, and the restricted level of investigation also precludes any statements about the eligibility of these sites for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). More detailed investigations will be conducted in association with assessing the potential impacts of the alternatives once these are selected, and a more comprehensive archaeological survey at Elkmont may also be required for compliance with Section 110 of the NHPA.

Historic Structures and Cultural Landscape Evaluations

Using the earlier work conducted within the Elkmont Historic District as a base, the present historic architectural investigation reexamined all of the buildings, structures, and aboveground sites associated with the historic Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs. This was done for the purpose of updating known information on the resources and assessing if any of the previous determinations as to contributing or noncontributing status might be subject to change. As part of this analysis, Steve Gaddis of Michael Hining Architects performed a physical condition evaluation of the resources. A cultural landscape investigation was conducted at the same time to address resources that might have been overlooked during the 1993 survey (Thomason 1993). Of 74 total buildings evaluated, 49 are recommended contributing to the district (see Table 1.1 below). This represents only a minor change from the existing makeup of the district, in that an outbuilding formerly determined contributing is now recommended noncontributing due to extreme deterioration (the garage at the Murphy Cabin in the Appalachian Club). Beyond the 74 buildings, a number of contributing and noncontributing structures and aboveground sites have been identified. An additional four structures and the Elkmont Campground (viewed as an architectural, aboveground resource) are recommended noncontributing to the district. It appears that these five resources were inadvertently left out of the district's NRHP nomination and Supplementary Listing Record during the listing process in 1993–1994 (Thomason et al. 1993). Cultural landscape features directly associated with a particular building or structure are recommended contributing to that building or structure and/or the district as a whole. Larger, district-wide landscape elements and smaller features not directly tied to a particular building or structure also are recommended contributing to the district. An analysis of potential impacts to the district and the identified contributing resources will be undertaken when the project alternatives have been selected.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report is organized in the following manner. Chapter 2 presents a description of the environmental setting, and Chapter 3 provides a cultural overview of Elkmont. The methods employed during the archaeological as well as the architectural and landscape surveys are discussed in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 provides the results of the geomorphic and archaeological investigations, and Chapter 6 provides the results of the architectural and landscape studies. Chapter 7 summarizes TRC's findings and recommendations. Following the References Cited, Appendices 1–3 contain the Elkmont Historic District National Register Nomination form, the Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations forms prepared by the historical architect, and the Draft Cultural Landscape Inventory plans prepared by GRSM.

Table 1.1. List of Contributing/Noncontributing Buildings, Structures, and Aboveground Sites within the Elkmont Historic District.

Resource Name	Resource Number	SHPO Survey Number	Location within District ²	Year Built	Status in Nomination (1993) ³	Current Status (2002) ³	Contributing/Noncontributing Status Due to: ⁴	Additional Comments	For More Information, Refer to:
I. Resort Era Buildings:									
Appalachian Clubhouse	N/A	SV-939 ¹	AC	1934	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity	Stabilized in FY1999	Page 90 and Figures 6.1–6.4
Sneed Cabin	1	SV-940	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity	Stabilized in FY1999	Page 93 and Figures 6.5–6.8
Smith Cabin	2	SV-938	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 96 and Figures 6.9–6.12
Higdon Cabin	3	SV-941	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of sufficient structural integrity		Page 96 and Figures 6.13–6.15
Swan Cabin	4	SV-937	AC	c. 1910	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations		Page 101 and Figures 6.16–6.18
Addicks Cabin	5	SV-942	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity	“Set” house	Page 104 and Figures 6.19–6.22
“Adamless Eden”	5A	SV-942	AC	c. 1921	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity	Playhouse	Page 107 and Figures 6.23–6.24
Creekmore Cabin	6	SV-936	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 107 and Figures 6.25–6.28
Mayo Cabin	7	SV-943	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity	“Set” house	Page 111 and Figures 6.29–6.31
Levi Trentham Log Cabin	7A	SV-944	AC	c. 1830	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity	Moved to lot in 1932	Page 114 and Figures 6.32–6.34
Mayo Cabin Servants’ Quarters	7B	SV-945	AC	c. 1920	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 114 and Figures 6.35–6.37

Table 1.1. List of Contributing/Noncontributing Buildings, Structures, and Aboveground Sites within the Elkmont Historic District (continued).

Resource Name	Resource Number	SHPO Survey Number	Location within District²	Year Built	Status in Nomination (1993)³	Current Status (2002)³	Contributing/Noncontributing Status Due to:⁴	Additional Comments	For More Information, Refer to:
Cain Cabin	8	SV-935	AC	c. 1915	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 118 and Figures 6.38–6.41
Galyon Cabin	9	SV-946	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of sufficient structural integrity		Page 118 and Figures 6.42–6.45
Galyon Cabin - rear 1-rm. cabin	N/A	SV-946	AC	Modern	NC	NC	Recent age		Page 118 and Figure 6.44
Baumann Cabin	10	SV-934	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 123 and Figures 6.46–6.49
Scruggs-Brisco Cabin	11	SV-947	AC	c. 1915	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of sufficient structural integrity		Page 126 and Figures 6.50–6.53
Sneed Cabin	12	N/A	AC	1974	NC	NC	Recent age	Rebuilt after fire	Page 129 and Figure 6.54
Cook Cabin	13	SV-948	AC	c. 1912	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 129 and Figures 6.58–6.60
Jamerson Cabin	14	N/A	AC	1974	NC	NC	Recent age	Rebuilt after fire	Page 129 and Figure 6.55
Hale Cabin	15	SV-949	AC	c. 1914	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of sufficient structural integrity		Page 134 and Figures 6.61–6.65
Burdette Cabin	16	N/A	AC	1974	NC	NC	Recent age	Rebuilt after fire	Page 129 and Figure 6.56
Bagley Cabin	17	N/A	AC	1974	NC	NC	Recent age	Rebuilt after fire	Page 129 and Figure 6.57
Gilliand Cabin	18	SV-933	AC	c. 1916	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 138 and Figures 6.66–6.68

Table 1.1. List of Contributing/Noncontributing Buildings, Structures, and Aboveground Sites within the Elkmont Historic District (continued).

Resource Name	Resource Number	SHPO Survey Number	Location within District ²	Year Built	Status in Nomination (1993) ³	Current Status (2002) ³	Contributing/Noncontributing Status Due to: ⁴	Additional Comments	For More Information, Refer to:
Thomas Cabin	19	SV-932	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 141 and Figures 6.69–6.71
F. Andrews Cabin	20	SV-931	AC	c. 1910	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations		Page 141 and Figures 6.72–6.74
Andrews-Sherling Cabin	21	SV-930	AC	c. 1912	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 145 and Figures 6.75–6.78
Congleton-Brownlow Cabin	22	SV-929	AC	c. 1915	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 148 and Figures 6.79–6.82
McDonald Cabin	23	SV-928	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 151 and Figures 6.83–6.85
W. Arnett Cabin	24	SV-927	AC	c. 1912	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alteration		Page 151 and Figures 6.86–6.88
Franklin Cabin	25	SV-926	AC	1913	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alteration	Likely built by Levi Trentham	Page 155 and Figures 6.89–6.91
Hutchins Cabin	26	SV-925	AC	c. 1912	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alteration		Page 158 and Figures 6.92–6.93
Gaines Cabin	27	SV-924	AC	c. 1910	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations		Page 160 and Figures 6.94–6.95
Spengler-Schmid Cabin	28	SV-923	AC	c. 1912	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alteration		Page 160 and Figure 6.96
F. Arnett Cabin	29	SV-922	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 163 and Figures 6.97–6.100

Table 1.1. List of Contributing/Noncontributing Buildings, Structures, and Aboveground Sites within the Elkmont Historic District (continued).

Resource Name	Resource Number	SHPO Survey Number	Location within District ²	Year Built	Status in Nomination (1993) ³	Current Status (2002) ³	Contributing/Noncontributing Status Due to: ⁴	Additional Comments	For More Information, Refer to:
Wright Cabin	30	SV-921	AC	c. 1921	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of sufficient structural integrity		Page 166 and Figures 6.101–6.103
Matthews Cabin	31	SV-920	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity	Likely built by Levi Trentham	Page 166 and Figures 6.104–6.106
“Little Cottage”	31A	SV-919	AC	c. 1925	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 170 and Figures 6.107–6.108
Allen Cabin	32	SV-918	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of sufficient structural integrity		Page 172 and Figures 6.109–6.111
Jeffords Cabin	33	SV-917	AC	c. 1920	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations; some loss of structural integrity		Page 175 and Figures 6.112–6.113
McAmis Cabin	34	SV-915	AC	c. 1920	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 175 and Figures 6.114–6.116
Culver Cabin	35	SV-914	AC	c. 1922	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 179 and Figures 6.117–6.119
Knaffl Cabin	36	SV-916	AC	c. 1910	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of sufficient structural integrity		Page 182 and Figures 6.120–6.123
Johnston Cabin	37	SV-913	AC	c. 1920	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations		Page 185 and Figures 6.124–6.126
Byers (or Chapman Cabin)	38	SV-912	AC	c. 1912	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of sufficient structural integrity	Owned by Col. David Chapman at one time	Page 185 and Figures 6.127–6.130

Table 1.1. List of Contributing/Noncontributing Buildings, Structures, and Aboveground Sites within the Elkmont Historic District (continued).

Resource Name	Resource Number	SHPO Survey Number	Location within District ²	Year Built	Status in Nomination (1993) ³	Current Status (2002) ³	Contributing/Noncontributing Status Due to: ⁴	Additional Comments	For More Information, Refer to:
Dudley Cabin	39	SV-911	AC	c. 1923	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 190 and Figures 6.131–6.133
Kuhlman Cabin	40	SV-910	AC	1925	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 193 and Figures 6.134–6.137
Kuhlman Cabin garage	40A	SV-910	AC	c. 1926	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 193 and Figures 6.138–6.139
Kuhlman Cabin woodshed	N/A	SV-910	AC	c. 1926	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 193 and Figure 6.139
McNabb Cabin	41	SV-909	AC	c. 1923	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations		Page 197 and Figures 6.140–6.141
McNabb Cabin privy	N/A	SV-909	AC	c. 1960	NC	NC	Recent age		Page 197
Spence Cabin (“River Lodge”)	N/A	SV-952	AC	c. 1928	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 199 and Figures 6.142–6.146
Brandau Cabin	N/A	SV-953	AC	1928	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 203 and Figures 6.147–6.149
Parrott Cabin	N/A	SV-954	AC	c. 1928	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations		Page 206 and Figures 6.150–6.152
Murphy Cabin	N/A	SV-955	AC	c. 1928	C	C	Few, if any, alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 206 and Figures 6.153–6.156
Murphy Cabin garage	N/A	SV-955	AC	c. 1928	C	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations; loss of structural integrity		Page 206 and Figure 6.157

Table 1.1. List of Contributing/Noncontributing Buildings, Structures, and Aboveground Sites within the Elkmont Historic District (continued).

Resource Name	Resource Number	SHPO Survey Number	Location within District ²	Year Built	Status in Nomination (1993) ³	Current Status (2002) ³	Contributing/Noncontributing Status Due to: ⁴	Additional Comments	For More Information, Refer to:
Murphy Cabin gazebo	N/A	SV-955	AC	c. 1980	NC	NC	Recent age	Rebuilt based on original design	Page 206
Miller Cabin	N/A	SV-960	AC	c. 1928	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity	Former barn remodeled into cabin in c. 1950	Page 212 and Figures 6.158–6.162
Faust Cabin	N/A	SV-959	AC	c. 1928	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 212 and Figures 6.163–6.165
Faust Cabin garage	N/A	SV-959	AC	c. 1928	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of sufficient structural integrity		Page 212 and Figure 6.166
Young Cabin	N/A	SV-957	AC	c. 1930	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations		Page 218 and Figures 6.167–6.168
Cambier Cabin	N/A	SV-956	AC	1940	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity	Last cabin to be built	Page 220 and Figures 6.169–6.172
Wonderland Hotel	N/A	SV-961	WC	1912	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity	Rear wing added in c. 1928; hotel partially stabilized in FY2000	Page 223 and Figures 6.173–6.178
Wonderland Hotel Annex	N/A	SV-962	WC	1920	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 227 and Figures 6.179–6.183
Wonderland Hotel Servants' Quarters (aka Riordan Cabin)	N/A	SV-963	WC	c. 1930	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 232 and Figures 6.184–6.185

Table 1.1. List of Contributing/Noncontributing Buildings, Structures, and Aboveground Sites within the Elkmont Historic District (continued).

Resource Name	Resource Number	SHPO Survey Number	Location within District ²	Year Built	Status in Nomination (1993) ³	Current Status (2002) ³	Contributing/Noncontributing Status Due to: ⁴	Additional Comments	For More Information, Refer to:
May or Moore Cabin	N/A	SV-901	WC	1917	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 232 and Figures 6.186–6.189
Paine Cabin	N/A	SV-964	WC	c. 1928	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 236 and Figure 6.190
Preston Cabin	N/A	SV-902	WC	1922	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 238 and Figures 6.191–6.192
Bowman or Brown Cabin	N/A	SV-908	WC	1913	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations		Page 238 and Figures 6.193–6.194
Hicks Cabin	N/A	SV-907	WC	c. 1918	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 241 and Figures 6.195–6.196
McMillian/Keith Cabin	N/A	SV-906	WC	c. 1922	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations		Page 243 and Figure 6.197
Vandergriff Cabin	N/A	SV-905	WC	c. 1925	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations	Tennessee Governor Austin Peay was part owner	Page 245 and Figure 6.198
Tate, Beaman, and Tucker Cabin	N/A	SV-904	WC	c. 1926	C	C	Minor or inconspicuous alterations; retention of structural integrity		Page 245 and Figures 6.199–6.200
Richards or Brandau Cabin	N/A	SV-903	WC	c. 1920	NC	NC	Major/conspicuous alterations; loss of structural integrity		Page 248 and Figure 6.201
Richards or Brandau Cabin woodshed	N/A	SV-903	WC	c. 1940	Not mentioned	NC	Loss of structural integrity		Page 248
74 Total Buildings: 49 Contributing and 25 Noncontributing									

Table 1.1. List of Contributing/Noncontributing Buildings, Structures, and Aboveground Sites within the Elkmont Historic District (continued).

Resource Name	Resource Number	SHPO Survey Number	Location within District ²	Year Built	Status in Nomination (1993) ³	Current Status (2002) ³	Contributing/Noncontributing Status Due to: ⁴	Additional Comments	For More Information, Refer to:
II. Structures/Aboveground Sites/Modern Buildings:									
Little River Stone Bridge	N/A	SV-950	AC	c. 1940	C	C	No apparent alterations; retention of structural integrity	Built by CCC	Page 250 and Figure 6.202
Little River Swimming Hole	N/A	SV-951	AC	1910s	C	C	Retention of sufficient integrity to communicate historic use and design	Remnant of 1930s CCC walkway	Page 250 and Figures 6.203–6.205
Bearwallow Creek Bridge	N/A	SV-958	AC	c. 1930	C	C	Minor alterations; retention of structural integrity	Footbridge	Page 253 and Figure 6.206
Old Elkmont Cemetery	N/A	SV-965	WC	1910	C	C	No apparent alterations; retention of integrity		Page 253 and Figure 6.207
New Elkmont Cemetery	N/A	SV-966	AC	1928	C	C	No apparent alterations; retention of integrity		Page 253 and Figures 6.208–6.209
Water tank	N/A	N/A	AC	Pre-GRSM	NC	NC	Not strong enough link to historical/architectural themes of district (NRHP Criteria A, C)		Page 256 and Figure 6.210
Water tank	N/A	N/A	AC	Pre-GRSM	NC	NC	Not strong enough link to historical/architectural themes of district (NRHP Criteria A, C)		Page 256 and Figure 6.210
Pump house	N/A	N/A	AC	Pre-GRSM	NC	NC	Not strong enough link to historical/architectural themes of district (NRHP Criteria A, C)		Page 256 and Figure 6.210
Pump house	N/A	N/A	AC	GRSM (camp-ground)	NC	NC	Recent age	Not in use	Page 256 and Figure 6.212
Water tank	N/A	N/A	AC	GRSM (camp-ground)	NC	NC	Recent age		Page 256 and Figure 6.213
Water tank	N/A	N/A	AC	GRSM (camp-ground)	NC	NC	Recent age		Page 256 and Figure 6.213

Table 1.1. List of Contributing/Noncontributing Buildings, Structures, and Aboveground Sites within the Elkmont Historic District (continued).

Resource Name	Resource Number	SHPO Survey Number	Location within District ²	Year Built	Status in Nomination (1993) ³	Current Status (2002) ³	Contributing/Noncontributing Status Due to: ⁴	Additional Comments	For More Information, Refer to:
Holding tank	N/A	N/A	AC	GRSM (camp-ground)	Not mentioned	NC	Recent age	Still in use	Page 256 and Figure 6.214
Horse barn	N/A	N/A	AC	GRSM	NC	NC	Recent age	Corral, pasture, utility building	Page 256 and Figure 6.211
#434 Quarters	N/A	N/A	WC	GRSM	NC	NC	Recent age		Page 260
#600 Quarters	N/A	N/A	WC	GRSM	NC	NC	Recent age		Page 260
Elkmont campground	N/A	N/A	Camp-ground	1950s-present	Not mentioned	NC	Recent age	Bldgs., structures, above-ground sites (roads, trailer & tent pads)	Page 260
Bridge 76	N/A	N/A	WC	c. 1902 or 1906–1908; likely moved in late 1940s or in 1950	Not mentioned	NC	Relocation from original site; major/conspicuous alterations; loss of structural integrity		Page 260 and Figure 6.215
Bridge 77	N/A	N/A	AC	c. 1984	Not mentioned	NC	Recent age		Page 262 and Figure 6.216
Bridge 49	N/A	N/A	AC	c. 1982	Not mentioned	NC	Recent age		Page 262 and Figure 6.217

19 Total Structures/Aboveground Sites/Modern Buildings: 5 Contributing and 14 Noncontributing

¹ SV is the two-letter prefix code for Sevier County

² AC = Appalachian Club; WC = Wonderland Club

³ C = Contributing; NC = Noncontributing

⁴ The Elkmont Historic District is significant under NRHP Criteria A (event) and C (design/construction). The buildings, structures, and aboveground sites within the district have been determined either contributing or noncontributing to its significance. Because nearly all of the resources have an association with the historic events that have made the district significant, the deciding factor in assessing contributing or noncontributing status has been the degree to which the resources retain their historic physical appearance exhibited during the district's period of significance (1908–1940). Alterations that are inconspicuous or, if conspicuous, do not compromise the character of a resource have been considered insufficient grounds for determining the resource noncontributing. The same can be said for retention of less than full structural integrity. Major and/or conspicuous alterations, loss of structural integrity, and recent age, however, have been deemed sufficient grounds for determining a resource noncontributing. Refer to Chapter 4 for a more detailed discussion of the rationale used to determine contributing/noncontributing status.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

PROJECT SETTING, PHYSIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY

The Elkmont District occupies a mountain valley and adjacent slopes on the north side of the Unaka Mountains, in the Southern Blue Ridge physiographic province (Thornbury 1965). This province also is termed the Appalachian Summit region (Dickens 1976; Keel 1976; Kroeber 1939), and includes the entire western mountain region of North Carolina, along with portions of extreme eastern Tennessee, southwestern Virginia, northeastern Georgia, and northwestern South Carolina. This region is characterized by rugged terrain, heavily forested slopes, and rushing streams with waterfalls.

The Elkmont District extends up to 9000 ft (ca. 2745 m) north-south by up to 5000 ft (ca. 1525 m) east-west and is bisected by the Little River and Jakes Creek, a principal tributary (see Figure 1.2). Elevations in the District range from about a low of about 2060 ft above mean sea level (AMSL) along the Little River at the north end of the District to a high of about 2400 ft AMSL along the ridge slopes.

GEOLOGY, GEOMORPHOLOGY, AND SOILS

Like most of the surrounding mountains, the Elkmont District is underlain by pre-Cambrian sedimentary and metamorphic rocks, including sandstone, conglomerate, siltstone, arkose, greywacke, quartzite, phyllite, slate, and schist (TDEC n.d.).

Geomorphic mapping was conducted at the Elkmont District as part of the present project; the results of that work, including a geomorphic map of the Elkmont District, are presented in Chapter 5.

The terraces and floodplains at Elkmont have been mapped as the Spivey-Santeelah Complex. The Spivey soils are described as “very deep, well drained, cobbly soils in long narrow areas in hollows, and coves in mountainous areas.” They formed in colluvium from metasedimentary rock (mostly sandstone of the Thunderhead formation). They are classified as loamy-skeletal, mixed, mesic Humic Dystrudepts. The Santeelah series consists of very deep, well-drained, moderately permeable soils on benches, fans, and footslopes in coves in mountainous areas. They formed in colluvium from metasedimentary rock (phyllite, slate, and sandstone). They are classified as course-loamy, mixed, mesic Humic Dystrudepts.

The adjacent upland slopes are classified as Soco-Stecoah complex or Junaluska-Brasstown Complex soils of varying slopes. The Soco-Stecoah complex soils are both well drained and are generally found in long and narrow areas along ridgetops and slopes. Permeability is moderately rapid; surface runoff is slow where forest litter has not been disturbed and rapid where it has been removed. The Junaluska-Brasstown Complex forms over metasedimentary bedrock and also generally occurs in linear areas along ridgeslopes. These soils are moderately permeable (USDA n.d.)

HYDROLOGY

The Elkmont District is drained by the Little River and its tributaries, which include Jakes Creek and Slick Limb, Catron, Mids, Pine Knot, and Bearwallow branches. The Little River flows west from the District through a series of mountain gorges to Tuckaleechee Cove and the town of Townsend, before turning northwest and joining the Tennessee River south of Knoxville.

CLIMATE AND PALEOCLIMATE

The Elkmont region has a humid-temperate climate that is characterized by moderate winters (with short cold periods) and hot summers. January is the coldest month, with an average temperature of 38.8° F; July is the warmest month, with an average temperature of 77.1° F. Precipitation is heaviest in the summer and lightest in fall, with an average annual accumulation of 47.4 inches (Elder et al. 1959:1).

The contemporary climate and vegetation of the Great Smokies and the Elkmont tract are products of a long and complex process of natural and human-induced change. The average winter temperatures in the area were considerably colder during the last glacial period, ca. 23,000–13,000 B.C. At that time, the Southeast was covered by a boreal, northern coniferous forest dominated by pines and spruce (Delcourt and Delcourt 1983; Whitehead 1973). The climate warmed and precipitation increased from ca. 13,000 to 8000 B.C., the period during which the first humans arrived in the Appalachian Summit region. During this time (the Late terminal Wisconsin glacial period), coniferous forests were replaced by northern hardwoods as dominant overstory species in the lower elevations (Bryson et al. 1970; Watts 1975, 1980; Whitehead 1973). The period from ca. 6000 to 3000 B.C. is referred to as the Altithermal or Hypsithermal. This has typically been considered a period of continued warming but decreased precipitation (Bryson et al. 1970; Watts 1975), although there is increasing evidence (e.g. Lamoreaux 1999; Leigh 2002; Leigh and Feeney 1995; Prentice et al. 1991) that portions of the Mid-Holocene were much wetter than previously supposed. The climate since ca. 3000 B.C. has cooled slightly, with a possible increase in precipitation. Delcourt and Delcourt (1983) have documented long-term fluctuations in vegetation zone elevations through pollen analysis. This vegetational variability would have been an important factor in the potential for human utilization of higher altitudes.

FLORAL COMMUNITIES

The Elkmont District contains three vegetation communities: Montane Alluvial Forest, Rich Cove Forest, and Acidic Cove Forest. The Montane Alluvial Forest is a relatively rare forest type that, as its name indicates, is found on high-elevation floodplains. This community generally has a canopy composed of a mixture of bottomland and mesophytic tree species, including Eastern hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*), sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), birch (*Betula* sp.), white oak (*Quercus alba*), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), and tulip poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*). Typical understory species include hornbeam (*Carpinus caroliniana*), witch-hazel (*Hamamelis virginiana*), and black willow (*Salix nigra*). The Montane Alluvial Forest at Elkmont occurs primarily on the floodplain and low terraces along the Little River.

The Rich Cove and Acid Cove forests occur on the adjacent slopes. The rich cove forest exhibits dense canopies with open to sparse shrub layers. Canopy species are diverse and include tulip poplar, basswood (*Tilia heterophylla*), sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), and yellow buckeye (*Aesculus flava*). The Acidic Cove Forests exhibit a dense forest canopy composed of a limited number of species, including tulip poplar, sweet birch (*Betula lenta*), Eastern hemlock, red maple, and red oak (*Quercus rubra*). Well-developed shrub layers form dense thickets composed primarily of rhododendron (*Rhododendron maximum*) and dog hobble (*Leucothoe fontanesiana*).

FAUNA

The varied forests at Elkmont supported a substantial and diverse fauna, as indicated by both early historic period observations and modern inventories (Davis 1990:32; Stupka 1960). Ecological analysis indicates that white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) would have inhabited the forests at a rate of about 400 head per 10 square miles (Dorwin 1975), although densities likely varied by season and by local topography and vegetation. Other large and small mammals were also common. Black bear (*Ursus americanus*) were present in densities of about 5 per 10 square miles, and elk (*Cervus elaphus*) may have

occupied the region during some intervals when human populations were low (Dorwin 1975). Wolves (*Canis* sp.) were also present, along with bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), gray fox (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), beaver (*Castor canadensis*), otter (*Lutra canadensis*), muskrat (*Ondatra zibethica*), mink (*Mustela vison*), opossum (*Didelphis marsupialis*), gray squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*), and fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger*) (Linzey 1995; Shelford 1963; Stupka 1960). Avian species of possible economic importance included turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*) as well as smaller species; other species may have been valuable non-food resources as well. The rivers and streams would have provided a variety of fish, including catfish (Ictaluridae), sunfish (Centrarchidae), largemouth (*Micropterus salmoides*) and smallmouth (*Micropterus dolomieu*) bass, and brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*).

III. CULTURAL HISTORY

PREHISTORIC OVERVIEW

Prehistoric occupation in the Appalachian Summit has occurred continuously since at least 12,000 years before present (B.P.). Throughout this period substantial changes occurred in technology, settlements patterns, subsistence practices, population densities, social organization, ideology, and other aspects of human behavior. This chapter provides a general overview of the current understanding of these changes and is derived from a variety of previous studies and overviews of the archaeological record in the Appalachian Summit region (e.g., Dickens 1970, 1976; Keel 1972, 1976; Purrington 1983; Ward and Davis 1999). It is divided into seven chronological periods; Pre-Paleoindian, Paleoindian, Archaic, Woodland, Mississippian, Historic Native American, and Euro-American (Table 3.1).

Pre-Paleoindian (40,000–11,500 B.P.)

The earliest well-documented human occupation dates to about 12,000 B.P., and is termed the Paleoindian period. Long-held theories regarding the colonization of the New World suggest that Late Pleistocene groups entered North America by crossing the Beringia landform, which had been exposed by low ice age sea levels, from northwest Asia to the modern-day state of Alaska; from there, they proceeded through an ice free corridor in western Canada, ultimately settling North and South America. This migration likely occurred sometime during the Late Wisconsin retreat of the Laurentide Ice Sheet between 14,000 and 12,000 B.P. (Anderson 1996). Various models have been proposed to explain colonization of the New World based on the assumption of this Beringia entry. Recent research at the Monte Verde site in south-central Chile has brought these models into question, however, and suggested that pre-Paleoindian populations may have reached North and South America much earlier than ca. 12,000 B.P. (Dillehay 1989, 1997). Although there are some indications that similar pre-Paleoindian sites may be present in the Southeast as well (Goodyear 1999), no such sites have yet been documented in the Appalachian Summit region.

Paleoindian Period (11,500–10,000 B.P.)

The earliest well documented occupation of the Southeast occurred about 11,500 B.P., which represents the beginning of the Paleoindian period. Recent research suggests that this period can be somewhat arbitrarily subdivided into Early (ca. 11,500–10,900 B.P.), Middle (ca. 10,900–10,500 B.P.), and Late or Transitional Paleoindian (ca. 10,500–10,000 B.P.) subperiods (Anderson 1995a and 1995b; Anderson et al. 1996) based on changes in hafted biface morphology. In particular, these three periods are thought to coincide with occurrences of Clovis and eastern fluted lanceolate projectile point forms like Gainey or Bull Brook; fluted and unfluted lanceolate forms with modified bases such as Cumberland, Quad, and Parkhill; and typically unfluted, notched, and unnotched lanceolate forms such as Dalton and Holcombe, respectively (Anderson 1995b; Morrow 1996) (Figure 3.1).

Paleoindian adaptation in the Southeast as well as across North America likely was characterized by small, highly mobile bands that moved from place to place as preferred resources were depleted and new supplies of resources were sought (Kelly and Todd 1988). Paleoindian groups were efficient hunters and carried a variety of tools. These included highly efficient sometimes fluted projectile points of the types mentioned above, as well as less distinctive implements such as various unifacial blades used for cutting and scraping. Undoubtedly tools that are less archaeologically recognized, like wood and bone implements were also utilized. Evidence of hunting mastodon in eastern Missouri as well as Middle

Table 3.1. Generalized Cultural Chronology for Elkmont and the Appalachian Summit Region.

Period	Phase or Subperiod	Chronology	Comments
Euro-American	GRSM Resort-Era (Elkmont) Railroad Logging	1930s-present Ca. 1910-1991 Ca. 1907-1925	Development of Elkmont Campground and other facilities Development of Wonderland Club and Appalachian Club Intensive Little River Lumber Company logging of East Prong Little River
	Settlement	1800s	Owenby, Trentham, and other occupations along Little River and Jakes Creek
Euro-American	Exploration and Early Settlement	Ca. 1750-1800	Early exploration; no known occupation of Elkmont area
Historic Cherokee	Late Qualla	A.D. 1650-ca. 1800s	
Mississippian	Early Qualla	550-350 B.P. (A.D. 1450-1650)	
	Mississippian I (Tennessee)/ Pisgah (North Carolina)	1000-550 B.P.	
Late Woodland	Undifferentiated	1500-1000 B.P.	Possible Late Woodland manifestations include Hamilton, Cane Creek, and late Connestee materials
Middle Woodland	Connestee	1800-1400 B.P.	Continues into Late Woodland period
	Woodland II (Tennessee)/ Pigeon (North Carolina)	2200-1600 B.P./2500-1800 B.P.	
Early Woodland	Woodland I (Tennessee)/ Swannanoa (North Carolina)	2900-2200 B.P./3000-2500 B.P.	
Late Archaic	Savannah River	5000-3000 B.P.	
Middle Archaic	Guilford	6000-5000 B.P.	Elkmont Site 40SV125
	Morrow Mountain	7500-6000 B.P.	
	Stanly	8000-7500 B.P.	
Early Archaic	LeCroy	8900-8000 B.P.	
	Kirk	9500-8900 B.P.	
Paleoindian	Late	10,500-10,000 B.P.	
	Middle	10,900-10,500 B.P.	
	Early	11,500-10,900 B.P.	
Pre-Paleoindian		40,000-11,500 B.P.	Hypothesized early occupation of Eastern North America

Tennessee (Graham 1986; Broster and Breitburg 1995, 1996), and white tailed deer, wapiti, small game, and birds in western Pennsylvania (Adovasio et al. 1978) suggest a varied diet of Paleoindian adaptation in the Eastern Woodlands.

The sparse distribution of Early and Middle Paleoindian archaeological remains in the Appalachian Summit reflects limited use of the region during these periods, and there is only slightly greater evidence of Transitional Paleoindian occupations. Purrington (1983) has suggested that the lack of Paleoindian remains might reflect the destruction and/or burial of Paleoindian sites by post-Pleistocene erosion, and this idea has been supported by recent geomorphological work in the area (Leigh 2002). Other researchers have postulated that a greater amount of Paleoindian materials have been found south of a hypothetical line drawn by Michalek (1969) extending through the Appalachian Summit region from east to west through Asheville, North Carolina. Apparently this line roughly separated a “periglacial climate to the north and a milder climate regime to the south during the final Wisconsin glacial periods” (Purrington 1983:108). Future archaeological research may discern better the nature of Paleoindian occupation in the Appalachian Summit.

Archaic Period (10,000–3000 B.P.)

The Archaic period in the Appalachian Summit can be divided into three subdivisions: Early (10,000–8000 B.P.), Middle (8000–5000 B.P.), and Late (5000–3000 B.P.). These divisions are largely based on temporal changes in style of projectile points. In general, the beginning of the Archaic tradition is associated with two environmental changes that occurred in the terminal Pleistocene and early Holocene epochs; 1) large game, which either became extinct in the area or migrated north with the glacial ice to where the arctic tundra environment suited them, were replaced by modern faunal and floral species, and 2) coniferous forests were replaced by mixed deciduous forests. The Archaic period also can be distinguished in the archaeological record by the termination of fluted point manufacture, the advent of numerous regional projectile forms and functions, and the presence of a variety of specialized artifact types.

As glacial ice retreated northward, such resources as white-tailed deer, turkey, squirrels, rabbits, and fish, as well as vegetal resources such as nuts, berries, seeds, bulbs, and greens, were now being exploited throughout the year. This broad range of fauna and flora was perhaps more prevalent than in the preceding Paleoindian period. The hunter-forager lifestyle in the Archaic period was highly efficient and resulted in a wide and even adaptation to the total natural environment (Jennings 1989). This intensive exploitation of local resources led to increased population growth over time throughout the Archaic period in the Southeast, which decreased group territory size (Anderson and Hanson 1988). Groups gradually became less mobile and more sedentary as villages began to be reoccupied annually.

Early Archaic Period (10,000–8000 B.P.). Adaptation in the Early Archaic is perhaps much like that of earlier Paleoindian hunting and foraging lifestyles. After the extinction of megafauna towards the end of the Paleoindian period, Early Archaic groups hunted smaller game like white-tailed deer and wild turkey. Plant foods and smaller animals presumably began to play an important role in subsistence as well. Early Archaic sites tend to be light scatters that likely represent specialized, seasonal camps at which tool manufacture/maintenance, hunting/butchering, and wood/hide working activities took place. They are also generally larger and occupied longer in comparison to earlier Paleoindian sites.

The Early Archaic period in the Appalachian Summit near the project area can be divided into two chronological and cultural phases: the Kirk phase (9500-8900 B.P.) and the LeCroy phase (8900-8000 B.P.). Although diagnostic projectile point/knife remains of these phases are somewhat limited in the region they far outnumber remains from earlier periods. The Kirk phase is characterized by Palmer

corner-notched points and Kirk corner-notched and stemmed points. These points are typically serrated and exhibit evidence of repeated sharpening and beveling of blades and grinding of bases, stems, and/or notches. Throughout the Appalachian Summit Kirk sites occur in both upland and valley habitats, suggesting a mobile population. Archaeological research in Watauga County, North Carolina (northeast of the project area), also points to broad adaptive strategy for Kirk populations (Purrington 1983).

The LeCroy phase is recognized by bifurcate-based points including (from earliest to most recent) MacCorkle, St. Albans, LeCroy, and Kanawha. These points have not been recovered in stratigraphic context in the Appalachian Summit, but excavations of stratified sites in the lower Little Tennessee River Valley have provided these temporal relationships. In the upper Watauga River Valley there seems to be a marked shift towards floodplain and valley margin habitats for LeCroy phase sites (Purrington and Douthit 1977). In some cases points are manufactured out of local vein quartz suggesting local occupations, while others were made out of Ridge and Valley chert to the east, pointing towards non-local LeCroy populations.

Middle Archaic Period (8000–5000 B.P.). The Middle Archaic period is generally seen as a difficult time, coinciding with the warmer and drier Hypsithermal Interval (Pielou 1991:269–290), although some recent evidence (e.g., Lamoreaux 1999; Leigh 2002; Leigh and Feeney 1995; Prentice et al. 1991), including work in the Oconaluftee Drainage across the mountains to the east, suggests that portions of the Mid-Holocene were much wetter than previously supposed. The Middle Archaic period can be distinguished technologically from the Early Archaic by an increase in ground stone tools manufactured through pecking, grinding, and polishing: adzes, axes, bannerstones, and pendants. Several other types of these ground stone tools, like manos, mortars and pestles, and nutting stones, suggest increased use of plant food resources during this period. The period can also be divided into three phases recognized in the Appalachian Summit based on diagnostic hafted bifaces: the Stanly phase (8000-7500 B.P.), the Morrow Mountain phase (7500-6000 B.P.), and the Guilford phase (6000-5000 B.P.).

The Stanly phase is defined by the occurrence of the Stanly stemmed point, which has been recovered from stratified contexts both in the neighboring Ridge and Valley and Piedmont provinces (Chapman 1977; Coe 1964). They occur less frequent in the Appalachian Summit than the preceding LeCroy phase types, suggesting a depopulation of the area during this time. Most of the points recovered were manufactured out of local quartz. The Morrow Mountain phase is characterized by Morrow Mountain projectile point/knives. Artifacts of this phase far outnumber those of preceding phases in the Appalachian Summit. Distribution of Morrow Mountain sites in the region suggests a generalized subsistence system. Possible evidence of specialized occupation may exist however at the Slipoff Branch site in the uplands of the Tuckasegee Valley (Purrington 1978), which may represent a specialized hunting/butchering camp. The thick, lanceolate Guilford point characterizes the Middle Archaic Guilford Phase. It was first recognized in the Piedmont by Coe (1964). It is also found throughout the Appalachian Summit, however such examples have yet to be recovered in the Ridge and Valley province. Distribution of this point throughout the Appalachian Summit points toward a continuation of the generalized Morrow Mountain settlement pattern.

Late Archaic Period (5000–3000 B.P.). During the Late Archaic period, modern climatic conditions prevailed throughout North America. Local inhabitants apparently took advantage of these conditions by living in strategically placed locations along major streams for long periods of time. An increase in site frequency is recognized throughout the Southeast in the Late Archaic, suggesting a substantial population increase. Some researchers see this trend as the beginning of a sedentary lifestyle, which laid the foundation for more permanent villages in later periods (Wauchope 1966).

In the Appalachian Summit the Late Archaic period is recognized by the Savannah River phase (5000-3000 B.P.). The remains of this phase are among the most abundant in the region and are principally

recognized by the appearance of the large, broad-bladed, straight-stemmed Savannah River point. At the Warren Wilson site, southeast of the project area in western North Carolina, the Savannah River component overlay the Morrow Mountain component and was comprised of bar gorgets, groundstone grooved axes, large elbow pipes, notched stones (net weights), pitted and pebble hammerstones, pear-shaped manos, mortars, large crude bifaces, and flake scrapers (Keel 1976). Soapstone bowls and jars, occasionally with lug handles, also are present during this phase.

Woodland Period (3000–1000 B.P.)

The Woodland period in the Appalachian Summit is divided into three sub-periods: Early (3000–2500 B.P.), Middle (2500–1500 B.P.), and Late (1500–1000 B.P.). In many ways the Woodland period marks only a gradual transition in both subsistence and settlement patterns of Archaic times, most likely because a similar deciduous forest environment was exploited throughout most of both periods. Various tools introduced in the Archaic, like drills, wedges, hoes, nutting stones, pestles, and awls, also appear in the archaeological record of the Woodland period. The Woodland period in the Appalachian Summit also is marked by the beginnings of pottery making and the introduction of the bow and arrow.

Early Woodland Period (3000–2500 B.P.). The most clearly identified Early Woodland component in the Appalachian Summit is called the Swannanoa phase, and represents the initial appearance of ceramics in the region. The most common Swannanoa vessels are cord marked or fabric-impressed simple bowls and conoidal jars. Keel has correlated simple stamped, check stamped, and smoothed plain ceramics to this phase and believes they are late additions as a result of increased cultural interaction with the Carolina Piedmont to the east (Keel 1976). Artifacts associated with this phase include rather small Swannanoa and Plott short stemmed points, bone awls, bar gorgets, soapstone vessels, pitted and pebble hammerstones, net weights, tubular ceramic pipes, and pigment stones. These have been found in association with fire-cracked rock clusters that overlay Late Archaic deposits at both the Warren Wilson and Gashes Creek sites in North Carolina.

In some regions throughout the Eastern Woodlands, Early Woodland adaptation represents an increase in sedentary lifeways likely related to the introduction of horticulture and/or the harvesting of floodplain plants (Purrington 1983). However, in the Appalachian Summit Early Woodland settlement appears to follow a continuation of broad Archaic adaptations with no notable increase in floodplain settings. Also, no notable indications of horticultural activity have been recovered at Swannanoa sites in the Appalachian Summit.

Middle Woodland Period (2500–1500 B.P.). The Pigeon phase (2500-1800 B.P.) is the earliest phase of the Middle Woodland period in the region. It is marked by check stamped or simple stamped vessels with crushed quartz temper and tetrapodal supports (Keel 1976). Vessel forms include conical jars, open hemispherical bowls, and shouldered jars. Diagnostic points of the phase include the large and often concave-based Garden Creek point, the long, narrow Copena Triangular point, and the shallow side-notched Pigeon point. Other artifacts such as flake scrapers, bone and antler awls, hammerstones, celts, expanded-center gorgets, and stone and ceramic pipes were found stratigraphically at the Warren Wilson and Garden Creek.

Purrington (1983) reports a significant shift in settlement patterns in the upper Watauga River during this time. This is represented by a marked increase in floodplain sites and a decrease in upland sites. He suggests that this may be the result of increased dependence on horticulture, and this idea is supported by the recent discovery of maygrass (*Phalaris caroliniana*) and marsh elder (*Iva annua*) remains at a Pigeon site in the Oconaluftee drainage (Webb 2002). Evidence of increased regional exchange systems is recognized in the Appalachian Summit during the Pigeon phase of the Middle Woodland period.

The Connestee phase (1800-1400 B.P.) constitutes the later part of the Middle Woodland period in the region, and likely extends into the subsequent Late Woodland period as well. Much of the information on this phase comes from Keel's (1976) work at the Garden Creek Mound No. 2 on the Pigeon River southeast of the project area. Initial construction of this mound began in the Connestee phase. Ceramics from the site are sand tempered with plain, brushed, or simple stamped finishes with some cord marked, fabric marked, check stamped, or complicated stamped present. Other artifacts include small Pigeon like side-notched and Connestee triangular points as well as flake scrapers and gravers, stone discs, conical celts, tabular gorgets, elbow and platform pipes, grooved stone plummets and pendants, small cylindrical hammerstones, bone awls, cut deer mandibles, and abraded pigments stones. There is also evidence from Garden Creek and elsewhere that at least some Connestee populations were participating in the network of exchange ideas, activities, artifacts, and raw materials that is referred to as the Hopewellian Interaction Sphere (Caldwell 1964). This association with Hopewellian peoples to the north and south suggests that Connestee groups in the Appalachian Summit may have experienced an increase in sociocultural complexity.

Settlement patterning during the Connestee phase suggests a continuation of the increased floodplain or valley occupation that had begun in the preceding Pigeon phase. Evidence from the Garden Creek Mound No. 2 and Gashes Creek sites show evidence of a relatively stable village settlement.

Late Woodland Period (1500-1000 B.P.) The Late Woodland Period is poorly understood in the Appalachian Summit region. Diagnostic artifacts have yet to be clearly defined, however the period may have seen a continuation of Connestee wares and point types (Dickens 1976; Keel 1976; Robinson et al. 1994; Wetmore et al. 2000).

Mississippian Period (1000–450 B.P.)

The Mississippian period has been the subject of much research throughout the Southeast. In the Appalachian Summit this period is marked by the Pisgah phase (1000-550 B.P.). Diagnostically it is recognized by small, isosceles triangular Pisgah projectile points along with a variety of other artifacts including microtools, gravers, perforators, and drills; ground stone celts, pipes, discoidals, and small discs. Shell artifacts associated with this phase include gorgets, ear pins, beads, and dippers. Pisgah series ceramics are characterized by shouldered vessels with a collared rim, usually decorated by rows of elongated punctations (Purrington 1983). Sand and quartz were common tempering agents.

Pisgah villages were stockaded and structures were square to rectangular measuring about 5 to 7 meters along the outer walls with wall trench vestibule entrances, slightly depressed floors, and 4 large center posts surrounding a raised clay, central fire basin (Dickens 1976). A circular pattern of post molds were found at the Warren Wilson site about 3 meters in diameter adjacent to a square house and may represent a conical "hot house" or winter house (Dickens 1978; Faulkner 1977, 1978). Ceremonial structures seem to have been restricted to the southwestern part of the region and include earth lodges and rectangular, flat-topped platform mounds topped with square or rectangular houses. Pisgah burials are usually flexed with grave goods typically being confined to personal adornment (Dickens 1976; Keel 1976).

The significance of the Pisgah phase and its relationship to the subsequent Qualla phases is currently uncertain, and it is becoming apparent that "the Pisgah phase did not make a significant cultural impact in the North Carolina [or Tennessee] mountains west of the Tuckasegee drainage" (Ward and Davis 1999:180). Consequently, it has been suggested that "an as-yet-unrecognized early Qualla (or Lamar) phase culture was thriving . . . at about the same time Pisgah influence was being felt in the central part of the Appalachian Summit" (Ward and Davis 1999:180). Other Mississippian manifestations are also present in the Tennessee and Little Tennessee valleys west and southwest of the project area, including the Hiwassee Island and Dallas phases (Davis 1990; Schroedl et al. 1990).

Historic Cherokee (550 B.P. – 1838)

The Cherokee Indians occupied the Appalachian Summit region at the time of the earliest European intrusion, that of Hernando de Soto's expedition in 1540, and had likely been resident in the area since at least the mid-fifteenth century (Ward and Davis 1999:181). The historic Cherokee occupation is known archaeologically as the Qualla phase (ca. A.D. 1450–1838) and can be divided into earlier (A.D. 1450–1650) and later (A.D. 1650–1838) subdivisions. The material culture of the early Qualla phase may represent to some extent a continuation of the earlier Pisgah phase pattern, although ceramic attributes show strong influences from the more southern Lamar style. Most early Qualla ceramics are complicated stamped, although incised cazuela (carinated) bowls are also present. Incising (and cazuela bowl forms) generally disappears during the later period, and by the end of the period check stamped ceramics make up a sizeable percentage of assemblages. The Cherokee subsistence base was mixed and included cultivation of maize, beans, and other foods as well as wild plant gathering, hunting, and fishing (Dickens 1976:14).

The typical structure in Qualla villages was of wattle-and-daub construction, usually square and occasionally circular with a bark covered or thatched roof, and a central clay fire basin. Some civic-ceremonial centers have been recognized for the Qualla phase such as the Coweeta Creek site, which was a small village that contained a central plaza and a platform mound (Egloff 1971). Qualla culture relied on maize, bean, and squash cultivation supplemented by hunting, fishing, and gathering.

The late Qualla phase (ca. A.D. 1650–1838) is marked by the increasing appearance of European goods at Cherokee sites, as well as shifts from typical Mississippian structure forms to more Euro-American style architecture (Dickens 1976:15). The overall settlement pattern for this phase changed during the latter part of the eighteenth century from nucleated towns or villages to one characterized by loosely grouped houses usually in a linear pattern. By the early nineteenth century, most Cherokees were living in Euro-American style log cabins (Riggs 1996). Late Qualla ceramics are generally similar to those of the early Qualla phase, although there are significant differences in the representation of specific vessel forms and decorative motifs. European-made items like glass trade beads, iron tools and utensils, guns, glass bottles, and copper kettles were introduced into the artifact assemblage (Dickens 1976).

Relations between the Cherokees and Europeans gradually became antagonistic during the century, especially once fortified military garrisons such as Fort Loudon were established and as advance guard pioneers began to settle the area. The Cherokee sided with the English during the American Revolution, and American forces carried out active raids against native settlements in the area during the period between 1777 and 1782. The 1785 treaty of Dumplin' Creek resulted in formal acknowledgement by the Cherokee of the loss of their dominion over the region. Following this, an increasing flow of settlers made their way west into the area (Pace 2001).

HISTORIC OVERVIEW

Euro-American (1750–present)

Late-eighteenth-century Euro-American settlements in Sevier County and the rest of eastern Tennessee generally were located on the flat and accessible lands along the main rivers and larger creeks. Several fortified homesteads, or "stations," were established in the area during this period, primarily along the larger drainages. Sevier County was established in 1785, and in 1795 the county seat was moved to Sevierville (Pace 2001). The more mountainous interior of the region saw later settlement, sometimes, as with Elkmont, not until well into the nineteenth century. Thomason et al. (1993:7:2) note that by the mid-nineteenth century the Owenby and Trentham families owned and farmed land along Jakes Creek in Elkmont. The still extant Avent Cabin is a much-altered version of the farm dwelling of Humphrey

Owenby, although none of the original farm outbuildings remain at this location. Another house, built in about 1825 by the Levi Trentham family on the upper reaches of Jakes Creek was dismantled in about 1932 and moved to the Appalachian Club area of Elkmont behind Cabin 7. The single-pen log structure was extensively altered and used as a guest cottage.

The history of logging on the East Prong of the Little River (which includes the Elkmont area) follows the pattern seen elsewhere in the Smokies. The earliest logging occurred between about 1880 and 1900 and was characterized by “selective cutting in areas most easily reached by the logger” (Lambert 1961:351). The early logging near Elkmont apparently focused on poplar and ash but also included some cutting of cherry and basswood. The J.L. English Company is known to have worked in the Blanket Creek area (west of Elkmont) in the late nineteenth century, and in the early 1900s Swaggerty and Eubanks used oxtams to log portions of the Blanket Creek and Jake’s Creek drainages (Lambert 1958:54).

Large-scale railroad (or mechanical) logging began in the Elkmont area in the early 1900s, when the Little River Lumber Company began to purchase property in the vicinity. The company built a large band mill at Townsend, in Tuckaluchee Cove southwest of Elkmont, and by 1908 had extended a railroad line through the Little River’s narrow East Prong gorge to Elkmont. The community of Elkmont soon developed as an “important facility for both railroad and lumbering operations” (Schmidt and Hooks 1994:62), and included a hotel, post office, commissary, church, railway yard, machine shop, coaling dock, and a variety of cabins for management and workers (Schmidt and Hooks 1994:67–68). Most of the structures were located on and near the broad floodplain of the Little River, in the general area of the present-day Elkmont Campground. The logging era at Elkmont and on the Little River and its various forks has been described in detail by several researchers, and more detailed accounts are provided by Lambert (1958, 1961), Schmidt and Hooks (1994), and Weals (1993), among others.

The intensive logging period at Elkmont began in 1908 and ended in 1926, nearly overlapping the first two decades of the Elkmont resort era (Schmidt and Hooks 1994:56). A detailed history of the resort era, taken from Thomason et al. (1993:8:4–14), is presented below (pages 29–36). Accompanying footnotes also are taken from Thomason et al., except for those identified as a “TRC note,” which have been inserted as of the writing of this report.

The Resort Era at Elkmont (1908–1940)

The scenic beauty and moderate climate of the southern Appalachian Mountains have long attracted visitors who came for short or extended stays, particularly in the summer months. However, the difficulty of transportation through the mountains in the nineteenth century limited the type of visitors and the areas developed for summer visitation. Soon after the construction of the Buncombe Turnpike, which connected Greeneville, Tennessee, to Greenville, South Carolina, in the 1820s, summer colonies of wealthy South Carolinians developed in the North Carolina mountains south of the Great Smokies. The purported healthy climate of the mountains was a particular lure for visitors during the middle to late nineteenth century.

Various types of health resorts, many located on springs, developed in both western North Carolina and eastern Tennessee. One of the earliest in Sevier County was Henderson Springs, known as a health retreat as early as the 1830s. Later in the century, a two-story frame hotel and 22 cabins were built at Henderson Springs, attracting the patronage of prominent Knoxville families (“Hotels and Resorts”).

The construction of railroads vastly enhanced the potential of the Great Smokies region for recreational purposes, particularly for those with more moderate incomes. The

railroad did not reach Asheville until 1880, but as it extended into western North Carolina, summer resorts began to flourish. Knoxville, Tennessee, was accessible by rail prior to the Civil War, but rail lines did not extend into Sevier County until after the turn of the century (Wheeler 1986:64–68). While resorts did develop prior to the building of the railroad in these counties, they developed along the more accessible roads or water routes. An advertisement in an 1897 edition of the *Knoxville Journal* for Dupont Springs, located 12 miles west of Sevierville, touted not only its three kinds of water, but also its “cool and invigorating” air and “unequaled” scenery. Visitors were advised to take a boat or hack for Sevierville (“Hotels and Resorts”). The more remote reaches of the Smokies, however, remained out of the reach of most summer visitors until after 1900.

The construction of railroads also allowed the timber resources of the southern Appalachians to be utilized for commercial purposes. After 1900, large northern timber companies, faced with depletion of the timberlands in the northeast and Great Lakes area, moved into the Great Smoky Mountains and began to develop the means to extract the timber.¹ Among the several large timber companies that worked within the Great Smokies was the Little River Lumber Company. Under the direction of the General Manager, Col. W. B. Townsend, the company began to purchase land in eastern Tennessee in 1901. The Little River Lumber Company was especially interested in cutting the hardwood and hemlock at the higher elevations. To enable them to extract this wood, they created the Little River Railroad Company. Chartered in 1901, it existed until 1940, at which time the company was dissolved.

The Little River Company must have soon realized that its railway through the Little River gorge provided more than an efficient means to extract timber from the mountains. An observation car was added to the lumber train for passengers who wished to view the scenery along the Little River, and by 1909 daily train service was available from Knoxville’s Southern Station to Elkmont (Weals 1991:29). In that year, a local paper reported an outing by a party of young people from Wears Valley, who took the train up to Elkmont.

The lumber company not only encouraged but also promoted the development of cutover land. In 1910, the Little River Lumber Company deeded the Appalachian Club 50 acres “more or less” along Jakes Creek just upstream from Elkmont. The lumber company retained timber and mineral rights, while the Appalachian Club was “to construct at its own expense, a Club House for the accommodation of members and guests, and the right or privilege, of constructing such cottages, or cabins, by itself, or by its members as may be desired” (Sevier County Deed Book [DB] 16:343).²

The Appalachian Club was a Knoxville-based social club. A 1915 brochure describes the Appalachian Club as “composed principally of Knoxville business men, for the purpose

¹ For a history of timbering in Southern Appalachia, see Ronald D. Eller, *Miners, Millhands and Mountaineers: Industrialization of the Appalachian South, 1880–1930* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1982), 86–127.

² TRC note: The deed also mentions the presence of two preexisting “cabins or cottages” on the premises that are said to have been constructed by the lumber company. The stipulation is made that the company “specifically reserves the ownership, and right of uses, occupancy and control of these two cabins, with such adjoining territory as shall be necessary for comfortable use and occupancy thereof” (Sevier County DB 16:344). The ultimate disposition of these two buildings is not known. It is possible that they were removed by the lumber company or by the club at a later date. It also is possible that they may have become, in part or in whole, two of the resort-era cabins located in the Appalachian Club area.

of providing a place for recreation and rest for themselves” (GRSM Archives, Elkmont Files). In 1919, the club was reconstituted and formally incorporated as the New Appalachian Club, with its headquarters in Knoxville and its principal clubhouse at Elkmont (Sevier County DB 40:228, 288:216).³ Membership in the Appalachian Club and the New Appalachian Club included banker J. Wylie Brownlee, university professor R. C. Matthews, several attorneys (including Forrest Andrews and James B. Wright), as well as two members associated with the Little River Lumber Company or the Railroad (General Manager Col. W. B. Townsend and Railroad Superintendent J. P. Murphy).⁴

While predominantly based in Knoxville, members of the Appalachian Club did come from other places in the South. Testimony by H. E. Wright in 1933 noted that, “we have located at Elkmont now 65 summer homes owned by the very best citizens of Knoxville, some from Memphis, some from Athens, some from Nashville, and some from Kentucky, and other places” (GRSM Archives, Tennessee Condemnation Files).⁵ However, most of the former cottage owners at the Wonderland and Appalachian Clubs who became leaseholders were from Knoxville. Their Knoxville business affiliations included Richards Loan Company and Bowman Hat Company (Margaret Richards and E. L. Bowman of Wonderland), and Price-Baumann Tire, Swan Brothers Bakery, and Galyon Lumber (J. Fred Baumann, Charles Swan, and Eugene Galyon of the Appalachian Club) (GRSM Archives, List of Sevier County Leaseholders, Land Acquisition II-24).

One year after the Appalachian Club established its clubhouse at Elkmont, the Little River Lumber Company deeded to C. B. Carter a tract of land immediately downstream from the town of Elkmont. Carter and his brothers founded the Wonderland Park Company and the next year purchased an adjacent tract of land from the lumber company. The Wonderland Hotel was begun in the spring of 1912 and was ready for business by June 15 of that year.

After construction of the Appalachian Club and Wonderland Hotel, a daily passenger train, the Elkmont Special, ran from Knoxville up the Little River to its final three stops, just minutes apart, at the Wonderland Park Hotel, Elkmont, and the Appalachian Club. The trip took approximately two-and-one-half hours from Knoxville. The Little River Railroad and the Knoxville and Augusta Railroad also promoted “Elkmont Country” through brochures. A 1914 brochure assured the reader that besides being noted for its beautiful scenery, Elkmont country “is becoming more popular each year as a recreation place for people from all over the South, some of whom have built summer cottages so they and their families may spend the summers in one of the most delightful mountain climates in the entire country.” In the same brochure the Appalachian Club was described in the following terms:

The Appalachian Club . . . has made extensive improvement on its club house and annex since last year, and is now in position to serve its members better than ever before. A complete water and sewerage system has been installed, also a new and up-to-date electric light plan.

³ The Club conveyed to the New Appalachian Club their tract of land at Elkmont, with the exception of 49 cottages and lots (Charter of Incorporation for the New Appalachian Club, March 5, 1919, Deed Book 288, Page 216).

⁴ Wright, Townsend, Murphy, and Brownlee were all cabin owners by 1919.

⁵ Condemnation against James B. Wright, 1933, testimony of H. E. Wright.

Here, situated at an elevation of twenty-five hundred feet above sea level and commanding a magnificent view of the Smoky mountains, some forty or fifty cottages have been built by members of the club. The natural surroundings of the cottages are so beautiful that the possibilities for enhancing the natural beauties are manifold, and this is one of the charms of the place. On the west side of Townsend avenue flows a tumultuous little mountain stream which furnishes running water in each summer home, and the cottages, rustic and simple, can boast of bath rooms, shower baths and sewer connections together with a natural swimming pool near the club house.

Wonderland Park is described in equally glowing terms in a 1915 brochure:

One of the most beautiful recreation places in the Elkmont country. Elevation two thousand five hundred feet. Hotel new and modern, situated in the heart of the Great Smoky Mountains. Wonderland Park is noted for its picturesque scenery, with river and mountains in delightful vista. A number of rustic cottages have been built here, which add to the attractiveness of the place. Excellent mountain and rainbow trout fishing in Little River. Horseback riding, bathing and mountain climbing. Accommodations for two hundred guests (GRSM Archives, Elkmont Files, Brochures).

Wonderland Park and the Appalachian Club were not the only resorts served by the Little River Railroad. Mount Nebo Springs near the Melrose station, the Chilhowee Inn near Walland, and Kinzel Springs at Sunshine all received visitors who used the railroad in Blount County. In Sevier County, the Line Springs Hotel overlooked Wears Valley and was accessible from the Line Springs depot. As at Wonderland Park, additional cottages were built near the hotel, but families took their meals in the big dining room. The Line Springs Hotel was demolished in 1969.

While the Wonderland Park Hotel was fairly typical of the resorts of the day, the owners of the Wonderland Park Company, the Carter brothers from Knoxville, had grander schemes in mind. The original plat for Wonderland had more than 650 tracts, and the Wonderland Park Addition had thousands more. The land, which had cost \$5 per acre and less, was subdivided into 16 lots per acre (GRSM Archives, Wonderland Files). Had it actually been built, Wonderland Park would have had the density of a major city for its time. However, even if the grid of streets had been laid, many of the tracts were too small and on sites not suitable for building.

It seems probable that the Carter brothers were engaged in land speculation of the type that seized Florida and the western North Carolina towns of Asheville and Hendersonville and crashed in the 1920s. The President of the Wonderland Company himself sold land through agents in Orlando, Florida. Aside from the hotel and annex, less than twenty structures were built at Wonderland. Many of the purchasers of land, in fact, never saw the tracts they had bought, and it was not until decades later, after creation of the National Park, that some of the business practices of the Carter brothers became known.

After the Carters conveyed this land to the Great Smoky Mountains Conservation Association, the deeds and title papers of all prior lot owners in this section were

canceled as clouds upon the title, since the Carters had possession of the land and the location of the owners of the tracts were unknown. However, even those who had clear title seldom recouped their purchase price and taxes in the creation of the Park. Many were notified that their tracts were only 25-by-100 feet and were on the side of a hill or mountain. Generally, they were offered from \$2 to \$25 for each tract, depending on location (GRSM Archives, Wonderland Files).

Despite the legal nightmare it was to create, the activities of the Wonderland Park Company were short-lived. By 1913, legal disputes developed between the Carter brothers, and the subsequent lawsuit dragged on for a number of years, during which time the defendant, T. M. Carter, died. In 1915, the Wonderland Park Hotel and immediately adjacent lands and buildings were sold to a group of Knoxville citizens who formed a private club, similar in nature to the Appalachian Club. Both clubs operated hotels that were available to members but were apparently also rented to paying guests. The Appalachian Club Hotel burned in 1933 and was replaced by the Club House. In 1920, the Wonderland Club built the hotel annex that provided additional rooms for club members.

For almost a decade and a half, recreational and industrial use of the East Prong of the Little River existed side by side. The train from Knoxville made day trips to Elkmont possible. Some stayed at the hotels for short periods, while club members often made extended visits. Passengers could debark at the imposing frame hotel on the hill. The next stop was the town of Elkmont. The final passenger stop was the Appalachian Club Station, where visitors would cross the river on a footbridge to the Clubhouse.⁶ The lumber town of Elkmont—with its plain, vertical plank, boxed structures—must have contrasted starkly with the quaint rusticity of the Wonderland and Appalachian Clubs' cabins. The Hotel Elkmont, almost indistinguishable from the other boxed houses, served a different clientele than the Wonderland Club.

It should be noted that industrial and recreational users of the East Prong of the Little River were not mutually exclusive groups. Several members of the Appalachian Club were at some point connected to the Little River Lumber Company. Furthermore, in 1928, a 65-acre tract of land belonging to the Little River Company, adjacent to the Appalachian Club holdings, was deeded to Alice U. Morier, who had married the aging Col. Townsend. Townsend had been listed as a lot owner in 1919. These properties along “millionaires row,” although not part of the original Appalachian Club deed, were later included in the negotiation of leases.

By 1923, much of the accessible timber above the East Prong had been removed, and the lumber company began to focus its efforts on its operations on the Middle Prong. The train to Elkmont was discontinued in 1925 and the tracks torn up. In 1926, a gravel road was built through the gorge from Townsend to Elkmont, providing an easier route than the steep mountain road from Gatlinburg through Fighting Creek Gap.

The development of roads into Elkmont in the middle years of the 1920s is reflective of the fact that by then a sizeable number of Americans owned cars. Many of the cottage owners were driving as far as Townsend and taking the train from there to Elkmont

⁶ Just beyond the Appalachian Club Station, Shays or geared engines replaced the piston-driven locomotives and continued up the steep hills to where lumbering was occurring.

(Weals 1991:85–86). In those same years, auto-tourism eclipsed the importance of the railroad in the development of the southern mountains for recreational purposes. It was later to be a major contributing factor in the creation of Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The road from Townsend to Elkmont and on to Gatlinburg was part of the one-hundred-mile scenic loop that began and ended in Knoxville. This road, passing through Maryville, Walland, Elkmont, Pigeon Forge, Sevierville, and along the route of present day I-40, exists today. The section from Townsend to Gatlinburg is within the National Park.

Tourism grew, and some of the structures within the town of Elkmont were bought and developed to meet the needs of tourists and visitors to the Wonderland and Appalachian clubs arriving by bus and private car. In 1927, hotel rooms at the Wonderland Park rented for \$2.50 per day. The weekly rate was lower. Cottages also were available for rent. At the Appalachian Club, residents and visitors stayed in cabins and dined at the clubhouse. Some residents brought their servants along for the summer. Recreation at both locations included hiking, picnicking, horseback riding, outdoor games like horseshoes and badminton, and dances both formal and informal. In an area of the Little River dammed by the Appalachian Club was the Swimming Hole, a popular spot during the summer (*Lure* 1927:302).⁷

Construction of cabins continued through the 1920s. By 1931, 19 cabins were located at Wonderland (Interview by Phil Thomason of Vernon and Helen Moore, 3 November 1992). At the Appalachian Club, a number of cabins were built during the decade. Some 75 cabins were located in the two areas just before the Depression. A few cabins were built in the 1930s, most notably those built by Mrs. Alice Townsend along the Little River. The Elkmont area in the early 1930s consisted of the cabins, hotel, clubhouse, the small community of Elkmont, and a few mountain farmsteads. When the community of Elkmont was created in ca. 1908, a cemetery was established. Located north of the Wonderland Hotel, it was the only cemetery in the area. In 1928, a new Elkmont Cemetery was dedicated adjacent to the Appalachian Club. The cemetery was given by Levi Owenby in memory of his wife (Interview by Phil Thomason of J. T. Higdon, Caretaker of the Appalachian Club, 19 October 1992).

The enthusiasm that led to the growth of the Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs was one of the forces behind the movement to create either a national forest or park in the Great Smokies as a means to manage or preserve the scenic and natural resources of the region. The movement started in Tennessee and later was embraced by supporters in North Carolina. Knoxville businessmen, along with the Chamber of Commerce and the Knoxville Automobile Club, launched the campaign. In 1923, the Great Smoky Mountains Conservation Association was formed. Initially, its concern was more with building roads than creating a park or forest preserve. In 1926, Congress passed a law authorizing the creation of several national parks in the Appalachians. Land would be acquired by the states involved. Eight years later, Congress authorized the establishment of Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and it was formally dedicated by President Roosevelt in 1940.

⁷ A film taken late in the 1920s shows life at the Appalachian Club (GRSM Archives, Film on Appalachian Club [ca. 1928]).

Considering the role that Tennessee politicians and businessmen had in promoting and opposing the establishment of the park, it is not surprising that major players on both sides were associated with the Elkmont communities. Governor Austin Peay, who spearheaded the purchase of the first large tract of land, was a member of the Wonderland Club. Mr. and Mrs. Willis P. Davis and Col. David Chapman were some of the organizers of the Conservation Association, along with J. Wylie Brownlee and attorneys Forrest Andrews and James B. Wright. Wright, who supported the establishment of a national forest, but not a national park, resigned from the Conservation Association and became one of the park movement's strongest foes.

Despite the role several members played in the Great Smoky Mountain Conservation Association, many in the Appalachian Club eventually opposed condemnation of land for the park, possibly when they discovered that their properties would be among those condemned. They retained James Wright to represent their interests. Faced with political opposition, particularly by members of the Appalachian Club, Congress in 1932 consented to a plan in which landowners could be offered long-term leases. As a result, Appalachian and Wonderland Club properties were acquired from the members for half the appraised value, plus a lifetime lease. Some cabin owners chose to sell their land for full value. At the Wonderland Club, some nine or ten cottages were acquired and demolished during the 1930s (Interview by Phil Thomason of Vernon and Helen Moore, 3 November 1992).

Leases also were offered to some long-term, full-time residents of the park area. However, restrictions on use of the natural resources, particularly wildlife and timber, and the loss of the rural communities that made life in the mountains viable presented major obstacles for them. Despite these restrictions, some mountain families remained in the Elkmont area until the 1950s.

With the creation of the National Park, commercial development ended at Elkmont. Development of Gatlinburg at the northern entry increased, although Elkmont retained some commercial activity. Park Superintendent J. Ross Eakin, in a letter to the Director of the National Park Service in 1934, noted that some of the lessees were subletting their cabins, and the Wonderland and Appalachian Clubs were entertaining paying guests and were in effect hotels (GRSM Archives, Chapman Files).

The community of Elkmont was gradually removed during the 1930s and 1940s. Many of the frame buildings were dismantled for their lumber. Others were moved. The Elkmont Baptist Church was moved to Wears Valley where it stands today as Valley View Church. A 1943 U.S. Geological Survey map shows only two buildings and the Elkmont School remaining on the site. The last class in the school was held that same year. A Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camp was established on the site in the late 1930s. The post office closed in 1950. In 1952, the National Park Service established a campground at Elkmont on the site of the community and the CCC camp, which destroyed the last remaining evidence of the town and the camp. However, the road system, which followed the same alignment of the Little River Railroad that historically tied the town and the Wonderland and Appalachian Clubs together, remains in use today.

The creation of the National Park preserved, perhaps inadvertently, a fragment of the architecture that was typical of the recreational use of the mountains in the four decades prior to the park's dedication in 1940. Restrictions on further commercial development or transfer of property and new construction after 1932 have preserved much of the

original character of the two club communities. Physical evidence of the railroad (except for the road system), the timber industry, and the town of Elkmont has disappeared. The buildings that made up the Appalachian Club and the Wonderland Club remain.

Historical Maps Showing Elkmont's Development

A series of late nineteenth through mid-twentieth century historical maps provides a useful picture of the development of Elkmont. In order to facilitate comparisons among the maps, a red triangle has been placed at the confluence of Jake's Creek and the Little River on each map.

The earliest detailed map, the 1892 1:125,000 scale Knoxville quadrangle (USGS 1892), shows Jake (sic) Creek and the Little River, but provides no cultural detail in the project area (Figure 3.2). The 1926 map of the Proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park (USGS 1926) is based on the same topographic information (Figure 3.3). That map depicts two structures on either side of Catron Branch at the north end of the Elkmont District, but does not show the extensive development that had occurred in the area by the 1920s. The earliest detailed topographic maps of Elkmont date to 1931 (Figures 3.4 and 3.5). These maps are based on 1927-1931 and 1928-1930, respectively, and show similar cultural detail. Both depict the logging development (including a church and a school) in the present-day campground area, along with the two concentrations of resort structures in the Wonderland and Appalachian Club areas. Two later USGS maps (Figures 3.6 and 3.7) depict the Elkmont area during the first 20 years of the park's existence. By 1942 there are only a few structures, including a school, in the former campground area; those structures had been removed by 1956.

PREVIOUS CULTURAL RESOURCE INVESTIGATIONS IN THE PROJECT VICINITY

The earliest known archaeological investigations at Elkmont apparently occurred in 1936, when George MacPherson, a Park employee who conducted archaeological reconnaissance in both Tennessee and North Carolina, discovered what he referred to as Locus 129 on the property. This site was later registered with the State of Tennessee as 40BT23, and has also been designated GRSM-2 by the NPS. (As discussed in Chapter 5, this number is in error, as the site is actually located in Sevier County). This site was also apparently referenced in Bass' (1975) summary of the archaeology of the GRSM region, in which he notes that the site had produced a "pitted cobble" but provides no other information.

The only subsequent work in the immediate Elkmont vicinity was carried out by NPS personnel in 1997 and 2001. In 1997 Vincent Birdsong of the Southeast Archaeological Center examined two small locations at Elkmont (the Elkmont Firing Range Privy Toilet and the Elkmont Campground Maintenance Shed) and documented that both areas had been disturbed (Birdsong 1997). In 2001, GRSM archaeologist Pei-Lin Yu (2001) carried out a surface reconnaissance of the Elkmont District as a part of the initial baseline studies for the present project. Yu examined only selected areas where visibility and terrain permitted, with no subsurface examination and no collection of artifacts noted on the surface. Yu identified six areas as having moderate to high probability for cultural materials. She reports relocating one previously recorded site (40BT23), seven other apparent site locations, a possible railroad grade bed and a well-preserved portion of an early historic period road. Due to the limited nature of the study, Yu did not register the sites with the State of Tennessee. Five of the seven sites are twentieth century domestic refuse scatters, while the other two are prehistoric lithic scatters. Yu concluded that given her findings, a more intensive archaeological investigation would be required prior to any ground disturbing activities at Elkmont.

In addition to the Elkmont work, a variety of cultural resource projects have been carried out in recent years in Sevier County and adjacent areas. The most notable of these is the recently completed data recovery project at Townsend, located on the edge of GRSM approximately 10 miles west of Elkmont in

Blount County. The work was undertaken in association with the improvement of a section of State Route 73 (U.S. 321) through Tuckaleechee Cove, a broad and relatively flat valley formed by the Little River and the location of the town of Townsend. The investigation is to date the largest archaeological project ever carried out in association with a Tennessee Department of Transportation project, and, as described on the official project web site, “is the most important archaeological project in East Tennessee in the past thirty years.” The Townsend project area was 7.9 km (4.9 miles) in length and the right-of-way width was 100 m (305 feet). The project included Phase I archaeological survey of the entire right of way, Phase II archaeological testing of five sites, and Phase III data recovery of four sites. An overview of the project is available on the internet at <http://ctr.utk.edu/arch/townsend.html>. As described in that overview, Tuckaleechee Cove’s “... flat bottomlands and terraces ... were utilized by Native Americans for camp sites and villages over thousands of years until the mid-1700s. The archaeological remains of these habitations ... included thousands of cooking and storage pits, dozens of dwellings, and palisaded or fortified village areas.” The primary components at the site were associated with Middle Woodland and historic Cherokee occupations, with secondary but still significant Early Woodland, Mississippian, and historic European components.

Other recent but much more limited transportation related archaeological investigations in Sevier County are represented by Pace (2001) and Creswell (1997). Creswell reported on a Phase I archaeological survey of proposed additions and changes to Parkway Road and State Route 66 within and to the north of the town of Sevierville. The survey discovered seven previously unrecorded sites, four which were exclusively prehistoric and three that contained both prehistoric and historic components. Creswell recommended three of the sites as potentially eligible for the NRHP.

Pace (2001) reported on a Phase I archaeological survey of proposed changes to Middle Creek Road, to the north-northeast of Sevierville. Of the twelve sites identified during the survey, Pace recommended three (all historic) as potentially eligible for the NRHP. Pace (2001) also provides a useful summary of archaeological research in Sevier County. In it, he focuses on the relationship between site locations and environmental setting, in particular landform. He notes “... a generally high concentration of prehistoric sites on the lower valley floors of the major tributaries in the Little Pigeon [River] system. As in other areas of the Appalachian highlands, this concentration is partially the result of the constraints imposed on settlement in the hilly surrounding terrain and partially the result of preference (proximity to water, to easily arable land, etc.)” (Pace 2001:19).

Finally, limited archaeological research also has been carried out in the Greenbriar area in connection with proposed improvements to US 321, including surveys by McElway (2001) and Yu (NPS 2001:21-22).

IV. METHODS

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The Tennessee Division of Archaeology's (TDOA) Archaeological Site Files were examined to identify previously recorded sites within the Elkmont Historic District and the surrounding vicinity. A search of TDOA's report library was made to locate significant archaeological projects done within the wider region surrounding the project area. Reports, articles, maps, and other materials on file at GRSM and TRC offices also were consulted. Finally, research was conducted at the Tennessee Historical Commission (THC) and at GRSM to gather data on the Elkmont Historic District.

A few of the structures within the Elkmont Historic District—the Elkmont Spur Road (the main entrance road), the Little River [Stone] Bridge, and several stone-faced culverts—are addressed in the Park Development Historic District. As the pending nomination for the districts states:

The Park Development Historic District within Great Smoky Mountains National Park is nationally significant under National Register criterion A for its associations with the expansion of the National Park System in the eastern United States in the 1930s. It is also significant for having been developed during President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal administration under national work relief, job training, and conservation programs such [as] the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Works Progress Administration. The district has additional significance under National Register criterion C for its design. The district represents an outstanding realization of the National Park Service's mature landscape design philosophy, which emphasized landscape harmonization, the careful shaping of the visitor's exposure to the park's natural wonders, and the consistent use of rustic, quarry-faced stone to visually link road structures and buildings (Blythe n.d.:8:1).

It should be noted that the nomination for the Park Development Historic District is currently in review by the THC and the North Carolina SHPO. The elements noted above (the Elkmont road, the Little River Stone Bridge, and the culverts) are within the boundary of the Elkmont Historic District and are discussed in that context—i.e., in conjunction with the Appalachian and Wonderland Club buildings—elsewhere in this document (see Chapter 6).

GEOMORPHOLOGICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODS

The goals of the geomorphological and archaeological investigations were to supplement the surface reconnaissance conducted by Yu (2001) and to evaluate the potential for various types of archaeological resources within and adjacent to the Elkmont Historic District. These data are intended to provide a basis for estimating the potential need for intensive archaeological survey resulting from the various proposed project alternatives. The geomorphic and archaeological fieldwork were carried out under the terms of Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) permit GRSM 02-002.

Field Methods

The geomorphological investigations were conducted by Dr. David Leigh of the University of Georgia Geography Department. The geomorphological field methods included pedestrian reconnaissance, subsurface analysis of soils and sediments using a three-inch diameter bucket auger, and observation of available stratigraphic outcrops. Soil profiles were described according to the standard terminology of the USDA Soil Survey Manual (Soil Survey Division Staff 1993) using moist Munsell colors.

The archaeological fieldwork included a pedestrian reconnaissance of the entire Elkmont Historic District, as well as subsurface survey (e.g., shovel testing) of selected locations. The shovel testing focused on a selected sample of the various landform types identified, and included additional assessment of prehistoric sites identified by Yu (2001) in her survey of Areas 2 and 5 on the property. Limited shovel testing was also conducted to determine the nature and depth of historic deposits in association with selected standing structures at Elkmont and with remnants of other structures noted during Yu's survey.

All shovel tests measured 30 cm in diameter, and the excavated soils were screened through ¼-inch (.64-cm) hardware mesh to ensure consistent artifact recovery. Upon completion of each shovel test, it was refilled and the ground's surface was returned, as nearly possible, to its original condition.

Given the limited nature of this project as a preliminary assessment based on reconnaissance level survey, none of the newly discovered sites were fully delineated in terms of horizontal extent, depth, and level of subsurface integrity and disturbance.

Artifact Analysis and Curation

All cultural materials recovered during the survey were transported to TRC's Durham office for processing, analysis, and temporary curation. Artifacts were analyzed according to regionally appropriate typologies, which generally followed those set forth in the SEAC Lexicon. Lithic artifacts were first sorted into a number of general categories, including chipped stone tools, chipped stone debitage, fire-cracked rock, and unmodified rock. The single chipped stone tool recovered was described by general type and assigned a type name based on those developed and used by previous regional researchers (e.g. Coe 1964; Keel 1976). Twelve metric attributes were measured for this projectile point using precision calipers and scales: maximum length, maximum width, maximum thickness, shoulder width, blade length, haft length, maximum blade width at the midpoint, distal haft element width, proximal haft element width, maximum thickness at the distal haft, basal concavity depth, and weight. The results are presented with the appropriate site description.

Chipped stone debitage was analyzed in accordance with a four-part scheme developed by Sullivan and Rozen (1985), in which artifacts are classified as complete flakes, broken flakes, flake fragments, or shatter. Raw material was also recorded for each debitage fragment. Individual debitage fragments were not weighted, but each distinctive lot (e.g. primary quartz flakes) from each provenience was weighed.

No prehistoric ceramic artifacts were recovered during the survey. The small quantity of historic artifacts recovered were described by material type and function.

At the completion of the Elkmont projects, all artifacts will be labeled and boxed in acid-free boxes following NPS and SEAC procedures, as outlined in the SEAC *Guidelines for Cataloging Archeological Objects*, and in accordance with 36 CRF 79.

ARCHITECTURAL AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPE SURVEY METHODS

Field Methods

Before entering the field, TRC developed a two-page field checklist form to help guide the survey. Since the initial survey work had already been done in 1993, the checklist form did not attempt to cover every topic but instead contained spaces for new or updated information only. For each building or structure, the second page of the checklist form contained the physical description text from the 1993 survey and a copy of the draft Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) plan for that property as prepared by GRSM. Once in the field, the surveyor compared the 1993 information with the present resource and noted any changes.

Information on integrity and condition also was collected. The landscape at each property was surveyed at the same time and the information cross-referenced with the draft CLI plans. Landscape features within the district but not associated with a particular building or structure also were identified and assessed. Black-and-white and color 35mm prints were taken of all buildings and structures and of many of the identified cultural landscape features.

The fieldwork also involved an evaluation of the buildings' current physical condition, consisting of both exterior and interior inspection. Steve Gaddis of Michael Hining Architects, a historical architect on the TRC team, conducted the evaluation. He was assisted in the field by Todd Cleveland of TRC and Tim House of T N & Associates. Due to constraints imposed by the presence of hantavirus in a number of the buildings (see below), and because many of the noncontributing buildings are the most structurally deficient (and certainly they have not improved in this area since the early 1990s), only those buildings contributing to the district were assessed as part of the physical condition evaluation. The physical condition evaluation included an assessment of each building for possible reuse. The evaluated components included the structure, the weather-tightness of the skin, potentials for accessibility, and the condition of the infrastructure (i.e., the electrical wiring and devices, the plumbing system and fixtures, and the kitchen).

Prior to the initiation of the architectural fieldwork, hantavirus was discovered in a number of the cabins. Hantavirus can affect the human respiratory system, primarily through "breathing infected rodent excreta particles that have become airborne or ingesting excreta particles that cling to hands or clothing" (T N & Associates 2002b:7). To guard against exposure to the virus, team members followed a strict health and safety protocol, including establishment of exclusion and control zones and contamination reduction corridors; wearing of personal protective equipment (PPE), such as full face respirators, Tyvek™ clothing, and latex gloves; strict adherence to decontamination procedures upon exiting the buildings; and medical evaluations prior to and following the fieldwork (T N & Associates 2002b:10–12). This protocol allowed safe access to the interiors of the cabins. As mentioned above, time, cost, and safety constraints imposed by the need to follow the protocol limited the physical condition evaluation to the contributing buildings. The realization also was that the noncontributing buildings, due to their generally deficient structural condition, would not become contributing buildings simply because of careful interior evaluation. Moreover, exterior analysis could often tell as much about overall physical condition as interior evaluation. Should full information on the physical condition of the noncontributing buildings be needed later in the process, however, as many of the buildings as necessary will be evaluated (along with five contributing cabins not assessed due to lack of access), likely as part of the analysis of alternatives.

NRHP Eligibility Criteria

According to 36 CFR 60.4, cultural resources that are eligible for the NRHP include buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts that retain integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and also meet one or more of the criteria outlined below. Criterion D is most often (but not exclusively) associated with archaeological resources.

- *Criterion A (Event)*. Association with one or more events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of national, state, or local history.
- *Criterion B (Person)*. Association with the lives of persons significant in the past.
- *Criterion C (Design/Construction)*. Embodiment of distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; or representation of the work of a master; or possession of high artistic values; or representation of a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- *Criterion D (Information Potential)*. Properties that yield (or are likely to yield) information important in prehistory or history.

Rationale for Determining Buildings and Structures Contributing or Noncontributing

The Elkmont Historic District NRHP nomination (Thomason et al. 1993) was prepared during the spring and summer of 1993 and was based on survey work undertaken in late 1992 and early 1993 (Thomason 1993). Throughout the rest of 1993 and into early 1994, intensive consultation and negotiation took place among GRSM, the Southeast Regional Office of the NPS, the Keeper of the NRHP, and the THC to arrive at consensus on the contributing/noncontributing status of the buildings and structures within the district. The district was listed on the NRHP on March 22, 1994. On March 28, the Keeper signed off on a Supplementary Listing Record, which had been coordinated beforehand with the Southeast Regional Office and the THC. The Supplementary Listing Record amended the nomination by changing the contributing/noncontributing status of 11 cabins (six to contributing and five to noncontributing) and by declaring another five buildings and four structures noncontributing.

The Elkmont Historic District is significant under NRHP Criteria A (event) and C (design/construction). The buildings, structures, and aboveground sites within the district were determined by the agencies to either contribute or not contribute to the district's significance. Because nearly all of the resources have an association with the historic events that made the district significant, the deciding factor in assessing contributing or noncontributing status was the degree to which the resources retained the historic physical appearance they exhibited during the district's period of significance (1908–1940). Alterations that were inconspicuous or, if conspicuous, did not compromise the character of a resource were considered insufficient grounds for determining the resource noncontributing. The same line of thinking applied to those resources where less than full structural integrity had been retained. Major and/or conspicuous alterations, loss of structural integrity, and recent age, however, were deemed sufficient grounds for finding a resource noncontributing.

With the exception of three cabins, whose leases expired in 2001, the buildings and structures in the district have remained vacant and unused since 1992. For this reason, no alterations have been made to the buildings and structures since the district was negotiated and listed. (Stabilization measures have been implemented at the Wonderland Hotel, the Appalachian Clubhouse, the Sneed Cabin [No. 1], and a few of the other cabins [minor work only], but these measures were carried out in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* and are not considered "alterations.") Thus, no manmade changes have occurred that would move a contributing building or structure to the noncontributing category. In only one instance, that of the Murphy Cabin garage, has there been sufficient *natural* damage and deterioration since 1993–1994 to recommend a change in status from contributing to noncontributing. With the level of alteration, then, consistent with that observed at the time the district was intensely negotiated and listed, it has been reasoned that the agencies' determinations remain both sound and applicable and should not be overturned unless the physical condition of the buildings and structures deteriorated sufficiently in the intervening years. It fell to the TRC team to investigate the current physical condition of the resources to see if the condition factor might trigger a change in contributing/noncontributing status.

The findings of the physical condition evaluation have shown that most of the contributing buildings remain in fair to good condition. In the case of the few contributing buildings that the evaluation has determined to be in poor condition, it has been found that the deterioration tends to be concentrated in later additions (mostly at the rear of the buildings). Moreover, the lack of major alterations and the retention of overall character at these buildings have served to override the findings of poor structural condition/integrity, thereby allowing the buildings to remain contributing to the district.

The decisions regarding contributing/noncontributing status were made on the basis of factors such as level of alteration, retention of historic character/appearance, location of alterations (i.e., the front of the building versus the rear), structural condition/integrity, and even age. It should be noted that even within

the category of contributing, a sliding scale of contributing status was possible, depending on the amount and location of alterations and the level of structural integrity observed. Refer to Table 1.1 in Chapter 1 for a listing of the reasons used to find specific resources contributing.

For the buildings in the district, the decision to find a building contributing was based on the following:

- Few, if any, alterations and retention of structural integrity. This applies to the Murphy Cabin alone. By “retention of structural integrity,” it is meant that the physical condition evaluation resulted in a determination of fair or good condition.
- Minor alterations and retention of structural integrity. This applies to over one-fourth of the contributing resources. By “minor,” it is meant that the alterations do not compromise the overall historic character and appearance of a resource. Again, by “retention of structural integrity,” it is meant that the physical condition evaluation resulted in a determination of fair or good condition.
- Minor or inconspicuous alterations and retention of structural integrity. This applies to over one-half of the contributing resources. By “inconspicuous,” it is meant that the alterations (usually additions) are either small in size if located at the front or side, or if large in size are located at the rear and out of sight (when viewed from the front).
- Minor alterations and retention of sufficient structural integrity. This applies to the Faust Cabin garage alone. By “sufficient,” it is meant that though the physical condition evaluation resulted in a determination of poor condition, the lack of major alterations and the retention of overall character serve to override the finding of poor structural condition/integrity, thus allowing the building to remain contributing to the district.
- Minor or inconspicuous alterations and retention of sufficient structural integrity. This applies to approximately one-sixth of the contributing resources. Again, by “sufficient,” it is meant that though the physical condition evaluation resulted in a determination of poor condition, the lack of major alterations and the retention of overall character serve to override the finding of poor structural condition/integrity, thus allowing a building to remain contributing to the district. Moreover, in the case of these resources, the evaluation found that the deterioration tends to be concentrated in later additions, mostly located at the rear of the buildings.

For the structures and aboveground sites in the district, the decision to find a structure or aboveground site contributing was based on the following:

- No apparent alterations and retention of structural integrity. This applies to the Little River Stone Bridge. An assessment by T N & Associates has found the bridge to be “in fair to good overall condition” (T N & Associates 2002a:8).
- No apparent alterations and retention of integrity. This applies to the Old and New Elkmont Cemeteries. Integrity here refers not to structural integrity but to the ability of the resource to still communicate its historic character and appearance.
- Minor alterations and retention of structural integrity. This refers to the Bearwallow Creek Bridge. The minor alterations consist of two missing lamps. Because it is a small footbridge, a structural condition assessment of the bridge was not undertaken. However, physical observation indicates that the bridge is in fair to good condition overall.

- Retention of sufficient integrity to communicate historic use and design. This refers to the Little River Swimming Hole. While most of the dam has been dismantled over time, the general outline of the swimming hole remains visible, and a nearby CCC walkway that accessed the swimming hole is still mostly intact. Thus, it is felt that the resource is still able to communicate its historic character and appearance.

The decision to find a building, structure, or aboveground site noncontributing to the district was based on the following factors, as expressed in the nomination and the Supplementary Listing Record (Thomason et al. 1993):

- Major and/or conspicuous alterations. This applies to the majority of the noncontributing resources. Such alterations are extensive enough, large enough, and/or prominent enough to have compromised the historic character and appearance of the resources.
- Loss of structural integrity. This applies to a few of the noncontributing resources and means that a resource is in poor or even failed structural condition.
- Not strong enough link to historical/architectural themes of district (NRHP Criteria A, C). This applies to the pre-GRSM water tanks and pump house. Although these structures evidence no apparent alterations, it is felt that as utilitarian support structures their link to the historical and architectural themes of the district is not strong enough to qualify them as contributing resources.
- Recent age. This applies to a few of the noncontributing resources and means that a resource is less than 50 years of age. The 50-year threshold is generally used in the NRHP process to demarcate resources where there has not yet been sufficient historical perspective to make informed decisions regarding significance.
- Relocation from original site. This applies to Bridge 76, a former railroad bridge that was moved from its original site on the Little River Railroad west of Elkmont to its current location near the northwest edge of the district. Relocation of a resource results in the loss of its historic context and feeling. In addition, the bridge has undergone major, conspicuous alterations—including conversion from railroad to automobile use—and it has lost its structural integrity.

V. GEOMORPHIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESULTS

GEOMORPHIC RESULTS

The geomorphic reconnaissance of the Elkmont tract was conducted to identify the major landforms present and their potential to contain buried archaeological deposits or artifacts. Five principal landforms were identified, including: (1) the floodplain; (2) a low terrace; (3) high terrace remnants; (4) alluvial/colluvial hillslope deposits; and (5) rocky upland slopes. The locations of these landforms and the auger tests are shown in Figure 5.1, and the profile descriptions and data from these tests are provided in Table 5.1. Each landform type is discussed below in terms of its sedimentation history and potential for containing buried archaeological materials.

Floodplain

The floodplain is the alluvial land surface that is being constructed by the modern regime of Little River and its tributaries, and is the first distinct alluvial surface moving up from the river and stream channels. The top elevation of this surface ranges from about 0.5 to 2.0 meters above the baseflow water level of Little River and its tributaries. The floodplain tends to be a narrow corridor of land, which indicates that the river and streams have not been graded to this elevation for a very long period of time. The floodplain probably receives new sediment (historical in age) during relatively frequent overbank flood events (every 0.5-5.0 year recurrence interval). The youngest parts of this surface consist of imbricated boulders and cobbles (Figure 5.2), whereas the older parts have a drape of sand and silt that is typically less than 50 cm thick over the cobbles. No auger holes were drilled into the floodplain deposits, but observations were made from cutbanks along the active channel.

This surface offers relatively low potential for deeply buried prehistoric artifacts, because (1) it typically exhibits only a shallow veneer (< 50 cm) of vertical accretion sediment on top of bedload gravels and cobbles, and (2) it is very clearly a young (probably <300 years old) geomorphic surface. It is probable that the floodplain is only hundreds of years old at the most, based on the soil profile development. However, the floodplain deposits could contain historic period artifacts, especially in the fine-grained (sandy and silty) top strata of this unit where such materials would be found in-situ. In contrast, any artifacts in the coarse-grained (gravel, cobbles, boulders) bottom strata of this unit have probably been reworked by transport during floods.

Low Terrace

The low terrace is the first widespread alluvial surface with increasing elevation above the floodplain (Figure 5.3). The average top elevation is at about 1.5 to 3.0 m above the baseflow water level, but can be as high as 4.0 m. There is considerable topographic relief on this surface as boulder bars and intervening swales are common. This is the most extensive alluvial surface in the valley at Elkmont. Some relatively low swales on this surface probably are the only portions of this landform that have received overbank flood sediment during historical time. This surface exhibits many very large boulders (some in excess of 2.0 m in diameter), indicating that debris flows were an important sediment source for the alluvium and that larger-than-modern floods were probably responsible for sedimentation of this surface.

Auger holes 2, 3, 9, 11, and 13 were drilled into the low terrace. Each hole exhibited a silty to sandy drape of sediment less than 1.0 m thick that overlies cobbles and boulders; in some places cobbles and boulders

Note: Certain information (i.e., site locations, maps, etc.) contained within this page were excluded from this report under exemptions found within the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 [43 CFR 7.18–Confidentiality of archaeological resource information].

are at the surface and completely lack a fine-grained drape (Figure 5.4). The soils observed on the low terrace are typified by an A-Bw-2C horizon sequence and lack any evidence of argillic horizon (Bt) development. The 2C horizon is the cobble/boulder zone. The Bw horizon is typically yellowish brown (10YR 4/4 to 10YR 5/5) in color and has a sandy loam to silt loam texture. These traits indicate that the low terrace probably is Holocene in age. In fact, this surface exhibits characteristics that correlate closely to those of the first terrace at the confluence of Raven Fork and the Oconaluftee Rivers on the east side of GRSM, which has been dated to 3,000 to 8,000 calendar years old (Leigh 2002).

The low terrace surface offers high potential for buried artifacts, because it probably is Holocene in age and there is up to about 1.0 meter of fine-grained alluvium that has accreted on top of the streambed cobbles during this time. It is conceivable that in-situ prehistoric artifacts could be found in the fine sediments atop the cobbles at depths of up to about 1.0 m, but this is within the reach of shovel testing. In the event that portions of this landform are to be impacted by the selected alternatives, it is recommended that shovel tests be excavated to the level of bedload cobble and gravel to fully explore this landform for deeply buried artifacts. While it is possible that prehistoric artifacts could be contained in the substrate of cobble and boulders, any such artifacts would be reworked and not in-situ.

High Terrace Remnants

Small remnants of high terraces occur sporadically throughout the project area. The available outcrops exposing this unit indicated a much greater degree of soil weathering than was seen in the low terrace, with 7.5YR hues and argillic (Bt) horizons.

These high terrace remnants represent a much higher elevation of the stream base level in the past. All available evidence (profile weathering and stratigraphic relation to the low terrace) suggests that this surface is Pleistocene in age. Therefore, there is virtually no potential for archeological materials to be found within this deposit.

Alluvial/Colluvial Hillslope Deposits

Alluvial/colluvial hillslope deposits are aprons of colluvium and alluvium along the sides of the valleys that have been transported from the uplands and redeposited in the lower backslope, footslope, and toeslope positions (Figure 5.5). Many of the hillslope deposits occur as lobes of sediment that debouch from small first and second order tributaries upon entry to the main valley of Little River and Jakes Creek. The thickness of the hillslope deposits is not well known, because cobbles and boulders were always encountered in auger holes, which restricted the depth of analysis within this unit. Auger holes 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 12 were drilled into hillslope deposits.

The soil profiles observed in the hillslope deposits typically consist of A-Bw-2C profiles. The A and Bw horizons have a combined thickness of about 0.5-1.0 m and are silt loam deposits that overlie gravel or cobbles of the 2C horizon. The Bw horizon typically exhibits a yellowish brown (10YR 5/5) color and appears to be temporally equivalent to the soil on the low terrace. Indeed the hillslope deposits interfinger with the low terrace deposits so that there is no clear boundary between the two units at many localities. These hillslope deposits are essentially identical to the Holocene hillslope sediments that were radiocarbon dated as part of the geomorphic investigations of the Ravensford Tract in the Oconaluftee drainage (Leigh 2002). Unlike the valley at Ravensford, an older phase (Pleistocene) of hillslope deposition was not identified at Elkmont, and it appeared that the majority of these deposits are Holocene in age. A buried A horizon was found in one auger hole (#4), indicating that the youngest of these

Note: Certain information (i.e., site locations, maps, etc.) contained within this page were excluded from this report under exemptions found within the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 [43 CFR 7.18–Confidentiality of archaeological resource information].

deposits is historical in age (Figure 5.6). Also, it is apparent that some of the older Holocene hillslope sediments have been somewhat dissected and appear as low spurs of footslope deposits protruding into the valley in some localities (i.e. near holes 4, 5, 6).

The alluvial/colluvial hillslope deposits offer extremely high potential for deeply buried artifacts in the project area. These types of deposits constitute an ideal setting for deeply buried and stratified archeological sites, and Early and Middle Archaic artifacts were encountered in similar hillslope deposits at the Ravensford Tract (Webb 2002) at depths of up to 1.3 m below surface. Shovel testing is inadequate for surveying this unit due to the thickness of the deposits and because impenetrable cobbles (from landslides and debris flows) will typically stop the shovel hole before it can be dug very deep. It is quite possible that artifacts from the earliest Americans (circa 12,000 years old) could occur deeply (i.e. 3-4 m deep) within these deposits. These hillslope deposits should be considered as areas that cannot be adequately surveyed by standard shovel testing, and they should receive deep testing if they are to be affected by project alternatives.

Uplands

The rocky uplands slopes are the hillslopes that consist of bedrock and saprolite with a thin veneer of colluvium. There is virtually no potential for deeply buried artifacts in this zone. Much of this sediment is rather coarse, consisting of angular cobbles and gravel. Furthermore, the slope angle of this unit is typically too steep to be considered for a human habitation site.

Geomorphological Study Conclusions

Five landform types were identified in the project area, including: (1) the floodplain; (2) a low terrace; (3) high terrace remnants; (4) alluvial/colluvial hillslope deposits; and (5) rocky upland slopes. This geomorphic setting is similar to that of the Ravensford Land Exchange Tract (Leigh 2002), which was extensively studied and radiocarbon dated. The main similarity is the existence of relatively young (Holocene) hillslope deposits that interfinger with a low terrace. The correlative hillslope and terrace deposits at Ravensford have been extremely well dated to the Holocene, and it is reasonable to assume a similar age for the hillslope and low terrace deposits at Elkmont due to similarities in stratigraphic and pedogenic characteristics. The main difference between Elkmont and Ravensford is that the narrower and steeper Elkmont locality represents a higher-energy setting for fluvial sedimentation, exemplified by very large boulders in the terrace deposits at Elkmont.

The alluvial/colluvial hillslope deposits deserve the highest priority in terms of potential for deeply buried artifacts, as they appear to be of Holocene age and cannot be adequately tested by standard shovel testing methods. The low terrace also appears to be of Holocene age, but it can be adequately tested by shovel testing, as the fine-grained upper stratum typically is within the reach of shovel testing, and the coarse substrate in this unit is not likely to contain in-situ artifacts. The floodplain has potential to contain in-situ historical artifacts, but again, it can be adequately shovel tested. The high terrace remnants and rocky upland slopes offer virtually no potential for containing deeply buried artifacts but could be covered by hillslope deposits in some places.

Note: Certain information (i.e., site locations, maps, etc.) contained within this page and the following 12 pages were excluded from this report under exemptions found within the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 [43 CFR 7.18–Confidentiality of archaeological resource information].

Two shovel tests on the landform occupied by the site turned up a scatter of quartz debitage and the basal portion of a Morrow Mountain (Middle Archaic) projectile point (Tables 5.8–5.9, Figure 5.20). This artifact was recovered from ST 38. That test encountered a 15-cm thick A horizon that overlay a 25 cm thick yellowish brown Bt horizon. The projectile point was recovered from 30 cmbs within the Bt horizon, and both shovel tests produced artifacts to the base of the Bt horizon.

Isolated Find 1

Isolated Find #1 is located at a standing house in the northern part of Elkmont, south of the road to the Old Elkmont Cemetery (see Figure 5.8). The find consists of a small collection of artifacts recovered from a single shovel test pit, including a single quartz flake and four fragments of twentieth century glass. Two additional tests nearby produced no archaeological materials. The recovered artifacts do not meet the minimum requirements of the Tennessee DOA for registration as an archaeological site, but it is possible that additional investigations at this location might produce additional material.

OTHER RECORDED SITES AND POTENTIAL SITES AT ELKMONT

In addition to these recorded sites, several specific locations at Elkmont have been noted as potential sites by previous researchers or former residents, and one (40BT23) has been registered with the Tennessee DOA. Summary data on those locations is provided in Table 5.10. The situation regarding 40BT23 is particularly confusing. As noted in Chapter 3, this site was recorded in 1936 by George MacPherson, a GRSM employee. Although the site was registered with the state as 40BT23, that number is clearly in error, as the site is actually located in Sevier County. Little is known about this site, which is described only as an Archaic campsite on the site form. The site also was referenced in Bass' (1975) summary of the archaeology of the GRSM region, in which he notes that the site had produced a "pitted cobble" but provides no other information. Yu (2001) reported observing white quartz debitage at this location during a reconnaissance survey, but TRC did not recover materials at this location during the present reconnaissance.

Yu (2001) also identified six other apparent site locations at Elkmont, including one prehistoric lithic scatter and five twentieth century domestic refuse scatters associated with residential sites. TRC relocated the second lithic scatter (Yu's Site 11), which has been registered as 40SV122. Due to the preliminary nature of the present reconnaissance, the historic scatters were not reexamined or collected. Many of these scatters may contain artifacts of sufficient age to meet state and NPS requirements for site registration, but that supposition will need to be checked through additional fieldwork.

The other reported site locations at Elkmont include two areas which former residents used to collect artifacts (and which were reported to TRC after the reconnaissance was complete), as well the concrete base of a former smokestack, which is located in the Elkmont Campground (Schmidt and Hooks 1994:63). These locations were not revisited by TRC.

The documented and reported sites at Elkmont undoubtedly represent only some of the locations from which prehistoric or historic materials would be recovered by an intensive, close-order subsurface survey. Additional prehistoric sites (including buried deposits) are certainly present, and numerous historic period features and artifact distributions resulting from the lumber and resort eras at Elkmont remain to be documented. Although these locations and significance of these potential sites can only be positively determined through fieldwork, some statements about the archaeological potential of various portions of the Elkmont District can be made based on the available archaeological, geomorphic, and historic period data.

The following maps represent an initial attempt to identify low, medium, and high potential areas for archaeological resources at Elkmont. Figure 5.21 illustrates likely locations for significant prehistoric Native American remains and is based on the geomorphic reconnaissance, the available archaeological data, and observations by Yu (2001) and TRC. This map includes all of the low terrace and alluvial/colluvial landforms identified in the geomorphic reconnaissance, as all portions of those environments offer the potential to contain significant resources. Much of the evidence for these occupations may have been destroyed by historic period activities, but this cannot be determined without additional data.

Figure 5.22 illustrates high probability areas for logging-era resources and is based on historic maps and photographs (including those presented by Schmidt and Hooks (1994:79) and on observations by Yu (2001) and TRC. (No map has been prepared for pre-logging era resources due to the lack of data). This map delimits the era of the principal logging occupation, including the present campground area. There is potential for significant logging-era remains across this entire area, although some areas have likely been disturbed by later NPS and resort-era private development.

Finally, Figure 5.23 illustrates high probability areas for archaeological features and deposits associated with the resort-era and is based on historic and current maps. Although some of these latter resources (i.e., those associated with the more recent use of the area) are unlikely to represent contributing resources to the Elkmont District, it may be necessary to document and evaluate such features and deposits as part of various project alternatives.

Note: Certain information (i.e., site locations, maps, etc.) contained within this page and the following two pages were excluded from this report under exemptions found within the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 [43 CFR 7.18–Confidentiality of archaeological resource information].

VI. HISTORIC STRUCTURE AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPE RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

The Elkmont Historic District NRHP nomination was prepared during the spring and summer of 1993 and was based on survey work begun in late 1992. Throughout the rest of 1993 and into early 1994, intensive consultation and negotiation took place among GRSM, the Southeast Regional Office of the NPS, the Keeper of the NRHP, and the THC to arrive at consensus on the contributing/noncontributing status of the buildings and structures within the district. The district was listed on the NRHP on March 22, 1994. On March 28, the Keeper signed off on a Supplementary Listing Record, which had been coordinated beforehand with the Southeast Regional Office and the THC. The Supplementary Listing Record amended the nomination by changing the contributing/noncontributing status of 11 cabins (six to contributing and five to noncontributing) and by declaring another five buildings and four structures noncontributing. Copies of the nomination and the Supplementary Listing Record are presented in Appendix 1.

The Elkmont Historic District was listed on the NRHP because it was found to be significant under NRHP Criteria A and C (see Chapter 4). As Thomason et al. (1993:8:1–4) notes:

The Elkmont Historic District meets National Register eligibility under Criteria A and C for its architectural and historical significance. The district is significant under Criterion A as the only remaining collection of early-twentieth-century resort cabins retaining integrity in the Appalachian Mountains of Tennessee. The district is significant under Criterion C as representative of the rustic or vernacular architecture of the early twentieth century. The district's period of significance extends from 1910⁸, when the Appalachian Club was formed, to 1940, when the last cabin was constructed.

Criterion A – Entertainment and Recreation

Elkmont is significant under Criterion A in the area of entertainment/recreation. Elkmont was formed during the outdoor recreation movement of the early twentieth century. This movement stressed a return to nature and resulted in the construction of hotels and mountain camps throughout America. The universal enthusiasm of Americans for the “back to nature movement” could be seen in the vast expansion of the national park and forest system under presidents Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft; the popularity of outdoor adventure stories; the creation of the Boy Scouts in 1910 and the Campfire Girls in 1912; and the vogue of birdwatching and sportsman's clubs (Clark 1986:180). In the Southern Appalachians, this renewed interest in outdoor life led to the construction of numerous hotels and mountain cottages.

The Little River Lumber Company of Sevier County, Tennessee, realized the possibilities of such mountain camps for its property. In 1910 and 1911, it deeded land for two private developments, the Appalachian Club and Wonderland Park. Summer cabins were soon built at both locations, primarily for Knoxville businessmen and their families. The formerly inaccessible location deep in the mountains was a major attraction for the well-to-do Eastern Tennesseans who built summer homes at Elkmont. Although earlier resorts

⁸ TRC note: The district's period of significance actually begins in 1908.

in Sevier County, such as Glen Alpine and Henderson Springs, attracted prominent Knoxville families, Elkmont is probably unique in its permanent, long-time association with individuals prominent in the business, professional, social, and civic life of East Tennessee.

Elkmont has both local and state significance. Not only is this resource unique in Sevier County, but also no similar collection of early-twentieth-century cabins and mountain hotels is known to exist in the Appalachian Mountains of East Tennessee (Interview by Phil Thomason of Steve Rogers and Claudette Stager, Tennessee Historical Commission, 18 December 1992). Other summer resort complexes in the vicinity, such as Line Springs and Dupont Springs, have been razed, and the resort cabins at Kinzel Springs in Blount County have been modified and no longer retain integrity (“Historical and Architectural Resources of Blount County, Tennessee” 1989). The creation of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the 1930s largely halted construction at Elkmont, resulting in few changes to its pre-1940 appearance.

The buildings and structures at Elkmont are especially notable for their survival to the present day. Tourist facilities are particularly vulnerable to the pressures of remodeling and rebuilding. With the creation of the National Park, tourist visitation to the area increased many fold, especially on the Tennessee side of the mountains. The Great Smoky Mountains National Park is the most visited national park in the country. This has brought considerable pressure for new development, particularly in the Gatlinburg area. Immediately outside the boundaries of the Park on the Tennessee side, no similar hotels or summer colonies survive intact from the early twentieth century.

The buildings at Elkmont also are unique in terms of the extant structures now within the boundaries of the National Park. At the time of the creation of the National Park, the architecture of the Great Smoky Mountains included early-twentieth-century timber camps and structures associated with timber-related industries (much of it vertical plank, “boxed” construction); nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century agricultural complexes and communities (log, frame, and “boxed” construction); and early-twentieth-century structures associated with tourism and recreational use of the mountains (mostly frame construction). On the Tennessee side of Great Smoky Mountains National Park, most of the latter type of structures were located in the area of Elkmont, though elsewhere in the park some families with large homes did take in borders that visited the area.

With its emphasis on the preservation of the natural environment in parks such as Great Smokies, the National Park Service in the past tended to treat the cultural landscape as an intrusion, and few buildings were preserved. Great Smoky Mountains National Park was somewhat unique in its early official policy of preserving mountain culture and its buildings and structures. During the 1930s and early 1940s, structures within the park were documented and photographed, and plans were made to preserve certain structures. Many structures, however, were demolished or burned. Preservation was quite selective, favoring nineteenth-century dwellings and agricultural structures (especially those built of log).

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Great Smoky Mountains were transformed by logging and tourism. Architectural evidence of this transformation has all but disappeared, except for a few early-twentieth-century frame dwellings that may have been used as boarding houses, such as the Caldwell House in Cataloochee, North Carolina. The structures at Elkmont were preserved, not because of the

recognition of their significance, but because lifetime leases were granted to the cabin holders. The Voorheis complex, built by a well-to-do Ohio businessman near Gatlinburg, is the only other summer home surviving on the Tennessee side of the Park.

Criterion C – Architecture

The building forms and plans of the cabins at Elkmont are typical of rural building traditions in the Tennessee mountains. House forms include Gabled Ell, Pyramid Square, Single or Double Pen, and Rectangular. The larger buildings—the Wonderland Hotel and Annex and the Appalachian Clubhouse—are typical of vernacular hotel or social halls of the period. There is evidence, however, of Craftsman or Craftsman-influenced design in some of the cabins. The builders of the cabins at Wonderland and Appalachian Club used materials that were most available, such as river, or cobble, stone and locally milled weatherboard, board and batten, and drop siding. Most of the buildings are of balloon frame construction, representing the availability of sawn lumber. The few log buildings were either moved to the area or represent original designs. Some of the log cabins have frame additions. The mixture of stock window and door elements also is common for building construction of the period.

All the buildings, from the smallest cabin to the hotel, reflected simplicity of form and function. In addition, they conveyed an impression of shelter, safety, and comfort. The front porches tied the buildings directly to the surrounding environment. Natural materials, including fieldstone piers and cobblestone in chimneys and fireplaces, as well as wood exterior walls, tended to blend with the area and required little maintenance in most cases.

The use of natural materials readily found in the immediate area also was expressed in the landscape elements at Elkmont. Cobblestone was used not only for fireplaces and chimneys but also for walls dividing property from the road or to mark property lines, as retaining walls and gates, and in decks or patios.

The focal point of the Wonderland Club development was the hotel, built in two stages in 1912 and 1928. The Wonderland Hotel is typical of the type of hotels built in the southern Appalachian Mountains during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when railroads, such as the Little River Railroad, made the mountains accessible to tourists or individuals with cabins in close proximity to the hotel. The Wonderland Hotel and the adjacent Annex (built in 1920) were constructed in this vernacular tradition. They are of frame construction with hipped roofs and weatherboard siding. The hotel has a porch that wraps around three sides of the building, while the annex has two small porches adjacent to the social room. Both buildings have chimneys and fireplaces. The hotel chimney is of brick rather than stone.

The Wonderland Hotel was unique. Unlike other resort hotels on commercial rail lines or roads, it was located deep within the mountains in an area accessible only by a logging train that also was used as an excursion train for tourists. As a result, it became a popular tourist destination. No similar hotel was located within the boundaries of Great Smoky Mountains National Park. As a result, Elkmont was the center of tourist activity on the Tennessee side of the park.

Similar in style to the Wonderland Hotel and Annex, the original Appalachian Clubhouse served more as a social center for the residents of the cabins that lined Jakes Creek Road

than as a destination for tourists. The original clubhouse burned and was replaced in 1934. The present building has a large porch on the front and cobblestone chimneys and fireplaces at each end of the large social room.

AVENT CABIN

Although discussed in the Thomason survey report and in the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason 1993; Thomason et al. 1993), the Avent Cabin is not located within the district. The Avent Cabin, more specifically known as the Mayna Treanor Avent Studio (Avent Cabin), was listed individually on the NRHP on February 7, 1994. The cabin is located some 900 to 1,000 feet outside the boundary of the Elkmont Historic District. The district nomination states that the Avent Cabin “is the subject of a separate nomination” and also says “it was never considered part of the Appalachian Club complex” (Thomason et al. 1993:7:19). This is certainly borne out by the Avent nomination itself, which focuses on the life of Mayna Treanor Avent and the architecture of the cabin, but never once mentions the Appalachian or Wonderland Clubs (Harnsberger 1993). For these reasons, the Avent Cabin has not been included in the current study.

PRELIMINARY CONDITION ASSESSMENT

A preliminary assessment of the current condition of the buildings was undertaken by Steve Gaddis, a historical architect on the TRC team. Due to constraints imposed by the presence of the hantavirus (see Chapter 4), and because many of the noncontributing buildings are the most structurally deficient, only those buildings contributing to the Elkmont Historic District were assessed. Five contributing cabins were not evaluated due to lack of access.⁹ These five and as many of the noncontributing buildings as necessary will be assessed at a later date if information on their condition is needed as part of the analysis of alternatives. The following is a general statement on the current physical condition of the contributing buildings within the district, including the Appalachian Clubhouse and the Wonderland Hotel and Annex. Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations forms for each building are included in Appendix 2.

General Notes on the Condition of Buildings at Elkmont

The team approached the assessment of the buildings at Elkmont with two purposes in mind. The first was to determine the existing physical condition of the buildings. The second was to evaluate each building for possible reuse. The components that were evaluated included the structure, the weather-tightness of the skin, potentials for accessibility, and the condition of the infrastructure—electrical wiring and devices, the plumbing system and fixtures, and the kitchen.

Based on the results of the assessment of physical condition and the work necessary for reuse of the buildings, the team tried to establish a value for the work that would need to be performed to make the buildings reusable. Three categories were established: low, moderate, and high. A low cost of renovation would be less than half the cost of totally rehabilitating the building. Moderate indicates renovation costs roughly half the cost of totally rehabilitating the building, while high indicates costs equal or beyond the total rehabilitation cost of the building. Using square footage figures compiled by the Tennessee Valley Authority during a condition evaluation of Elkmont in early 1993 (Caughron et al. 1993:Appendix D:1–3), it appears that the average-sized cabin at Elkmont is 1,248 square feet. Utilizing the NPS general unit

⁹ The five included the Paine Cabin at the Wonderland Club and the Levi Trentham Log Cabin (No. 7A), the Mayo Cabin Servants’ Quarters (No. 7B), the Matthews Cabin (No. 31), and the Little Cottage (No. 31A) at the Appalachian Club.

costs for rehabilitation, as prepared by the Branch of Estimating within the Denver Service Center's Engineering Services Division (Branch of Estimating 1995:18), and multiplying them by the average cabin size of 1,248 square feet, gives the cost figures shown in Table 6.1. The general unit costs, based on 1995 estimates, have been escalated at four percent per year to more accurately reflect 2002 costs.

Table 6.1. Approximate Rehabilitation Costs for the Elkmont Cabins.

Rehabilitation Category	General Unit Cost/SF* (2002)	Multiplied by Average Cabin Size (in Square Feet)	Equals Approximate Rehabilitation Cost
Exterior only	\$ 83	x 1,248	= \$103,584
Living quarters	\$ 90	x 1,248	= \$112,320
Commercial	\$102	x 1,248	= \$127,296
Historic period	\$192	x 1,248	= \$239,616

* SF = square foot

As Table 6.1 indicates, the approximate rehabilitation cost per cabin (based on an average cabin size of 1,248 square feet) could range from \$103,584 to \$239,616, depending on the rehabilitation category chosen. The NPS general unit costs also address structural problems by including a figure of \$38 per square foot that can be added to any of the rehabilitation categories. Table 6.2 presents the approximate rehabilitation cost for each category with the additional cost for structural problems included.

Table 6.2. Approximate Rehabilitation Costs for the Elkmont Cabins (Structural Problems Included).

Rehabilitation Category	General Unit Cost/SF* (2002)	Plus General Unit Cost/SF* for Structural Problems (2002)	Equals Total General Unit Cost/SF* (2002)	Multiplied by Average Cabin Size (in Square Feet)	Equals Approximate Rehabilitation Cost w/Structural Problems Incl.
Exterior only	\$ 83	+ \$38	= \$121	x 1,248	= \$151,008
Living quarters	\$ 90	+ \$38	= \$128	x 1,248	= \$159,744
Commercial	\$102	+ \$38	= \$140	x 1,248	= \$174,720
Historic period	\$192	+ \$38	= \$230	x 1,248	= \$287,040

* SF = square foot

As Table 6.2 indicates, the approximate rehabilitation cost per cabin (based on an average cabin size of 1,248 square feet) increases by \$47,424 when structural problems have to be addressed as part of the rehabilitation program. Thus, depending on the rehabilitation category chosen, the approximate rehabilitation cost per cabin could range from \$151,008 to \$287,040.

With the larger buildings—the Appalachian Clubhouse and the Wonderland Hotel complex—there are two extremes. The Clubhouse already has been stabilized,¹⁰ and the cost associated with its refurbishment and reuse mainly will be associated with restoring the porch, renewing interior finishes, installing a modern kitchen (if food service is to be provided), and creating accessible entrances and toilet facilities. Costs of \$150,000 to \$300,000 are anticipated, depending on whether or not a new kitchen is included.

The cost of repairs to the Wonderland Hotel complex is difficult to predict on a square-foot basis because the ultimate intervention plans may vary in scope. In terms of gross square footage, the two buildings together total 20,980 square feet (Caughron et al. 1993:Appendix C). The assumption at this point is that this project would cost well over \$1,000,000.

¹⁰ GRSM spent approximately \$40,000 on stabilization measures in FY1999. The bulk of the money was spent on the Sneed Cabin (No. 1), but funds also were spent on the Appalachian Clubhouse and a few of the other cabins (minor work only).

Obviously, it will be necessary to make good field measurements and to come up with detailed plans for renovating each building. Architectural and engineering fees will be in the range of 14% to 20% of the cost of the project; larger projects will have a lower percentage fee. These fees reflect an assumption that all the work will be done in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*.

It is important to note that when the impact analysis is carried out later in the process, a more detailed cost analysis will be undertaken as well, since the scope of the alternatives will be known, and it will be possible to establish refined cost figures, not simply estimates. Of course, as with any rehabilitation/construction/demolition project, issues will arise during the actual work that will result in additional costs not anticipated or included in the refined cost figures established during the impact analysis.

As the team examined the buildings, a third category was identified, that of the architectural integrity of the buildings as viewed today. As is typical of older structures, there have been many adaptations and additions. Some have been done well; a fair number are awkward or poorly designed, both from the point of view of architectural integrity and structural soundness. Much of the damage to the cabins has resulted from failing roof joints at these additions. These situations raise the question of whether some of the ill-conceived additions should be removed to return the cabins to a point where they had greater architectural integrity. On the other hand, the accumulated additions and modifications tell a story about how the buildings were inhabited over time.

The overall management plan for the buildings will dictate an approach to renovating and upgrading them. To give a simple example, the team noted almost no air-conditioning or heating systems. Fireplaces provided the only heat source. Very few cabins showed signs of any insulation or other weatherization measures. If the management plan were to call for winter use of the cabins, the upgrade plans would have to address how to provide an adequate, low-management heating system that gives thermal comfort to the inhabitants and maintains enough heat in times of non-use to protect the plumbing system. On the other hand, the management plan may suggest that the upgrades to the structures include simple ways to prepare the units for non-use during winter (e.g., an easy way to cut off water supply and drain all pipes).

The overall management plan for the buildings also will dictate an approach to making them accessible. Clearly, the Wonderland Hotel and the Appalachian Clubhouse, if retained, will have to have extensive modifications to achieve accessibility. None of the cabins are now fully accessible; some would be easier to retrofit because they are close to grade and have few interior doors. In other cases, retrofitting a cabin would be an intrusive measure and is not recommended.

Common Building Problems

The team saw many conditions and problems over and over again. Below are some general notes regarding these issues.

- There should be an investigation of environmental hazards that will affect the work, including hantavirus, carcinogenic spores from rotting wood, asbestos in floor tiles and sheet goods, and lead paint. Abatement procedures for hazardous substances could amount to a significant part of the renovation costs.
- All buildings will require electrical and plumbing upgrades (dependent on use, of course). In some cases, it may be possible to refurbish certain of the plumbing fixtures (primarily claw-foot tubs and wall-hung sinks). In practically all of the cabins, the predominant lighting fixture is the porcelain socket; this type of lighting will prove to be inadequate for modern expectations.

- All windows will need to be reglazed (i.e., the old putty removed and replaced). Some sash frames will need to be rebuilt, although, surprisingly, a majority of the window and sash frames are in good condition. Most cabins have a variety of window types, reflecting what seemed to be a generally practiced custom.
- All fireplaces and chimneys must be inspected for the integrity of their mortar joints to ensure that smoke and noxious gases are not accidentally vented back into interior spaces.
- One of the most sizable problems will be the cleaning out of the accumulated items and debris beneath most of the cabins. This problem is exacerbated by the hantavirus concern; the dusty areas beneath the cabins could be a prime hazard area.
- Most of the buildings at Elkmont are built on pole or post foundations. In the oldest cabins, the posts or poles sit directly on stone footings. The foundation system of each cabin should be evaluated to determine whether the bases of the posts are rotting and whether there has been subsidence in the footings. If either of these conditions is present, it should be repaired.
- All of the structures need to be repainted or re-stained. Also, if screened porches are kept and restored, then the porches need new screening.
- Many cabins are roofed with a so-called 5-v metal roofing. A few of the roofs need total replacement; however, most can have a longer life with some preventive maintenance and refurbishment. Such treatments would include checking and tightening the fasteners, straightening bent and dented panels, checking all flashing and drip edges, and coating the metal with an appropriate coating for galvanized steel.
- Some cabins still have their historic door and window hardware in place. This hardware should be repaired where necessary and reused. Where the hardware is missing, finding sources for compatible hardware that will work on the doors and windows without extensive reworking will be important.
- Many of the cabin walls and ceilings are covered with a pressed composition board. This board has not fared well in the high humidity; it has sagged, is often water-stained, or is broken. All of this board should be replaced. The problem to be solved from a technical and a historic point of view is to determine an appropriate replacement material. As a precautionary measure, the existing material should be tested for the presence of hazardous components before removal.
- Historically, most of the cabins did not have a complete gutter system; there is often only a short gutter section over the entrance. In most cases, these gutters are rusted through and, depending on the historic period sought in the restoration program, they will need to be replaced.

ARCHITECTURAL OVERVIEW

(Note: The following overview is taken from Thomason et al. (1993:7:2–7) (pages 86–90). The text has been updated minimally to reflect current conditions and to agree with the findings of the present survey. Accompanying footnotes are not original to Thomason et al. but have been inserted by TRC to provide clarification and/or additional information where needed.)

With the exception of the Avent and Levi Trentham Cabins,¹¹ the properties at Elkmont were built after 1910. The Appalachian Club was created in 1910, and many of the cabins along Jakes Creek were built over the next decade. The first section of the Wonderland Hotel was built in 1912, and most of the adjacent cabins were built during the 1910s and 1920s. The last major area of construction was the acreage along the Little River owned by Mrs. Alice Townsend. Those cabins were built following the removal of the railroad in 1926 and are considered part of the Appalachian Club.

The lumber camp and community of Elkmont were located on the east side of Little River between the Appalachian Club and the Wonderland Club properties. The camp was built by the Little River Lumber Company in 1908, and by the 1920s consisted of several dozen dwellings, a few commercial buildings, a school, and two churches. After the Great Smoky Mountains National Park was established, all these buildings were either razed or moved. No aboveground resources associated with the lumber camp or community of Elkmont were identified in this study. The area is presently encompassed by the Elkmont Campground created in the 1950s.

The builders of the Elkmont cabins included carpenters employed by the Little River Lumber Company and area residents such as “Uncle” Levi Trentham. At least two cabins (Numbers 5 and 7) are believed to have originally been built as section or “set” houses for workers on the railroad. These houses were built in three sections, transported on railroad flatcars, and “set” down adjacent to the railroad to provide housing for the workers. These two cabins are believed to have been purchased by the original owners and placed on their lots.

At least two cabins have been attributed to local builder, “Uncle” Levi Trentham. Levi Trentham owned a farm in the upper reaches of Jakes Creek and was a neighbor to the club property for many years. Following his death, his cabin was purchased and moved to the Appalachian Club about 1932. Trentham is the presumed builder of Cabin 31 and Cabin 25, the Matthews and Franklin Cabins, and may be responsible for the construction of other buildings at Elkmont (Interview by Phil Thomason of C. L. Matthews and Larry Franklin, 19 October 1992). Several accounts describe property owners employing “local carpenters,” and Trentham may be one of the individuals so identified. Accounts also suggest that some cabins were built by carpenters brought in from Knoxville by the property owners.

The building forms and plans at Elkmont are representative of vernacular designs typical of the early twentieth century. Represented at Elkmont are Pyramid Square, Gabled Ell, Single-pen, and Double-pen. The larger buildings of the Wonderland Hotel and Annex and Appalachian Clubhouse are typical of vernacular hotel and social buildings of the early twentieth century.

The majority of buildings in the Wonderland and Appalachian Club complexes were built between 1910 and 1930. Most dwellings are of balloon frame construction with exteriors of board and batten, weatherboard, and drop siding. The majority were built with the exterior siding applied directly to the studs and framing system. In recent decades a number of these dwellings have had the interior walls finished with drywall or sheetrock panels.

¹¹ See discussion in Chapter 3.

Common features include exterior wall chimneys of concrete and river stone; foundations of fieldstone, wood posts on poured concrete or fieldstone, or concrete block; and gable or hipped roofs. Most roofs appear to have been metal, and a few of the cabins still retain their original roofs. However, most of the cabins have replacement metal roofs or roofs of asphalt shingles.

The cabins display a wide variety of exterior wall finishes. At the Appalachian Club the most common exterior siding is board and batten. Of the 61 buildings in this area, 26 have this exterior siding material. Fourteen have weatherboard siding, and eight are of log construction or have log cores. The remaining nine buildings have a combination of these three exteriors or feature some other siding type (shingles, vertical plank, etc.).¹² Four others were rebuilt in 1974 after burning down. Of the twelve buildings in the Wonderland Club area, three have board and batten siding, one has cedar shingles, one has asbestos shingles, and four have weatherboard siding.¹³ The remaining three have post-1940 wood siding materials. The early-twentieth-century log cabins at Elkmont have unhewn logs with concrete chinking. Logs are joined by some form of notching and were left in an unpainted and natural condition. The construction of Cabin 19 in the Appalachian Club area is typical of the log buildings.

The primary use of stone, brick, and concrete at Elkmont can be found in chimneys, foundations, and retaining walls. More than fifty of the cabins have chimneys constructed of concrete and cobblestones, also referred to as rubble, fieldstone, and river stone. These were widely used due to their availability from the nearby Little River and its tributaries. The varying sizes of these stones allowed for a variety of construction uses, such as walls and chimneys. Most stones in the buildings are rounded, with edges smoothed from water erosion. A common form of construction was to layer stones with a layer of concrete to create irregular horizontal bands.

Porches are integral elements to the majority of the Elkmont cabins. The outdoor recreational nature of the area resulted in the construction of large one-story porches on many of the cabins for socialization and relaxation. The wraparound porch at the Wonderland Hotel is the most obvious example of this recreational emphasis, and many cabins have porches on both the main and secondary façades.

Porches can be found on nearly all the Elkmont cabins. On primary façades, porches are generally partial-width or full-width with square columns and wood railings. The use of unhewn logs is evident at a number of cabins, such as Cabins 1 and 18. A few dwellings display cobblestone and concrete construction in the porch piers and porch railings. A good example is the May or Moore Cabin in the Wonderland complex. It has a low railing of stacked river stones and concrete.

At many of the cabins, exposure to the area's high rainfall has resulted in the deterioration of porch components, such as roofs, railings, columns, and floors. This has necessitated porch rebuilding, including replacement of these components. In many cases replacement has been sympathetic to the character of the cabins through the use of square wood columns, railings of square balusters, and wood floors that are compatible with the original design. In several cases, however, replacement has included expansion

¹² Thomason et al. (1993:7:3) does not mention the other siding types here.

¹³ Thomason et al. (1993:7:4) does not list asbestos shingle siding here.

or partial infill of the original porch. Much of this replacement and extension of porches appears to have occurred in the early 1970s when cabin leases were renewed.

The majority of the Elkmont properties retain their original entrance doors. Most of these are stock wood doors of four-, five-, or six-panel design. An example of a four-panel door is at Cabin 5, which has four raised panels. Other popular door types found at Elkmont are cross-panel doors and single-light glass and wood doors. Only a few cabins have had the original primary entrance doors removed and replaced with modern glass and/or wood solid core doors. The majority of doors on secondary and rear entrances also are original wood-paneled doors.

A wide variety of window designs are present at Elkmont, including casement, sliding, and double-hung. The most common are casement window variations, which can be found on the majority of the cabins. Sliding track windows are usually arranged in pairs or larger groups and move horizontally in grooves or between runners. Double-hung sash also were widely used, especially for the larger cabins and on primary façades. The Wonderland Hotel is primarily composed of original one-over-one, double-hung sash windows. In several cabins, window replacement has required retrofitting of window surrounds to accommodate the new window size. The Faust Cabin is an example of this treatment.

The majority of the interiors of the cabins retain their original design, plan, and detailing. Most of these share similar characteristics in their arrangement and use of materials. The largest rooms are those used for communal living space, such as living rooms and dining rooms. These are rooms that generally feature fireplace openings and surrounds. Bedrooms are generally small with room only for a bed, dresser or bureau, and a few chairs or a table. Kitchen areas are usually in rear wings or ells off the back of the dwelling and also are often small in comparison with the living or dining rooms.

The “rustic” nature of the cabins was accented through the use of exposed wood ceilings, wood walls, and floors. The focal point for most cabins was the large stone surround at the fireplace opening. This feature is common to the majority of the Elkmont cabins, the Wonderland Hotel Annex, and the Appalachian Club. In recent decades, some cabins have had the interiors remodeled with modern materials, such as plywood, wood paneling, carpeting, and acoustical tile ceilings. About twenty of the cabins appear to have been remodeled in this fashion.

The construction of the Wonderland Hotel and Annex between 1912 and 1928 followed vernacular hotel designs of the period. By the early 1900s, at least ten major hotels operated in the mountainous areas of Blount and Sevier Counties. Historic photographs show that most were of frame construction, two to three stories in height, and built with large porches on one or more façades (Bicentennial Committee of Sevier County 1976:n.p.). These buildings lacked decorative detailing. Other mountain hotels exhibiting this type of construction were located at Tremont, Line Springs, Henderson Springs, and Dupont Springs.

The Wonderland Hotel and Annex are of frame construction with hipped roofs and weatherboard siding. The Wonderland has a one-story porch that wraps around three façades of the building. The building has interior brick chimneys and a large fireplace in the social room. The Annex has similar construction, with a large stone chimney on an exterior wall and one-story porches adjacent to its social room.

The original Appalachian Clubhouse also was a frame vernacular design of the period with large porches. It burned in the early 1930s and was replaced with the present structure in 1934. The present clubhouse is of frame construction with a large porch on the east side. The interior has two large stone fireplaces in the social room, along with exposed ceiling beams and paneled walls.

During the 1920s and early 1930s, cabins continued to be constructed. The cabins built after 1928 along the Little River Road are similar to earlier ones in design, detailing, and materials. The last cabin to be built at Elkmont during this period was the Cambier Cabin, which was completed in 1940.

In addition to the cabins, a number of outbuildings also were constructed at Elkmont. These include guest cottages, servants' quarters, woodsheds, and garages. A fine example of a servants' quarters is located at the rear of Cabin 7 in the Appalachian Club area. This one-story frame building housed servants that stayed with the family during the summer season (Interview by Phil Thomason of Dale Mayo, 19 October 1992). Frame garages were built adjacent to Cabin 40, the Murphy Cabin, and the Faust Cabin.

The creation of Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the acquisition of the lands and buildings at Elkmont ended the sale of lots at the Wonderland and Appalachian Club complexes. Little new construction occurred at Elkmont over the next several decades. A fire in 1974 resulted in the destruction of four cabins in the Appalachian Club area. New cabins (Numbers 12, 14, 16, and 17) were constructed on these lots in 1974–1975. These are the most recent buildings in either the Wonderland or Appalachian Club areas.

Many of the cabins in the Elkmont District are examples of Craftsman or Craftsman-influenced designs.¹⁴ The Craftsman movement in America is an outgrowth of the English Arts and Crafts movement. In the United States, it flourished from the turn of the twentieth century until about 1930. It emphasized interiors that were functional with rooms directly connected to each other. Numerous windows and front or side porches created continuity between the house and its surroundings. The buildings carried out this theme of harmony with nature through the use of natural, readily available materials in construction. Fireplaces and dormers are other features of Craftsman design. Landscape features, such as walks or paths, simple entry gates, or walls of stone were used to emphasize the link between the structure and its surroundings. Closely associated with bungalows in urban and suburban areas, these same design elements were found in summer or vacation cottages.

In the Appalachian Club portion of the Elkmont Historic District, low rock walls line both sides of Jakes Creek Road, and gravel paths lead from openings in the walls to the front porches of the cottages. In other locations, stone walls delineate the boundaries between the small lots. Cabins along the Little River have decks and patios adjacent to the river with simple gates of wood and stone along the road. Stone steps lead up from the road to the Wonderland Hotel. The cabins or cottages in Elkmont have large fireplaces and chimneys built of cobblestone or river rock in the largest or central room, with other rooms leading off from it.

¹⁴ The cabins are best classified as vernacular adaptations of the Craftsman style. The buildings borrow some of the style's design elements and incorporate certain of its details but should not be considered true examples of the Craftsman style.

In recent decades, alterations and additions to the majority of the Elkmont properties have consisted primarily of enclosing or extending porches and adding rooms or wings to the side and rear façades. Approximately two-thirds of the properties retain most of their overall historic design and detailing. Of the 74 buildings at Elkmont, 25 are considered to no longer retain integrity.

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

The basic descriptive information in this section is taken from Thomason et al. (1993:7:8–26), although it has been updated and expanded as necessary, utilizing data gathered during TRC's recent architectural survey and condition assessment. Additionally, each description includes pertinent data from GRSM's draft Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) plans. Copies of the draft CLI plans are included in Appendix 3. TRC's recommendations as to contributing/noncontributing status accompany each resource description. A detailed discussion of the rationale used to determine contributing/noncontributing status is included in Chapter 4.

Appalachian Club Buildings

Appalachian Clubhouse. The Appalachian Clubhouse is located at the northern end of the complex between Jakes Creek and Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.1 to 6.4). Constructed in 1934, the clubhouse replaced an earlier structure that burned two years before. It was designed by Knoxville architect, Albert Baumann, Jr. The building has a large social room, a kitchen, and various meeting and storage rooms. The exterior has weatherboard siding, and there are exterior chimneys of cobblestone and concrete on the north and south ends of the building. The structure is on a wood post foundation and has a metal gable roof. Wood lattice covers the foundation at each side. On the main or east side is a full-width porch, the design of which mimics the verandah of the Wonderland Hotel. The porch features decorative wood brackets, and sections of the porch have been enclosed with screened panels. Window openings contain six-over-six, double-hung sash, except where the sash has been removed and replaced with wood louvers as a ventilation and protection measure. A wood-panel door and vertical board shutters are located at the north side of the building; shutters also are located at the building's west side. Interior doors include multi-light and four- and five-panel wood doors. A partial cellar with an adjacent storage or workroom is located beneath the building. There is evidence of rot in the foundation posts. The social room has a king post truss system of unhewn logs supporting the roof, and at the north and south ends are large cobblestone and concrete chimneys and fireplaces. Interior rooms have exposed framing and/or are sheathed with plywood. There have been only minor modifications to the original design of the building.

In October 1998, the Historic Preservation Training Center of the National Park Service conducted a condition assessment of the Appalachian Clubhouse and submitted a report with recommendations to GRSM (McGrath 1998). Of the stabilization and mothballing recommendations made in the report, GRSM carried out the following in FY1999: the clearing out of all trash and debris from the structure; the securing of doors and windows; the installation of window vents/louvers; the installation of brick and stone caps at the two chimneys; and the installation of a few support posts beneath the main floor of the building. GRSM spent approximately \$40,000 on building stabilization in FY1999, the bulk of which was spent on the Sneed Cabin (No. 1). However, funds also were spent on the Appalachian Clubhouse and a few of the other cabins (minor work only).

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition. The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Appalachian Clubhouse is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a flat terrace above Jakes Creek and Bearwallow Branch, the gravel parking lot to the south, and the former swing off the north end of the porch. The draft CLI plan for the Appalachian Clubhouse is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:18–19), the Appalachian Clubhouse is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The Appalachian Clubhouse evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (clubhouse and cultural landscape features)**

Sneed Cabin (No. 1). The Sneed Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.5 to 6.8). Constructed in ca. 1910, it is a one-and-one-half-story log dwelling with front and rear porches and a gabled roof covered with asphalt roll roofing. The foundation consists of wood posts on stacked fieldstone, and the log walls are chinked with grout (i.e., mortar). The fireplace and chimney are built of cobblestone and concrete. Built in a gabled ell plan, the building appears to be relatively original. At the roofline is a gable dormer with wood shingle siding. Wood shingles and the remains of a decorative wood truss are found in the front gable, while the rear gable has wood slats and the remnants of a truss. The side gable also has wood shingles. On the north side is a one-story log kitchen wing added in ca. 1948. Wood lattice covers the foundation at the north and south sides. All but about four of the original two-over-two, double-hung windows have been fitted with wood louvers, similar to those used at the Appalachian Clubhouse. Recently installed porch framing and foundation support posts are visible at the rear of the building. The main interior space features exposed log walls, log cross beams, and a stone and concrete fireplace.

In FY1999, GRSM carried out the following stabilization measures at the Sneed Cabin: the clearing out of all trash and debris from the structure; the installation of window vents/louvers; the refurbishment of the front porch; the partial reconstruction of the rear porch; and the installation of a number of support posts beneath the main floor of the building. GRSM spent approximately \$40,000 on building stabilization in FY1999, the bulk of which was spent on the Sneed Cabin.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a projected renovation expense of low to moderate (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Sneed Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a ridge above Bearwallow Branch, the stone wall along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the front walkway and rear landing with steps, and the two large hemlocks in the front yard. A reinforced concrete pier is located on the slope behind the cabin; its original purpose is not known. In addition, a concrete retaining wall with a pipe outlet and a set of concrete steps is located at the bottom of the slope behind “Adamless Eden” (No. 5A). This feature appears to connect to the landing and steps behind the Sneed Cabin via a dirt path up the slope. The draft CLI plan for the Sneed Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:8), the Sneed Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The Sneed Cabin evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Smith Cabin (No. 2). The Smith Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.9 to 6.12). The original core of this cabin, constructed in ca. 1910, was a square block with a pyramidal roof. The present roofing is 5-v metal, and the siding is board and batten. An interior brick chimney protrudes from the east roof slope. On the main or east façade is a shed-roofed, wraparound porch that was rebuilt in 1970. The north part of the porch has screened panels, while the remaining portion is open. The porch features a solid balustrade made up of beaded board. The shed-roofed, screened porch on the rear of the building is on concrete block piers and has T1-11 siding. An open porch on the north side serves as an exterior hallway connecting the front porch with a rear addition. The building likely housed two families, based on the two front entry doors and the interior arrangement of rooms. Windows contain six-over-six, double-hung sash, and a five-panel wood door is visible at the south side. Wood lattice covers the foundation. The interior is finished with beaded board in one half of the building and composition board in the other half. The interior also features a two-sided brick chimney with corbelled mantels and four- and five-panel wood doors with porcelain knobs and metal box locks.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Smith Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the stone wall along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the front gravel walkway and rear concrete block steps to the creek, and the mature maples and hemlocks and the rhododendrons in the front and side yards (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Smith Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:8), the Smith Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Although the front porch was rebuilt in 1970, it remains in its original location and follows its historic configuration. The later additions are inconspicuous, all but one located at the rear and out of view of the front. The north side addition is small in scale and fits within the existing wall plane and roof overhang. Thus, the Smith Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Higdon Cabin (No. 3). The Higdon Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.13 to 6.15). It is a one-story frame dwelling with a gable roof of 5-v metal and an exterior of board and batten. Built in ca. 1910, the building has retained much of its original appearance. The foundation is stone and concrete at the front and wood posts elsewhere (covered by a board and batten skirt). There is an interior concrete flue at the rear roof slope and a brick chimney at the rear ell. A full-width porch across the front (west) side was rebuilt about 1980. Windows contain six-over-six, double-hung sash, as well as nonhistoric casements. The front entry features a door with six lights over several horizontal panels, set within a surround with four-over-four side lights and a six-opening (blind) transom. The rear ell has a gable roof, a mixture of siding, and a concrete block and

wood post foundation. The interior features composition board walls and ceilings and four- and six-panel wood doors with porcelain knobs and metal box locks.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall poor condition, with a projected high renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Higdon Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location on a ridge above Bearwallow Branch, the stone wall with inset steps along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the front walkway with steps, a low concrete wall at the rear, and the mature poplar in the side yard. The draft CLI plan for the Higdon Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:8), the Higdon Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Although the front porch was rebuilt in ca. 1980, it remains in its original location and follows its historic configuration. The later window sash is concentrated in the later rear ell, which itself is inconspicuous, located at the rear and out of view of the front. Most of the building’s condition problems have been caused by the later rear ell and are concentrated in that part of the building or at the juncture of the original building and the ell. Thus, the Higdon Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained sufficient structural integrity in its original section over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Swan Cabin (No. 4). The Swan Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.16 to 6.18). The cabin, constructed in ca. 1910, is a one-story frame dwelling with a gable roof covered with 5-v metal and an exterior clad in non-original horizontal lap siding (board and batten siding appears to be beneath the later siding). An exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney is located at the south side. The cabin has a wraparound porch that is a recent addition (ca. 1970). There also are a number of side and rear additions, including a modern deck. A number of concrete block piers have been placed beneath the building; however, the foundation is out of plumb. Windows contain six-over-six, double-hung sash and both two- and six-light casements. Wood doors have both four and five panels. The interior of the cabin was not examined during the recent survey.

Because the Swan Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC’s own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at “Preliminary Condition Assessment” above).

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the stone wall with inset steps along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the stone front porch steps, the stone planter in the front yard, and the two mature hemlocks on the property. The draft CLI plan for the Swan Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:8–9), the Swan Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). Major, conspicuous alterations to the building include the later siding; the ca. 1970 front porch addition; the side additions (they are both large

in size and they project out from the original building); the highly visible, modern concrete block foundation piers; and the later window sash. Limited structural problems are evident at the foundation and the roof. Rear additions are inconspicuous and not visible from the front. Overall, the Swan Cabin evidences major and conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
 Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Addicks Cabin (No. 5). The Addicks Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.19 to 6.22). This ca. 1910 building rests on a stone foundation and has an interior concrete block chimney. It is a one-story, frame, rectangular dwelling with drop siding and a gable roof covered with 5-v metal. On the front is a shed-roofed porch that has been altered by the addition of beaded board to the beltline. The front (west) façade features three four-panel wood doors and six-over-six, double-hung wood sash windows. Other windows on the building contain two- and six-light casements and modern sliding sash. On the rear is a shed-roofed wing built in the 1930s with board and batten siding. The main interior space features a large, modern fireplace and hearth of stone, a flush board ceiling, and walls covered with flush boards, beaded boards, and modern paneling. Interior wood doors feature four panels each, porcelain knobs, and metal box locks. The building was relocated from the town of Elkmont and is an example of the “set” houses moved from one location to another by railroad.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate to high renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Addicks Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location on a ridge above Bearwallow Branch, the stone wall along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the mortared stone walkway with steps at the front, the stone boundary walls, the rear stone patio and planters, and the mature maple at the rear and the small masses of hemlocks at the front. The draft CLI plan for the Addicks Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:9), the Addicks Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The use of beaded board at the porch beltline is a minor change overall, as is the presence of later window sash (which is located at the sides and rear only). The rear addition is unobtrusive and dates to the historic period. Thus, the Addicks Cabin evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Ten feet north of the Addicks Cabin is a one-story playhouse built of unhewn logs with saddle notching and concrete chinking (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.23 and 6.24). Named “**Adamless Eden,**” the structure was built in ca. 1921. The building has a gable roof covered with asphalt roll roofing and a stone and concrete exterior chimney. At the southeast corner is a shed-roofed addition with board and batten siding. Decorative timbering is present in the front gable, and the doorway has a clipped surround. Windows contain two- and four-light fixed sash. The interior features exposed log walls, log beams, and a stone and concrete fireplace.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for “Adamless Eden” is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include the stone wall along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the mortared stone walkway at the front, the stone boundary wall immediately to the north, and the small stone planter at the front. The draft CLI plan for “Adamless Eden” is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:9), “Adamless Eden” is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The rear corner addition is inconspicuous and may date to the historic period. Thus, “Adamless Eden” evidences only minor, inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (playhouse and cultural landscape features)**

Creekmore Cabin (No. 6). The Creekmore Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.25 to 6.28). This ca. 1910 building originally rested on timber posts, which were later reinforced with concrete blocks. The foundation is covered with wood lattice at the front. The cabin is a one-story frame structure with board and batten siding and a gable roof covered with 5-v metal. The interior chimney is built of cobblestone and concrete. On the front (east) side is a full-width porch that was added or rebuilt in 1975. At the north end of the porch is a recent addition (ca. 1970). On the south is a shed-roofed wing built about 1980, and on the west, or back, is a wood deck constructed at the same time. A shed-roofed addition also is located at the building’s northwest corner. The front façade features two five-panel wood doors and four-over-four, double-hung wood sash windows. Four- and six-light casements and modern sliding sash are found at the additions. The additions are finished with a mixture of board and batten, T1-11, and horizontal lap siding. The interior of the cabin features composition board and modern paneling on the walls. The main interior space has a beaded board ceiling, board and batten wainscoting, and a stone fireplace.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate to high renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Creekmore Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the stone wall with inset steps and the stone walkway along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the low stone walls leading to the stone front porch steps, the south side walkway and rear steps to the creek, the stone planter in the front yard, and the mature hemlocks at the southeast corner of the cabin. The draft CLI plan for the Creekmore Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:9), the Creekmore Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. If the front porch was rebuilt in 1975, then it remains in its original location and follows its historic configuration. If, in fact, the front porch was added, then it still does not detract from the overall appearance of the building and is in keeping with similar historic porches found elsewhere in the district.

Likewise, the north and south end additions do not detract from the overall appearance of the building and are unified with the rest of the building via the front porch. The rear deck is inconspicuous, not visible from the front. The northwest corner addition is small in size and located at the rear wall plane, sufficiently set back from the front so as not to interfere with the façade. Overall, the Creekmore Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Mayo Cabin (No. 7). The Mayo Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.29 to 6.31). This ca. 1910 cabin rests on a concrete block foundation. It is a one-story frame structure with a gable roof covered in 5-v metal, a board and batten exterior, and an interior brick chimney. There is a full-width porch on the west, or front, of the building and a 1930 shed-roofed wing on the rear. The front porch exhibits a nonhistoric plywood balustrade. Within the porch are two five-panel wood doors and two six-over-six, double-hung sash windows. The interior features composition board walls, a double-sided chimney with wood mantelpieces, and four-panel wood doors with porcelain knobs and metal box locks. Like the Addicks Cabin, the Mayo Cabin was moved to this location from the town of Elkmont.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate to high renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Mayo Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop above Bearwallow Branch, the stone wall with inset steps along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the stone walkway leading to the front porch, and the mature hemlocks, poplar, and maple on the property. The draft CLI plan for the Mayo Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:10), the Mayo Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The use of plywood at the front porch balustrade is a minor change overall. The rear addition is unobtrusive and dates to the historic period. Thus, the Mayo Cabin evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Levi Trentham Log Cabin. This single-pen log cabin was built on Jakes Creek about 1830 and moved to its present location in 1932. It sits directly behind the Mayo Cabin (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.32 to 6.34) on a stone foundation, and its logs have half-dovetail notching and concrete chinking. The gable roof is covered with 5-v metal. The exterior chimney is cobblestone and concrete. Windows contain paired two- and three-light casements, and six-light sash are located in the gables. Vertical board doors are located on the east and west sides of the structure. The interior was not accessible during the recent survey.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a projected low renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Trentham log cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include the mature hardwoods on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Trentham log cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:10), the Trentham Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Although relocated from its original site, the building was moved during the historic period and has been at its present site for 70 years. Likewise, the roofing, chimney, and window sash do not date from the 1830s but are original to the historic period of the district (1908–1940). Thus, the Trentham Cabin evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Mayo Cabin Servants' Quarters. This ca. 1920 cabin sits directly behind the Levi Trentham Log Cabin (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.35 to 6.37). The structure is a frame servants' quarters. The single-story structure rests on a stone and wood post foundation and has a board and batten exterior. Its gable roof is covered with 5-v metal. A shed-roofed porch was added about 1970 on the front (west) side. The building features wood slats at its foundation, three vertical board doors, and both four-light and six-over-six sash windows. The interior was not accessible at the time of the recent survey.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a projected low renovation expense (see "General Notes" for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Mayo Cabin servants' quarters is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include the rock outcrop at the rear and the mature hardwoods on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Mayo Cabin servants' quarters is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:10), the Mayo Cabin servants' quarters is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Although the front porch was added in 1970, it is small, unobtrusive in its design and profile, and in keeping with the appearance of the building. It probably replaced an earlier porch, as there likely would have been some covering or canopy at the front door to provide protection from the elements. Thus, overall, the Mayo Cabin servants' quarters evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Cain Cabin (No. 8). The Cain Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.38 to 6.41). This ca. 1915, one-story frame dwelling rests on a combination of wood posts and concrete blocks, with wood lattice as a foundation covering. The cabin has board and batten siding. The gable roof is covered with 5-v metal, and there is an interior brick chimney. On the front (east) side is a wraparound, shed-roofed porch with later framing. It appears that

the original porch was expanded in 1970; the work also may have included the infilling of the porch's north end. Windows contain single and paired four-over-four and six-over-six, double-hung sash, as well as six-light casements. There have been several additions added to the rear of the dwelling over the years, each exhibiting various types of siding and window sash. Interior features include thin vertical board walls and ceilings, a brick stovepipe stack supported on wood studs in the main room, and five-panel wood doors with porcelain and metal knobs and metal box locks.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate to high renovation expense (see "General Notes" for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Cain Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its slightly elevated location above Jakes Creek, the stone wall with an inset step and the stone walkway along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the concrete walkway lined with stones leading to the front porch, and the mature hemlock in the front yard. In addition, a set of concrete block steps at the rear leads to a stone and concrete patio with planters and a series of stepping stones to the creek. The draft CLI plan for the Cain Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:10; see especially Supplementary Listing Record), the Cain Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The later framing at the front porch is a minor alteration and does not detract from the porch's or the building's appearance. Likewise, the expansion of the porch in 1970 (likely to the south) is in keeping with the design and scale of the building and is similar to historic porches found elsewhere in the district. The infilling of the porch's north end, while a visible change, is minor overall and does not detract greatly from the building's design and feeling. The rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Overall, then, the Cain Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Galyon Cabin (No. 9). The Galyon Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.42 to 6.45). This ca. 1910 one-story frame dwelling has a board and batten exterior, a 5-v metal gable roof, and an interior chimney of cobblestone and concrete. The building rests on a wood post foundation, although the porch has a solid stone foundation at the front. Initially, the cabin consisted of two rooms and a back porch. In 1919, the bedrooms and kitchen were added. On the west (front) and north sides of the building is a shed-roofed porch that was rebuilt and expanded in ca. 1970; the work also may have included the infilling of the porch's south end. The porch balustrade consists of crossed 2x4s at the front and plywood and horizontal planks at the side. A six-panel wood door and a set of French doors are located within the porch. Windows consist of paired four- and six-light casements. Several additions pile off the rear of the cabin. One of these is a modern deck with a catwalk leading to a modern one-room cabin. This small gable-roofed cabin rests on a wood post foundation and has board and batten and drop siding and a screened porch on the front. The main room within the main cabin features horizontal board walls and beaded board ceilings and a stone and concrete fireplace with vertical log sides and a log mantel shelf.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall poor condition, with a projected moderate to high renovation expense (see "General Notes" for

explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Galyon Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its elevated location above Bearwallow Branch, the mortared stone walkway leading from the road to the front porch, and the mature hardwoods on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Galyon Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:10–11; see especially the Supplementary Listing Record), the Galyon Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Although the front porch was rebuilt in ca. 1970, it remains in its original location and follows its historic configuration. The use of different materials for the side balustrade is not a major alteration. The infilling of the porch's south end, while a visible change, is minor overall and does not detract greatly from the building's design, scale, and feeling. The later rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Many of the building's condition problems have been caused by the rear additions and are concentrated in those parts of the building or at the juncture of the original building and the additions. Overall, then, the Galyon Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained sufficient structural integrity over time.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:10–11; see also the Supplementary Listing Record), the one-room cabin to the rear of the Galyon Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the one-room cabin noncontributing to the district due to its recent age.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Contributing (cabin) Noncontributing (one-room cabin to rear)
TRC Recommendation:	Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features) Noncontributing (one-room cabin to rear)

Baumann Cabin (No. 10). The ca. 1910 Baumann Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.46 to 6.49). Resting on a concrete block pier foundation, this single-story frame dwelling has board and batten siding, an exterior concrete and cobblestone chimney, and a hipped roof of 5-v metal. At the roofline is a raised pyramidal roof with six-light clerestory windows (added in the 1920s). There is a half-hipped porch with unhewn log posts and lattice panels on the front. The front door has a single light over three panels and is flanked by paired two-over-two sash windows. Other windows contain two-light sash, paired four-light sash, and 12-light casements (at the chimney). A rear ell, added in 1936, has a brick chimney. A shed-roofed screened porch is on the south side of the ell. The main interior space features beaded board and horizontal board walls, a ceiling open to the roof framing, and a fireplace consisting of small mortared stones.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair to good condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Baumann Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the stone wall with an inset step and the stone walkway along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the mortared stone walkway leading to the front porch, the two stone planters in the front yard, and the

mature hardwoods on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). A possible barbecue grill is located on the south side of the cabin, and two wood planters on concrete block piers flank the front walkway. The draft CLI plan for the Baumann Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:11), the Baumann Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The roofline changes occurred during the historic period, and the modern use of lattice at the front porch balustrade is a minor change overall. The rear addition is unobtrusive when viewed from the front; moreover, it dates to the historic period. Thus, the Baumann Cabin evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Scruggs-Brisco Cabin (No. 11). The Scruggs-Brisco Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.50 to 6.53). This ca. 1915 cabin has a foundation of stone and concrete block piers. The single-story frame dwelling has a gable roof covered with 5-v metal and a board and batten exterior. The interior chimney is constructed of cobblestone and concrete. The original porch was expanded in ca. 1970 to wrap around two sides of the cabin. It displays modern framing, and canvas awnings hang from beneath the porch roof near the balustrade. The five-panel wood front door is flanked by 12-light casements. Two-by-two sliding sash units are found on each side of the cabin. The building has several additions to the rear and a small addition off each side. The interior features both modern and historic finishes, including composition board, paneling, and beaded board. Both vertical board and five-panel wood doors are found throughout the interior, and a stone and concrete fireplace is located in the corner of the rear dining room.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair to poor condition, with a projected moderate to high renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Scruggs-Brisco Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Bearwallow Branch, the stone wall with inset steps along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the mortared stone walkway leading to the front porch, the line of stones at each property line serving as boundary markers, and the mature hardwoods, tree masses, and rhododendron mass on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest or the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Scruggs-Brisco Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:11; see especially the Supplementary Listing Record), the Scruggs-Brisco Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Although the front porch was expanded in ca. 1970, it remains an open front porch as it was historically. The expansion of the porch and the use of later framing members are not major changes and do not detract greatly from the building’s overall design, scale, and feeling. The later rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. The north side addition is small in size and is set back from the façade at the rear wall plane. The south side addition, while larger, is integrated into the building via the unifying front porch. Most of the building’s condition problems are located in and near the rear additions. Overall, then, the Scruggs-Brisco Cabin

evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained sufficient structural integrity in its original section over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Sneed Cabin (No. 12), Jamerson Cabin (No. 14), Burdette Cabin (No. 16), and Bagley Cabin (No. 17). These cabins were reconstructed in 1974 after burning down (Figures 6.54 to 6.57). They are located on the west side of Jakes Creek Road just north of the road leading to the New Elkmont Cemetery (see Figure 1.5). No preliminary condition assessment was performed on the buildings.

The site-specific elements of the buildings' cultural landscapes include features from the earlier cabins as well as features installed in 1974 or later. Such features include stone walls, walkways, paths, and planters, and mature maples, pines, poplars, oaks, and hemlocks. Although some of the features are modern, they are in keeping with the type, scale, and material of historic landscape features found throughout the district. The draft CLI plans for the Sneed, Jamerson, Burdette, and Bagley Cabins are presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:11), the Sneed, Jamerson, Burdette, and Bagley Cabins are recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the four cabins noncontributing to the district due to their recent age (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however).

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabins)**
 Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Cook Cabin (No. 13). The Cook Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.58 to 6.60). This ca. 1912, one-story frame dwelling rests on a foundation of wood posts and concrete blocks, with a skirt of wood slats. It has board and batten siding and a 5-v metal gable roof. An interior stone and concrete chimney, set at an angle, protrudes from the roof. The shed-roofed porch on the north and west sides of the cabin was built or expanded in ca. 1970 and displays nonhistoric porch framing. The five-panel wood front door is flanked by paired five-light casements. Similar casements and paired two-over-two sash windows are found at the north and south sides of the building. Two rear additions built between 1930 and 1950 doubled the size of the original cabin. The main interior space features composition board walls and ceilings and a stone chimney and fireplace in the corner. Interior doors exhibit five wood panels, porcelain knobs, and metal box latches.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see "General Notes" for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Cook Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its elevated location above Bearwallow Branch, the stone wall and wood and wire fence along the Jakes Creek Road frontage, the concrete walkway lined with brick and stone leading to the front porch, the three stone planters in the front yard, and the mature hemlocks on the property. The draft CLI plan for the Cook Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:11–12; see especially Supplementary Listing Record), the Cook Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The front porch, whether built anew or expanded in ca. 1970, likely replaced an earlier porch. Moreover, the porch does not detract from the building’s appearance and is in keeping with the design, scale, and feeling of the building. It also is similar to other historic porches found in the district. The two rear additions are inconspicuous and were constructed during the historic period. Thus, the Cook Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Hale Cabin (No. 15). The Hale Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road, near the intersection with the road leading to the New Elkmont Cemetery (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.61 to 6.65). This ca. 1914 cabin has a foundation of concrete block piers. The single-story frame building has a pyramidal roof of 5-v metal, and the exterior is board and batten. The interior chimney is cobblestone and concrete. Numerous additions have been added to the rear and north side of the structure, and the wraparound front porch has been infilled on the south side (perhaps during the historic period, however). The porch may have been expanded to the north in the 1970s and likely received new framing members at that time. The front (west) façade features two four-panel wood doors and both single and paired six-over-six sash windows. Similar windows are used throughout the cabin. The entry to the south side of the porch features a five-panel wood door flanked by four-over-four sash windows. A fourth entrance to the cabin is located at the southwest corner, where a set of concrete block steps with metal pipe rails lead to a five-panel wood door. The room containing the stone chimney and fireplace features vertical board walls, beaded board wainscoting, exposed roof framing, and four-panel wood doors. Similar detailing is found in adjoining spaces.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall poor condition (mainly at the rear additions), with a projected moderate to high renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Hale Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Bearwallow Branch, the mortared stone steps leading to the front porch, the row of five hemlocks along Jakes Creek Road, and the other mature hemlocks and tree masses on the property (including one hemlock surrounded by the cabin’s rear additions). The draft CLI plan for the Hale Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:12), the Hale Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Although the front porch may have been expanded to the north in the 1970s, it remains an open front porch as it was historically. The expansion of the porch and the use of later framing members are not major changes and do not detract greatly from the building’s overall design, scale, and feeling. The infilling of the porch’s south side, while a visible change, may have occurred during the historic period. Moreover, the infilled portion is set back from the plane of the façade and does not negatively impact the building’s design and feeling. The later rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. The north side additions are small in size, set back from the façade, and shielded by vegetation. Most of the building’s condition problems are located in and near the rear additions. Overall, then, the Hale Cabin

evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained sufficient structural integrity in its original section over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Gilliand Cabin (No. 18). The Gilliand Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road, just south of the road to the New Elkmont Cemetery (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.66 to 6.68). This ca. 1916 cabin, also known as Walnut Lodge, is a one-and-one-half-story log and frame building resting on stone and wood posts. Originally, it may have been a single-pen log cabin with a board and batten half-story added later. The logs are saddle-notched with concrete chinking. The chimney is stone and stucco, and the gable roof is covered with 5-v metal. On the main or east façade, there is a one-story porch recessed beneath the half-story. The porch has original unhewn wood columns, a railing of birch branches, and wood lattice at the cornice. Within the porch are a vertical board Dutch door and a 36-light window in the north side of the log section (a similar window is located in the south side of the section). Four 12-light windows are located at the upper story beneath the roofline. Similar windows as well as modern sliding sash windows are located on the north and south sides of the cabin. Additions have been built on the rear and the south side of the building. The main room on the first floor features exposed log and paneled walls, log beams at the ceiling, and a central stone chimney and fireplace with a log surround and a two-level log mantel shelf.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a projected low renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Gilliand Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location near Jakes Creek, the walkway with steps at the front porch, the retaining wall on the south side, the rear stairs and landing, the mature maples and hemlocks on the property, and the rock outcrop and yucca plants at the road. The draft CLI plan for the Gilliand Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:12), the Gilliand Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The upper half-story, while a later addition, most likely was built during the historic period. The building’s rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. The south side addition is small in size, set back from the plane of the façade, and shielded by vegetation. Thus, the Gilliand Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Thomas Cabin (No. 19). The Thomas Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road, south of the road to the New Elkmont Cemetery (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.69 to 6.71). This ca. 1910 cabin is a one-story log dwelling resting on wood posts. The exterior is log and board and batten, and the gable roof is covered with 5-v metal. A cobblestone and concrete chimney is on the south exterior wall. A full-width porch with log and branch supports and rails is located on the front (east) side. The north end of the porch features a single room sided with board and batten. The six-panel wood front door with transom is offset by a three-part window, consisting of a central 12-light window flanked by three-part casements. Each gable end features 12-light sash and board and batten siding in the

gable. Additions include a back porch using horizontal lap siding, and two extensions off the back porch of board and batten with board and batten enclosing the area below the north extension. There also is an exterior wood staircase off the rear wing. The main interior space features exposed log walls, log beams at the ceiling, and a stone and brick fireplace with two logs supporting the wood mantel shelf. Beaded board wainscoting is used in the rooms to the rear.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected low to moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Thomas Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the walkway leading to the front porch, and the stone edging and mature maple in the front yard. The draft CLI plan for the Thomas Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:12), the Thomas Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The infilling of the front porch’s north end, while visible, is not a major alteration and does not detract from the building’s overall design, use of materials, and feeling. The rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Thus, the Thomas Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

F. Andrews Cabin (No. 20) The F. Andrews Cabin (also known as Hemlock Cabin) is located at the northern end of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road, south of the road to the New Elkmont Cemetery (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.72 to 6.74). This ca. 1910 building rests on brick piers and is a one-and-one-half-story frame and log dwelling. The original building was a single-pen log cabin. It is possible that the half-story board and batten addition was added to the log cabin at an early date. The logs on the original section are unhewn and saddle-notched and exhibit concrete chinking. In 1956, a frame wing was added on the south side. It is clad in T1-11 siding. The log section at the front (east) façade exhibits a vertical board door with flanking four-light sash. The T1-11 section has a modern storm door and two-over-two horizontal sash windows. The half-story above displays log supports and a ribbon window of two-over-two, double-hung sash. Several additions have been added to the rear, including a wood deck at the southwest corner. The cabin has a gable roof of metal and an exterior chimney of cobblestone and concrete. The interior of the cabin was not examined during the recent survey.

Because the F. Andrews Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC’s own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at “Preliminary Condition Assessment” above).

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the wire mesh fence surrounding the front yard, the walkway lined with stone leading to the front door, the rear walkway and steps, and the mature hemlocks within the front yard. The draft CLI plan for the F. Andrews Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:13; see especially Supplementary Listing Record), the F. Andrews Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR

60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). Major, conspicuous alterations to the building include the 1956 frame addition covered with modern T1-11 siding and the modern deck off the south side. The 1956 addition abuts the south side of the building's original log section and is roughly half the width of the original section. It also is fitted with nonhistoric doors and window sash. The building's upper half-story likely was added during the historic period. Rear additions are inconspicuous and not visible from the front. Overall, the F. Andrews Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Noncontributing
TRC Recommendation:	Noncontributing (cabin) Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Andrews-Sherling Cabin (No. 21). The Andrews-Sherling Cabin is located at the northern end of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road, south of the road to the New Elkmont Cemetery (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.75 to 6.78). This ca. 1912 cabin was originally a long rectangle with a full-width, shed-roofed, screened porch on the south side. The foundation consists of wood posts resting on fieldstone, brick piers, and mortared stone. The exterior is weatherboard siding. The gable roof is covered with 5-v metal roofing, and an exterior cobblestone chimney is located on the south side (within the porch). Painted battens in the east side gables give the cabin a timbered look. The east gable of the main block contains a three-part, six-over-six window beneath a bracketed canopy. Similar windows are used throughout the building. A gabled wing extends from the north side of the main block, and a screened porch is located in the angle between this wing and the main block. The main entrance is within the screened porch and is marked by a five-panel wood door. A two-level rear addition (with sleeping rooms at the lower level) has board and batten and horizontal lap siding. The main interior space has beveled edge paneling, a beamed ceiling, and a stone veneer fireplace with a scalloped-edge shelf unit above it. Other rooms have similar detailing, and the interior doors are six-panel wood doors.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected low to moderate renovation expense (see "General Notes" for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Andrews-Sherling Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the screened fence surrounding the front yard, the walkway leading to the northeast corner porch, the stone entry steps and stone cheek walls, the stone planter off the cabin's southeast corner, and the mature oaks and hemlocks and rhododendron mass on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). A small concrete structure in Jakes Creek behind the cabin may have functioned as a fish holder, as it has both upstream and downstream openings, slots for wood gates, and a place for a wood top. The draft CLI plan for the Andrews-Sherling Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:13), the Andrews-Sherling Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The north side gabled wing and the northeast corner screened porch, while visible, were likely added during the historic period. They do not greatly detract from the building's overall design, use of materials, and feeling but instead compliment and balance the entire composition. Moreover, the use of wood battens in the front-facing gables has served to tie the original and later sections together in a unified whole. The rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Thus, overall, the

Andrews-Sherling Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Congleton-Brownlow Cabin (No. 22). The Congleton-Brownlow Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.79 to 6.82). This ca. 1915 cabin is a wide rectangle with a front-gabled front porch on the east side, a gable roof of asphalt shingles, and board and batten siding. While the porch rests on concrete and cobblestone piers, the main structure is on a stone foundation. The porch features log supports, brackets, and a truss in the gable. Logs serving as horse ties (the top one is missing) are located in the center of the front porch balustrade. A rear deck of pressure-treated lumber rests on 15-foot concrete block piers. A shed-roofed addition on the north side has a large picture window on its east side and a three-part window and a 12-light casement with a transom on its north side. Other windows on the cabin contain six- and eight-light sash. The main entrance contains a door with three vertical lights over a single, cross-braced panel. The door is flanked by pairs of two-over-two sash, which are in turn flanked by four three-over-three sash windows. The main interior space features composition board and board and batten at the walls, ceiling beams, and a stone and concrete chimney with a fireplace on the south side and a stovepipe opening on the north side.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected low to moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Congleton-Brownlow Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the stone planter walls in the front yard, the stone planter off the cabin’s northeast corner, and the mature hemlocks on the property. The draft CLI plan for the Congleton-Brownlow Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:13), the Congleton-Brownlow Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The north side addition, while visible, is small in size, shares the same siding and foundation materials, and does not detract from the building’s balanced façade or from its overall design, scale, and feeling. The rear deck is inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Thus, the Congleton-Brownlow Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

McDonald Cabin (No. 23). The McDonald Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.83 to 6.85). This ca. 1910 building is a single-story frame building with board and batten siding and a concrete block foundation. The hipped roof is covered with 5-v metal, and the interior chimney is cobblestone and concrete. Single-story wings extend from the higher main block on the north and south sides. A second-story addition with an outside wood staircase is located on the south side. These additions date to the historic period. A screened porch of modern materials is located on the rear; however, it is not visible from the front of the building. The center of the front (east) façade is marked by three 12-light casement windows with three five-light sash above. Five-light sash also are located at the north, south, and west sides of the main block, serving as clerestory

windows for the interior. A Dutch door entry is located at the northeast corner, and a double-door entry is situated at the southeast corner. The main central space features board and batten siding, exposed roof framing, and a large cobblestone and concrete chimney and fireplace in the rear corner.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the McDonald Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the path or dirt drive lined with stones at the front, the stone landing at the northeast corner entry, and the mature hemlock and butternut hickory on the property. The draft CLI plan for the McDonald Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:13), the McDonald Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The front and side wings or additions date to the historic period and exhibit the same exterior materials found on the rest of the building. The rear porch is inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Thus, the McDonald Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

W. Arnett Cabin (No. 24). The W. Arnett Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.86 to 6.88). This ca. 1912 building is a simple rectangle with a wood post and stone foundation, a clipped gable roof covered in 5-v metal, and board and batten siding. A cobblestone and concrete chimney is on the south exterior wall. A projecting gabled wing was constructed on the front façade in ca. 1970. The wing has wood shingles on the exterior, a north side chimney, and a multi-light bay window on the front. On the rear is a wood deck constructed in ca. 1970 that rests on metal columns, and a shed-roofed addition is located at the southwest corner. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey.

Because the W. Arnett Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC’s own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at “Preliminary Condition Assessment” above).

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, a mortared stone walkway and stone planter at the front, and mature hardwoods on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the W. Arnett Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:14), the W. Arnett Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alteration to the building is the ca. 1970 projecting gabled wing off the front façade, which has greatly changed the design, scale, and feeling of the building. The wing also features incompatible materials, such as wood shingle siding and a curved bay window at its front. The shed-roofed addition at the building’s southwest corner

and the modern deck at the rear are inconspicuous and are not visible from the front. Because of the large front wing, the W. Arnett Cabin evidences a major, conspicuous alteration to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
 Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Franklin Cabin (No. 25). The Franklin Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.89 to 6.91). This 1913 gabled ell plan building has a foundation of wood posts on fieldstone and concrete block. The exterior is board and batten. On the front or east side is a nonhistoric, front-gabled wing and a wraparound porch. On the rear are a modern deck built in 1970 and a shed addition with board and batten siding. The roof is covered with asphalt roll roofing, and two exterior chimneys (one stone and the other concrete block) are located on the south side. The front gable contains a group of three two-over-two windows at the east side and single two-over-two windows at the north and south sides. Within the porch, there are three wood-paneled doors and several one-by-one windows. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey.

Because the Franklin Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC’s own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at “Preliminary Condition Assessment” above).

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the crushed stone path bordered with stones leading to the front porch, the stepping stones leading to the creek, the three metal fence posts on the south property line, the outcropping of boulders in the front yard, and the mature hemlocks and hickories on the property. The draft CLI plan for the Franklin Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:14; see also the Supplementary Listing Record), the Franklin Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alteration to the building is the projecting gabled wing off the front façade, which has changed the design, scale, and feeling of the building. A concrete block chimney is located on the south side, although it is inconspicuous for the most part. The rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. According to the nomination, the building is considered one of the worst in regard to structural condition. Thus, the Franklin Cabin evidences a major, conspicuous alteration to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling and has apparently suffered a loss of structural integrity.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
 Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Hutchins Cabin (No. 26). The Hutchins Cabin (also known as Laurel Lodge) is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.92 to 6.93). This ca. 1912 building was originally a square block with a pyramidal roof and board and batten siding. Presently, it has a hipped roof covered with asphalt roll roofing. It has retained the board and batten siding and has a cobblestone and concrete chimney on the south wall. It rests on a stone foundation. A front-gabled porch with later framing has been grafted onto the front, or east, side of the building. Within the porch is a central door with six-lights over three panels, flanked by paired six-light sash. Four- and six-light sash are

utilized throughout the building. On the rear is a 1960 addition with a combination of board and batten and T1-11 siding. The interior of the cabin was not examined at the time of the recent survey.

Because the Hutchins Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC's own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at "Preliminary Condition Assessment" above).

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, a gravel parking area at the front, a walkway lined with stones and a planter at the front, and mature hardwoods, tree masses, and rhododendrons on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest or the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Hutchins Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:14; see also the Supplementary Listing Record), the Hutchins Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alteration to the building is the large, front-gabled porch, which has greatly changed the design, scale, and feeling of the building. The porch also features modern framing. The rear addition is inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Because of the large front porch, the Hutchins Cabin evidences a major, conspicuous alteration to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Noncontributing
TRC Recommendation:	Noncontributing (cabin) Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Gaines Cabin (No. 27). The Gaines Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.94 to 6.95). This ca. 1910 building rests on a combination of mortared stone, fieldstone piers, and wood posts on fieldstone. The exterior is board and batten, and the hipped roof is covered with 5-v metal. On the front wall is an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney. A porch was added on the east or front of the building in 1970, and a room at the south end of the porch was enclosed with board and batten. Within the porch are 10-light French doors and a single door with one light over three panels. The single door is flanked by six-light sash, and similar sash are utilized throughout the building. A two-story, shed-roofed porch has been constructed on the rear, and its foundation has been enclosed to create a partial basement. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey.

Because the Gaines Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC's own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at "Preliminary Condition Assessment" above).

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, a dry laid stone wall with steps at the front, a crushed stone path to the rear, a mortared stone deck overlooking the creek, and mature hardwoods, rhododendrons, and hibiscus on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest or the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Gaines Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:14), the Gaines Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape

features are recommended contributing to the district, however). Major, conspicuous alterations to the building include the 1970, nearly full-width front porch and the infilled south end of the porch, which have greatly changed the design and feeling of the building. The porch also contains a set of nonhistoric French doors. The rear addition is inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Limited structural problems are evident at the foundation. Overall, the Gaines Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
 Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Spengler-Schmid Cabin (No. 28). The Spengler-Schmid Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.96). This ca. 1912 building began as a simple rectangle with horizontal lap siding and a gabled roof covered with metal. The exterior is weatherboard, and an exterior brick chimney is located on the south wall. The foundation is a combination of mortared stone, wood posts on fieldstone, and concrete block. There is a wraparound porch with later framing on the east and north sides and a screened porch on the rear. Within the front porch is a four-panel wood door flanked by four-over-four sash windows. Similar windows are utilized throughout the building. A two-story, shed-roofed wing, added to the south side in ca. 1960, has T1-11 siding. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey.

Because the Spengler-Schmid Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC’s own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at “Preliminary Condition Assessment” above).

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, three dry laid stone walls in the front yard, a crushed stone walkway with two sets of steps leading to the front porch, a set of stone steps at the front porch, and mature hardwoods and rhododendrons on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest or the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Spengler-Schmid Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:15), the Spengler-Schmid Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alteration to the building is the ca. 1960, shed-roofed wing abutting the south side, which, because of its two-story height and use of modern T1-11 siding and aluminum windows, has greatly changed the design, scale, and feeling of the building. The rear porch is inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Because of the south wing, the Spengler-Schmid Cabin evidences a major, conspicuous alteration to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
 Contributing (cultural landscape features)

F. Arnett Cabin (No. 29). The F. Arnett Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.97 to 6.100). This ca. 1910, one-and-one-half-story, double-pen log dwelling rests on posts and timber on fieldstone. The full-width front porch, which is integral with the main roof, has a foundation of mortared stone. The exterior is unhewn, saddle-notched logs with concrete chinking. The usual cobblestone and concrete chimney is on the north exterior wall.

On the rear is a shed-roofed addition of frame and logs and a wood deck on concrete block piers. The addition is sided with wood shingles, and the roof area above the cabin's central dogtrot is elevated above the flanking roof surfaces. The dogtrot is screened at both ends. On the front or east side, the central screened door is flanked by paired, 16-light casement windows. Wood shingles and nine-light casements are found at the north and south gable ends of the building. A one-story shed addition of log construction, sided with wood shingles, extends from the cabin's north side. The interior of the north side features exposed log walls, exposed framing for the loft floor above—a similar loft is located above the south side of the cabin—and a large, mortared stone fireplace.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a projected low to moderate renovation expense (see "General Notes" for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the F. Arnett Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the dry laid stone walls at the property lines and near Jakes Creek Road, the two sets of stone steps along the north property line, the mature hemlocks at the front and south side, and the masses of rhododendrons and hibiscus in the front yard (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the F. Arnett Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:15), the F. Arnett Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The north side shed addition is small, of log construction like the main building, and partially hidden by vegetation. The rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Thus, the F. Arnett Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Contributing
TRC Recommendation:	Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)

Wright Cabin (No. 30). The Wright Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.101 to 6.103). This one-and-one-half-story frame dwelling, constructed in ca. 1921, has a gable roof covered with 5-v metal, board and batten siding, and a foundation of wood posts and stone. An exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney is located on the north wall. On the front or east is a full-width porch recessed beneath the half-story. Wood lattice serves as the porch balustrade and also is located at the cornice and around the central entry. Within the porch is a central, 15-light door flanked by paired six-over-six sash. Single and paired six-light sliding sash windows are located at the upper-floor level of the east and north sides and at both levels of the south side. Many of these windows display flanking louvered shutters. At the rear of the cabin is an enclosed screened porch with a gabled porch extension off its north end. A variety of materials in addition to board and batten have been used on the rear additions, including drop siding, tongue and groove flooring, and tarpaper. The main interior space within the main block features a composition board ceiling and walls, a high baseboard, and a stone and brick fireplace.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall poor condition (mainly at the rear of the building), with a projected high renovation expense (see "General Notes" for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Wright Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the dry laid stone walls at the property lines and across the front yard, the large stone planter near the road and the two small stone planters at the entrance to the front porch, the concrete and mortared stone walkway leading from the road to the front porch, and the mature hemlocks and rhododendron masses on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Wright Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:15), the Wright Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Although the latticework at the front porch may be a nonhistoric treatment, it is a minor change and does not detract from the building's overall design, scale, and feeling. The later rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Most of the building's condition problems are located in and near the rear additions. Overall, then, the Wright Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained sufficient structural integrity in its original section over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Matthews Cabin (No. 31). The Matthews Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.104 to 6.106). This ca. 1910, gable-roofed cabin, also known as Wilderness Lodge, is a double-pen, one-and-one-half-story log building resting on mortared stone and wood posts on fieldstone. The logs are hewn and square-notched with concrete chinking, and the roof is covered with 5-v metal. There is an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney on the south wall. The wraparound front porch was added in 1940. Portions of the balustrade are missing or rotted. Within the porch, there are two four-panel wood doors, with paired six-light sash above each entry. Groups of six-light sash also are located at the lower and upper levels of the log section's north side. The northwest corner of the porch is screened. Both levels of the cabin's south end feature six-over-six sash on either side of the chimney. On the rear of the building are a frame wing and a single-pen log wing. The former may date to 1940, while the log wing was either part of the original cabin or added in ca. 1920. The log wing has an exterior stone and concrete chimney on its north side, and directly north of it is a walled enclosure with no roof and a door opening in its north side. The interior was not accessible at the time of the recent survey.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the exterior of the building to be in overall good condition, with an unknown renovation expense at this point in time due to the lack of interior access. The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Matthews Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the dry laid stone retaining walls at the front of the property, the dirt path lined with stone from the front of the lot to the porch, the path along the north side of the cabin leading to the rear yard, the stone planter near the front porch, and the hemlocks, rhododendrons, hibiscus, and lecothe on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Matthews Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:15–16), the Matthews Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination

and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The front porch, though not original, was added during the historic period, and its simple, open plan does not negatively impact the design and feeling of the original building. The rear additions date to the historic period. Thus, the Matthews Cabin evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Little Cottage (No. 31A). The Little Cottage is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road, directly south of the Matthews Cabin (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.107 and 6.108). The cottage, built in ca. 1925, is a single-pen structure with a roof of 5-v metal, an exterior of board and batten, and a foundation of concrete block. A four-panel wood entrance door sits beneath a braced canopy on the east side. Two six-light sash under a braced canopy are located to the south. Similar sash appear on the structure’s north side. A shed-roofed, screened porch is located on the rear side. The interior was not accessible at the time of the recent survey.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the exterior of the building to be in overall good condition, with a projected low renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Little Cottage is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the drainage ditch to the north, the path from the adjacent Matthews Cabin, and the mature hardwoods and rhododendrons (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest or the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Little Cottage is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:16), the Little Cottage is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Viewed from the front and sides, the building appears unaltered. The rear porch may be a later addition, although it likely was built during the historic period. Thus, the Little Cottage evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Allen Cabin (No. 32). The Allen Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.109 to 6.111). This ca. 1910 one-story frame dwelling rests on fieldstone and concrete block piers. The exterior is board and batten, and there are two exterior chimneys of cobblestone and concrete. The cabin has a gable roof of 5-v metal. On the front or east side is a full-width, shed-roofed porch with a cobblestone and concrete deck and unhewn log support posts (one has collapsed). Within the porch, the main entry is flanked by six-over-six sash windows. One-by-one sliding sash windows are located at the north and south ends of the main block. The cabin has been added to about four times, including a large back porch and a rear deck built of modern materials. A stone pier, perhaps the base of a former chimney, is located on the south side of a southwest corner wing. The main interior space features a composition board ceiling and upper walls, lower walls clad with sheet paneling, and a stone and brick fireplace.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall poor condition, with a projected high renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Allen Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the drainage ditch to the north, the dirt walkway from the road to the front porch, the stone steps leading from the south side porch to the rear deck, the rock outcrop on the south side of the cabin, and the dogwoods, mature maple, and rhododendrons on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Allen Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:16), the Allen Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The later window sash on the north and south sides of the building is a minor change that does not detract from the building’s overall design, scale, and feeling. The southwest corner wing, while visible, is small in size and is set back from the façade at the plane of the rear wall. The later rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Many of the building’s most serious condition problems are located in and near the rear additions. Overall, then, the Allen Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained sufficient structural integrity in its original section over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Jeffords Cabin (No. 33). The Jeffords Cabin is located in the southern portion of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.112 to 6.113). This ca. 1920 building has a gable roof covered with asphalt roll roofing, weatherboard siding, and an interior chimney of cobblestone and concrete. The foundation of the main block is wood posts on fieldstone, while the ca. 1970 front porch rests on mortared fieldstone. On the north side of the building is an addition that extends from front to rear with non-matching horizontal siding. The shed porch on the rear has board and batten siding. The front or east façade has an entry door with three lights over three panels and two four-by-four sash windows. The door and windows are flanked by later louvered shutters. The other sides of the building display a mixture of window sash types and sizes. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey.

Because the Jeffords Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC’s own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at “Preliminary Condition Assessment” above).

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the dry laid stone wall at the north property line, the walkway at the south side lined in stone, the retaining/support wall at the rear of the cabin, the two stone planters in the front yard, the concrete landing and steps at the front porch, and the mature hemlocks on the property. The draft CLI plan for the Jeffords Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:16), the Jeffords Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alterations to the

building include the ca. 1970 front porch, the later north side addition, the mixture of siding materials, the mixture of window sash types and sizes, and the later shutters at the façade. These changes have greatly altered the design, scale, use of materials, and feeling of the building. The rear porch is inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Sagging of the roof and floor is apparent. Overall, then, the Jeffords Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling and appears to have lost at least some of its structural integrity.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
 Contributing (cultural landscape features)

McAmis Cabin (No. 34). The McAmis Cabin is located in the southern portion of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.114 to 6.116). This ca. 1920, one-story frame dwelling rests on a mixture of poles on fieldstone and old and new concrete block. The cabin has a hipped roof covered in 5-v metal, a board and batten exterior, and an exterior concrete and cobblestone chimney. There is a shed-roofed entry porch on the front or east façade. The main entry contains a five-panel wood door flanked by two pairs of six-over-six sash windows. Other window openings on the building contain six-over-six and six-by-six sash. The east roof slope exhibits a hipped dormer with a pair of louvered vents. On the rear is an attached storage shed and screened porch with a sleeping room underneath. The main interior space features paneled walls, a beamed ceiling, and a stone fireplace at the north wall.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a projected low to moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the McAmis Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the stone retaining wall and stone planter in the front yard, the stone walkways at the front and rear, and the mature hemlocks on the property. The draft CLI plan for the McAmis Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:16), the McAmis Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Viewed from the front and sides, the building evidences no apparent alterations. The north side of the rear screened porch (especially the northeast corner staircase) is somewhat visible. However, the staircase is small and set back from the façade at the plane of the rear wall. For the most part, the rear additions are inconspicuous and not visible from the front. Thus, the McAmis Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Culver Cabin (No. 35). The Culver Cabin is located in the southern portion of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.117 to 6.119). This ca. 1922 one-story frame cabin has a gable roof covered with 5-v metal, an exterior of nonhistoric weatherboard siding, two interior chimneys (one cobblestone and concrete, the other stuccoed), and a concrete block foundation covered with T1-11 siding. A partial-width, inset porch is located on the front or east side, and a lateral porch wing extends from the southwest corner of the building. Two decks connected by wood steps are located

at the rear. Within the front porch, an entry door with three lights over three panels is flanked by six-over-six sash windows. Single and paired six-over-six sash windows are utilized throughout the building. On the interior, the main room features a composition board ceiling and walls, a later stone fireplace, and six-panel wood doors leading to the adjoining spaces.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Culver Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the stone planter and walls in the front yard, the walkways along the south side of the building, the concrete steps and cheek walls at the entrance to the cellar (at the southwest corner porch), the maples and other hardwoods on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape), and the forsythia and boxwoods next to the cabin. The draft CLI plan for the Culver Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:17), the Culver Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The weatherboard siding, while not original, is in keeping with the simple design and feeling of the building. The T1-11 siding at the foundation is only visible on the north side of the building, where views are restricted by vegetation and by the proximity of the McAmis Cabin. The north end of the front porch may have been infilled; however, the infilled area is small, is contained within the porch, and does not greatly detract from the building’s overall design, scale, and feeling. The southwest corner wing is small in size and is set back from the façade at the plane of the rear wall. The rear decks are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Thus, the Culver Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Knaffl Cabin (No. 36). The Knaffl Cabin is located in the southern portion of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.120 to 6.123). This ca. 1910 one-story frame cabin has a gable roof covered with 5-v metal and asphalt roll roofing. The exterior siding includes both board and batten and wood shingles. The foundation is a mixture of post on stone, stone piers, concrete block, and mortared stone. The interior chimney is concrete and cobblestone. The original small front porch has been modified to a full-width screened porch. At the base of the porch are three six-light and one single-light sash windows. Within the porch are a four-panel front door and two pairs of six-light casements. Other windows throughout the cabin contain sash in six-over-six, eight-over-eight, and six-by-six configurations. A large, six-by-six-foot picture window has been added on the south wall. A kitchen, laundry room, side rooms, and a back porch have been added to the rear of the building. The main interior space off the front porch features vertical board walls, a beaded board ceiling, and a mortared stone chimney and fireplace at the south side.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall poor condition, with a projected high renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Knaffl Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location at the base of a steep ridge, the stone retaining wall along the road, the stepping stones from the road to the front porch, the rear concrete patio, and the row of six hemlocks along the road. The draft CLI plan for the Knaffl Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:17; see especially the Supplementary Listing Record), the Knaffl Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The use of board and batten and wood shingle siding and the presence of the large picture window are minor changes that do not detract from the building's overall design, scale, and feeling. The expansion of the front porch and the construction of the rear rooms likely occurred during the historic period. Moreover, the rear rooms are inconspicuous when viewed from the front. The most serious condition problems are located at the front porch and in the front section of the building. These problems, however, do not detract from the character of the building or override its status as a contributing building. Overall, then, the Knaffl Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained sufficient structural integrity over time to continue to reflect its historic character and its contributing status within the district.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Johnston Cabin (No. 37). The Johnston Cabin is located in the southern portion of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.124 to 6.126). This ca. 1920, gabled ell plan building has a board and batten exterior and a gable roof covered with 5-v metal. Fieldstone, wood posts on fieldstone, and concrete block make up the foundation. A modern screened porch wing extends from the east side and incorporates an earlier porch adjacent to the main block. This earlier porch contains a two-panel wood door and four 12-light sash windows. Other changes include an exterior concrete block chimney on the south side, a large picture window (ca. 1950) with flanking shutters on the north side, and smaller replacement windows of the same period on the west side. The south side contains a 1950s door under a later canopy roof and a single 12-light sash window. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey. Stone walls once associated with a barn are located to the east of the cabin.

Because the Johnston Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC's own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at "Preliminary Condition Assessment" above).

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location at the base of a steep ridge, the dry laid stone wall to the south of the cabin, the set of stone steps leading to the front porch, the row of fence posts to the north of the cabin along a former driveway, and the mature hemlocks and maple on the property. The draft CLI plan for the Johnston Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:17), the Johnston Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alterations to the building include the large, modern screened porch wing, which has incorporated an earlier porch and has greatly altered the overall design, scale, and feeling of the building. Other changes, which when taken together create a negative impact on the design and feeling of the building, include the large concrete block chimney, the ca. 1950 picture window with its later shutters, the 1950s replacement window sash,

and the 1950s door beneath the later canopy. Thus, the Johnston Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
 Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Byers (or Chapman) Cabin (No. 38). The Byers (Chapman) Cabin is located in the southern portion of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.127 to 6.130). This ca. 1912, one-and-one-half-story frame dwelling was owned by Col. David Chapman, one of the “fathers” of Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The cabin rests on posts and concrete block piers (shielded from view by wood slats), has a board and batten exterior, and is capped by a gable roof covered with 5-v metal. An interior brick stack protrudes from the west roof slope. There is a one-story entry porch on the front or east side. The front door has a single light over three panels and is flanked by side lights featuring a single light over a molded panel. The entry porch is in turn flanked by pairs of six-over-six sash windows. Similar windows, along with six-light sash and four-light awning sash, are used throughout the building. A half-story, screened sleeping porch was added later on top of the front porch. At the east roof slope, two shed-roofed dormers with a single-light window each were added. It appears that the entire south side may have been an addition. A one-story, shed-roofed porch is located at the back and ties into an adjacent landing and set of stairs, as well as a shed-roofed extension off the north side of the main block. The main interior space features board and batten siding, a composition board ceiling, a brick fireplace with a wood mantel at the west wall, and a staircase to the upper level at the south wall.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall poor condition, with a projected moderate to high renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Byers (Chapman) Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the stone grill off the cabin’s southwest corner, and the mature hardwoods, rhododendrons, and forsythia on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest or the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Byers (Chapman) Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:17; see especially the Supplementary Listing Record), the Byers (Chapman) Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The sleeping porch, while certainly visible, is in keeping with the historic use of the building and with its overall design and feeling. The dormers are small in size and do not detract from the building’s overall design, scale, and feeling. If, in fact, the south side is an addition, it appears that it was constructed during the historic period, as the building evidences a uniformity in its design and materials. The rear additions are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. The north side extension is small in size and is set back from the façade near the plane of the rear wall. The building’s condition problems are found throughout the structure. The problems, however, do not detract from the character of the building or from its historic association with Col. Chapman, nor do they override its status as a contributing building. Overall, then, the Byers (Chapman) Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained sufficient structural integrity over time to continue to reflect its historic character and association and its contributing status within the district.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Dudley Cabin (No. 39). The Dudley Cabin is located in the southern portion of the complex on the west side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.131 to 6.133). This ca. 1923 frame cabin has a gable roof covered with 5-v metal, weatherboard siding, an exterior concrete and cobblestone chimney on the south wall, and a concrete block, mortared stone, and wood post foundation. There is a full-length porch on the east or front that connects on the north with the original screened porch. The front door features three lights over three panels and is flanked by pairs of eight-light paired casements. A similar door and window arrangement is found at the north end porch, which is screened and covered with lattice. On the rear is an extension of the main block with an exterior concrete block chimney on the south side and a concrete block basement at grade level (containing a recreation room and kitchen). A redwood deck is located at the west end of the cabin at the creek. The main interior space features a drywall ceiling and walls and a mortared stone fireplace at the south wall.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair to good condition, with a projected “unknown” renovation expense, because the cabin could or could not require much intervention depending on the reuse option selected. The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Dudley Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its elevated location above Jakes Creek, the wood post and wire fencing near the road, the stepped walkway and landing on the south side, the adjacent concrete and stone “patio,” and the mature maples, hemlocks, and poplars between the cabin and the road. The draft CLI plan for the Dudley Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:17–18), the Dudley Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The later front porch likely replaced an earlier porch of the same configuration, and it does not detract greatly from the building’s overall design, scale, and feeling. The rear concrete block section and rear deck are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Thus, the Dudley Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Kuhlman Cabin (No. 40). The Kuhlman Cabin is located in the southern portion of the complex on the east side of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.134 to 6.139). The property includes a garage and an adjacent woodshed. The 1925 frame structure has a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles, an exterior of horizontal lap siding, and an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney on the south side (there also is an interior stone chimney). The cabin rests on a combination of mortared fieldstone and fieldstone piers. On the front or west is a front-gabled, screened porch with stone piers, a wood balustrade, and wood lattice at the foundation. This and a rear shed addition are the major alterations to the cabin. Within the front porch is the main entry door, a wood door with six lights over two panels. Windows within the porch and on the exterior of the structure contain both six-over-six and six-light sash in singles and in pairs. The consistency of design and materials give this cabin a sense of unity. The original wood entry gate is in front of the cabin along Jakes Creek Road. To the rear of the cabin is an original, one-story, single-bay garage with a gable roof, weatherboard siding, and double doors of vertical board design at the north end. A servant’s room is located at the south end and is accessible by its own entrance. Adjacent to the garage is a shed-roofed woodshed with horizontal siding and a stone and

concrete foundation. The main interior space of the cabin features a composition board ceiling and walls, a heavy wood baseboard, and a stone chimney and fireplace at the south wall.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the cabin to be in overall fair to good condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The garage is in good condition, with a projected minor renovation expense. The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations forms for the Kuhlman Cabin and garage are included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the buildings’ cultural landscape include the location at the base of a steep ridge, in an open area on a slight rise; the stone steps and entry feature at the road; the wire fence along the road and the gate at the gravel drive; the paths through the property, leading to the cabin and rear outbuildings; the many individual hardwoods and the areas of mixed hardwoods on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape); and the plantings near the cabin, such as juniper, coralberry, forsythia, and miscanthus. The draft CLI plan for the Kuhlman Cabin, garage, and woodshed is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:18), the Kuhlman Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The later front porch likely replaced an earlier porch of the same configuration, and the present porch does not detract from the building’s overall design, scale, and feeling. In fact, the porch gives the appearance of being original to the building. The rear addition is small in size and inconspicuous when viewed from the front. Thus, the Kuhlman Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:18), the Kuhlman Cabin garage and adjacent woodshed are recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the two buildings, along with their associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Other than a nonhistoric flush door at the south end of the garage, there are no apparent alterations to the buildings. Thus, the Kuhlman Cabin garage and adjacent woodshed evidence only minor alterations to their design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and they have retained their structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Contributing (cabin, garage, and woodshed)
TRC Recommendation:	Contributing (cabin, garage, and woodshed, and cultural landscape features)

McNabb Cabin (No. 41). The McNabb Cabin is the southernmost resource of the complex and is located on the east side of Jakes Creek Road where the creek crosses over the road (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.140 to 6.141). This ca. 1923, one-story frame structure has a gable roof covered with 5-v metal, an interior concrete block chimney, and a stone and wood pier foundation. About 1970, the exterior was covered with wood shingles (the east end still displays some board and batten siding, however). At the same time, a shed-roofed porch was added on the north side, and a storage shed was built at the northeast corner. The storage shed has vertical board siding. At the west end of the cabin is likely a former porch, now infilled and fitted with modern windows and sliding glass doors. A wood deck is located immediately to the south. Plastic skylights have been installed in the ceiling of the main room and the north side porch. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey. A small, ca. 1960, shed-roofed privy of vertical board construction is located to the rear of the cabin.

Because the McNabb Cabin and privy are noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC's own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the buildings was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at "Preliminary Condition Assessment" above).

The site-specific elements of the buildings' cultural landscape include the location at the base of a steep ridge, right on the east bank of Jakes Creek; the gravel entry drive leading to the cabin; the stone steps with pipe rails at the north porch; the stone retaining wall at the east end of the cabin; the nearby culvert and drainage channel; and the hardwoods, hydrangea, and boxwood on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the McNabb Cabin and privy is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:18), the McNabb Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alterations to the building include the wood shingle siding added in ca. 1970; the ca. 1970 shed-roofed porch on the north side; the ca. 1970 storage shed at the northeast corner; the infilled west end porch and adjacent deck; and the skylights in the ceiling of the main room and the north side porch. Thus, the McNabb Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:18), the McNabb Cabin privy is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the privy noncontributing to the district due to its recent age.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Noncontributing (cabin and privy)
TRC Recommendation:	Noncontributing (cabin and privy) Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Spence Cabin (or River Lodge). The Spence Cabin is the westernmost cabin of those lying between the Little River and the Little River Trail, within that portion of the Appalachian Club that extends out to the east (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.142 to 6.146). This ca. 1928 building consists of three sections joined at two obtuse angles. The center section is built of unhewn logs with concrete chinking. On the south or front side is a large cobblestone and concrete chimney, and a section of the chimney encloses the main entrance. The entrance opening is arched and contains a vertical board door with diagonal bracing. The west wing, which is divided into two sections with differing roof heights, has both horizontal and board and batten siding. At the south side of the westernmost section, there is a gable-roofed entry porch resting on stone piers, with wood lattice in the gable. A three-sided bay window is located at the west end. The east wing has weatherboard and board and batten siding. It appears that the westernmost section of the west wing (with the gabled entry porch) is the latest section of the cabin, owing to the fact that all other sections of the structure have log braces and fascias in the gables. The north side of the cabin features a shed-roofed, screened porch addition with a workroom/canning room below. Window openings contain sash in six-light, six-over-six, and four-over-four configurations. Many have flanking vertical board shutters. On the interior, the log section contains one large room, with log trusses at the ceiling, paneled walls, and a large stone fireplace. The two frame sections contain bedrooms, a kitchen, and bathrooms. The building has a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles and rests on a foundation of stone, concrete block, and wood posts. At the rear is a stone and concrete deck, and a separate deck of the same materials is located next to the Little River. There are stone and concrete entry gates on Little River Road (with attached wire fencing) and a second, smaller set of gate posts off the southeast corner of the cabin.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the cabin to be in overall good condition, with a projected minor renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Spence Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include those noted above, as well the following: the location between two ridges in close proximity to the river; the driveway and paths connecting the cabin with the road, the river, and neighboring cabins; the stone retaining walls scattered throughout the property; the stone entry walls and steps at the main entrance to the cabin; the stone entry feature off the east end of the cabin; the concrete and stone walkways and steps behind the cabin; the Japanese boxwoods, English ivy, and ferns near the cabin; and the mixed hardwoods throughout the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Spence Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:19), the Spence Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The west end of the west wing, although later, was likely built during the historic period. In design, scale, materials, workmanship, and feeling, it is in keeping with the rest of the building and serves to balance the east wing. The rear porch addition is small in size and inconspicuous when viewed from the front. Thus, the Spence Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Brandau Cabin. The Brandau Cabin is southeast of the Spence Cabin, between the Little River and the Little River Trail, and within that portion of the Appalachian Club that extends out to the east (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.147 to 6.149). This 1928 building is a one-story frame structure with a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles, drop siding, a stone foundation, and an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney on the south side. A front-gabled wing with an attached shed addition is located off the east end of the cabin. To the rear is a shed-roofed, screened porch, with a latticed storage room at the west end. A second front-gabled wing extends from the cabin’s west end. All additions are well integrated and finished with drop siding to match the original building. The main entry is located in the west side of the cabin and contains a vertical board door under a braced canopy roof. Windows contain sash in six-over-six and six-light configurations. A window grille made of logs is attached to the south-facing window of the west end wing. The main interior space features a composition board ceiling and walls, stained wood trim, and a large stone chimney and fireplace.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the cabin to be in overall good condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Brandau Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location between two ridges in close proximity to the river; the driveway connecting the cabin with the road; the stone retaining walls on the property; the stepping stones leading from a remnant fence and wall to the cabin; the stone planters along the west side of the cabin; the mortared stone patio at the main entry; the mortared stone patio at the river, with its stone grill; the concrete and stone steps at the rear porch; and the cleared and forested areas on the property. The draft CLI plan for the Brandau Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:19), the Brandau Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Although additions have been built off the east and west sides of the building, they are small in size and are set back from the front façade. They also are well integrated into the main building and are covered with the same siding to match. The additions may have been built during the historic period; they certainly do not detract greatly from the overall design, scale, use of materials, and feeling of the building. The rear porch and storage room are inconspicuous, not visible from the front. Thus, the Brandau Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Parrott Cabin. The Parrott Cabin is due east of the Brandau Cabin, between the Little River and the Little River Trail, and within that portion of the Appalachian Club that extends out to the east (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.150 to 6.152). This ca. 1928 frame building rests on a stone and wood post foundation and has weatherboard siding, an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney at the south wall, and a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles. The siding and asphalt shingles on the roof are recent alterations. A large rear porch addition with a loft above it extends from the north end of the cabin. A shed addition with an inset corner porch is located on the cabin’s east side. A single log supports the porch roof. The main entry, located within this porch, is fitted with a modern flush door. A small shed addition is attached to the south side of a west-facing wing. Windows contain sash in six-over-six, six-over-one, six-light, four-light, and two-over-two configurations. Several windows have flanking wood shutters with a clover design. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey.

Because the Parrott Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC’s own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at “Preliminary Condition Assessment” above).

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location between two ridges in close proximity to the river, the driveway connecting the cabin with the road (shared with the Brandau Cabin); the stone retaining walls on the property; the stone retaining wall and steps at the edge of the Little River; the natural swim area created at the Little River; the rock outcrops and tree masses on the property; and the cleared and forested areas on the property. The draft CLI plan for the Parrott Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:20; see also the Supplementary Listing Record), the Parrott Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alterations to the building include the recent siding; the large rear porch addition with loft above (which nearly doubles the size of the building); the shed addition on the east side (at the main entry); the modern front door; and the small shed addition on the west side (which blocks part of the original wall). Thus, the Parrott Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
 Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Murphy Cabin. The Murphy Cabin is the easternmost cabin of those lying between the Little River and the Little River Trail, within that portion of the Appalachian Club that extends out to the east (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.153 to 6.157). This ca. 1928 building appears to be original in all respects. The one-story frame building has a hip-on-gable roof of asphalt shingles, an exterior of board and batten, an interior foundation of cobblestone and concrete, an exterior foundation of wood posts, and a cobblestone and concrete chimney protruding from the east roof slope. There is a shed-roofed entry porch on the front or south side. The porch roof is supported by wood posts atop stone walls, each with an attached concrete bench. Metal trim with a corrugated edge is located at the porch cornice and at the cornice of the main hip roof. The main entry door is a vertical board door with nine small lights. Flanking the entry are two pairs of six-over-six windows, each with a vertical board shutter. Other windows throughout the cabin contain four- and six-light sash. On the rear is a screened porch, which is an extension of the building and the main roof; a pent roof above the porch openings provides protection from the weather. A portion of the main roof is raised to accommodate three-light clerestory windows. The main interior space features a high ceiling open to the roof framing, clerestory windows on three sides, paneled walls, and a large stone chimney and fireplace against the east wall.

Ten yards to the southeast of the main building is an original shed-roofed board and batten garage with two open bays. At the rear of the garage is a shed-roofed storage wing. Since 1993–1994, the roof of the garage has collapsed and much of the siding is missing. The shed wing also has partially collapsed and is missing some of its siding. About 20 yards to the southwest is a ca. 1980, one-story open gazebo with a gable roof. The gazebo was rebuilt at its original location based on an original design.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the cabin to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The garage is noted to be in poor condition and, in all likelihood, beyond saving. The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Murphy Cabin and garage is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include the location between two ridges in close proximity to the river; the walkway lined with stone leading to the main entry; the two stone planters in the front yard; the remnant fence along the road; the stone steps at the Little River; and the rock outcrops and hardwoods on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Murphy Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:20), the Murphy Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The building exhibits few, if any, alterations and has retained more architectural integrity than any other building in the district. Thus, the Murphy Cabin evidences few or no alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:20), the Murphy Cabin garage is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC does not concur with the existing nomination but instead recommends the building noncontributing to the district. Since 1993–1994, the roof of the garage has collapsed and much of the siding is missing (perhaps purposely removed). The attached shed wing also has partially collapsed and is missing some of its siding. Thus, the Murphy Cabin garage evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has lost its structural integrity.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:20; see also Thomason 1993:128), the Murphy Cabin gazebo is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC

concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the gazebo noncontributing to the district due to its recent age.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing (cabin and garage)**
 Noncontributing (gazebo)
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**
 Noncontributing (garage and gazebo)

Miller Cabin. The Miller Cabin is the westernmost cabin of those lying south of the Little River Trail, within that portion of the Appalachian Club that extends out to the east (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.158 to 6.162). This ca. 1928 building, originally a cantilever barn, was remodeled into a dwelling in ca. 1950. It is two stories in height, and it features a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles, a weatherboard and board and batten exterior, and an ashlar-faced concrete block foundation. A brick chimney protrudes from the south roof slope. The main entrance, reached via two staircases, is on the east end within a second-story screened porch. The west end exhibits double barn doors at the first level and a cantilevered balcony with a hip roof at the second level. Above the balcony is a diamond motif executed in painted wood slats (the same motif is in the east gable end). Barn-type openings with wood shutters are located at the first level on all sides, while the second-level openings are fitted with three-over-one sash and flanked with wood shutters with an applied evergreen tree symbol. At the roofline is a gable-roofed belfry with louvered vents. The interior of the first level follows a typical barn layout, with a central corridor running the length of the building and stalls on either side. The second-floor living spaces feature paneled walls, flush board ceilings, and wood-paneled doors.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the cabin to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Miller Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location along Bearwallow Branch at the base of a steep ridge; the mortared stone entrance gates at the Little River Trail; the dry laid stone walls along the path leading to the cabin; the rock outcrops near the cabin; the several large maples on the property; and the mixed hardwood areas (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Miller Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:21), the Miller Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. All of the alterations that were needed to transform the second level of the barn into dwelling space occurred in the historic period (i.e., over 50 years ago). The exterior changes—the balcony, the chimney, the entry stairs and porch, and the upper level windows—while visible, are mostly small in size and scale, and several have been located in inconspicuous places. Moreover, the changes do not detract greatly from the overall design, scale, use of materials, and feeling of the building. Thus, the Miller Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Faust Cabin. The Faust Cabin is located southeast of the Miller Cabin, within that portion of the Appalachian Club that extends out to the east (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.163 to 6.166). This ca. 1928

building is a one-story frame structure that has been altered several times. Walls have been removed to create interior spaces, and external porches are now part of the interior. On the east side, a shed-roofed porch was added in 1980. It has a flagstone floor, three log supports, and contains three pairs of 12-light casements, each of which consists of three, four-light, bi-fold sections. The building has a gable roof covered with 5-v roofing, weatherboard siding, a stone foundation, and an interior stone and concrete chimney. The main entry is in the north end of the cabin and features a modern door. Windows vary throughout the cabin and include four- and six-light casements, one-by-one casements, and four-light sash. A screened porch and a shed wing are located off the south end of the building. The main interior space features a flush board ceiling and walls, built-in shelves, and a large mortared stone chimney and fireplace. Adjacent to the cabin to the northwest is a ca. 1928, gable-roofed, frame, two-bay garage.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the cabin to be in overall good condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” for explanation). The assessment has found the garage to be in poor condition. The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Faust Cabin and garage is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location along Bearwallow Branch at the base of a steep ridge; the dry laid stone wall enclosing the yard; the remnant wood fencing along the tree line north of the cabin; the stone wing wall at the steam running behind the cabin; the small (10-foot-by-3-foot) mortared stone footbridge over Bearwallow Branch south of the cabin; the various hardwood trees and rhododendrons on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest or the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape); and the cleared and forested areas of the property. The draft CLI plan for the Faust Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:21), the Faust Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. A former south end porch has been enclosed and incorporated into the building. To its south, a screened porch and shed wing have been added. These later additions are smaller in scale than the main building and are inconspicuous for the most part, being located at the rear of the building. The 1980 east side porch is relatively small in size and is in keeping with historic porches found elsewhere in the district. Its materials blend with the building and its surroundings, and its open plan allows for unobstructed views of the building’s east side. The modern door is a minor alteration that is largely hidden by vegetation. Overall, the changes do not detract greatly from the design, scale, use of materials, and feeling of the building. Thus, the Faust Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:21), the Faust Cabin garage is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building contributing to the district. Other than some missing siding, there are no apparent alterations to the building. However, sagging in the roof and foundation has left the building in poor condition. But the lack of major alterations and the retention of overall character have served to override the finding of poor structural condition. Thus, the Faust Cabin garage evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained sufficient structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Contributing (cabin and garage)
TRC Recommendation:	Contributing (cabin, garage, and cultural landscape features)

Young Cabin. The Young Cabin is located east-southeast of the Faust Cabin, within that portion of the Appalachian Club that extends out to the east (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.167 to 6.168). This ca. 1930 one-story frame structure has a gable roof, modern board and batten siding, both an exterior and interior chimney of concrete and cobblestone, and a stone and concrete block foundation. False half-timbering has been added at the north and west sides of the cabin. Some steel jack posts have been installed under the house. At the northeast corner is a single-story screened porch, accessed by a wood deck in front of the cabin's north end. Windows on the north façade are original wood sash; however, the remaining windows are ca. 1960 jalousie and sliding metal sash. A five-panel wood door is located within the porch; however, the remaining doors throughout the cabin are modern. On the west side is a 1970 lateral, one-story wing with board and batten siding and a gable roof. It is connected to the main cabin by a small hyphen. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey.

Because the Young Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC's own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at "Preliminary Condition Assessment" above).

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location along Bearwallow Branch at the base of a steep ridge; the various rock outcrops and hardwood trees on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape); and the cleared and forested areas of the property. The draft CLI plan for the Young Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:20–21), the Young Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alterations to the building include the modern siding; the false half-timbering at the north and west sides; the later deck at the façade; the ca. 1960 window sash; the modern doors; and the 1970 west side wing and connecting hyphen. Thus, the Young Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Noncontributing
TRC Recommendation:	Noncontributing (cabin) Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Cambier Cabin. The Cambier Cabin lies directly north of the Young Cabin and is at the eastern end of that portion of the Appalachian Club that extends out to the east (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.169 to 6.172). This 1940 building, the last cabin to be built, is one-and-one-half stories high and has a gable roof covered with 5-v metal. The exterior siding is board and batten, and the entire structure has been upgraded with a continuous concrete block foundation (formed concrete piers are still visible at the corners). The interior chimney is brick covered with stucco. The main entrance is at the north side and consists of a single door with three lights over three panels flanked by six-over-six sash windows. The door lies beneath a canopy supported by wood brackets. Six-over-six windows are used throughout the cabin, except at the rear, where two modern windows have been installed. At the rear is a rotted wood staircase leading to an entry in the half-story. The entry contains a wood door with three lights over three panels that is flanked by a four-light and a six-light window. The only apparent addition to the cabin is the east side room, which also is enclosed in board and batten siding. The main interior space features a flush board ceiling and walls and a brick chimney stack with a stovepipe opening at the south wall.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the cabin to be in overall fair condition, with a projected moderate renovation expense (see "General Notes" for explanation). The

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Cambier Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location between two ridges in close proximity to the river; the wood fence along the Little River Trail; the wood chopping blocks near the fence; the path leading to the main entry; the concrete block steps and cheek walls at the main entry; the concrete sidewalk on the east side of the cabin; the rock outcrops surrounding the cabin; and the cleared and forested areas of the property. The draft CLI plan for the Cambier Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:20), the Cambier Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The east side addition, which likely was built during the historic period, is smaller in scale than the rest of the building and is set back from the façade. Like the main building, it is covered with board and batten siding and features a concrete block foundation. Its front-gabled orientation matches well with the multiple gables of the façade and the gable at the rear. The building's concrete block foundation also is a minor alteration; it matches the color of the original concrete piers and is mostly hidden behind numerous rock outcrops. The changes do not detract from the design, scale, use of materials, and feeling of the building. Thus, the Cambier Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Contributing
TRC Recommendation:	Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)

Wonderland Club Buildings

Wonderland Hotel. The Wonderland Hotel is located at the western end of the complex on a ridge overlooking the Little River and the paved entry road (see Figure 1.4; Figures 6.173 to 6.178). This two-story frame hotel was built in two stages. The front section that faces the Little River Railroad was constructed in 1912, while the two-story rear wing was added in ca. 1928 and contained the dining room on the first floor and rooms on the second floor. The building's hipped roof is covered with asphalt roll roofing. The exterior is weatherboard siding. The foundation is wood post and stone, and there are two interior brick chimneys. On the front or south side is a one-story wraparound porch or verandah with original wood columns and diagonal bracing. Both ends of the verandah have collapsed, and the portion still standing exhibits deterioration in many places. The low roof vents or dormers have collapsed and have allowed water to penetrate the building. Windows on all sides of the hotel follow a program of six-over-six, double-hung sash on the first floor and one-over-one, double-hung sash on the second floor. Windows are arranged in singles and pairs. Metal fire escapes are located at the east end of the front section, the east side of the rear wing, and the west side of the rear wing at its juncture with the front section. A shed-roofed canopy is located at the rear of the main section, and a weatherboard addition extends from the north side of the rear wing. The hotel's former concrete block loading dock is located on the west side of the rear wing.

The first floor contains the former lobby, social room, and ballroom in the original section. Drywall and acoustical tiles that had been added to the social room and ballroom have been removed as part of the clean-up process within the building. The former ballroom has a post and lintel central support system with diagonal bracing. In the northeast corner is a raised wooden stage. The dining room, part of the later addition, has its original flooring with alternating strips of light and dark wood.

Access to the second floor is by stairwell from the lobby. Originally an open stair, it was enclosed in 1972 to meet fire code. There are 27 rooms arranged on either side of a central corridor. While the wood floor is original, hallway walls were covered with drywall in 1985. The rooms have wood paneling added in 1965 and dropped ceilings installed in ca. 1980.

In May 2001, the Historic Preservation Training Center of the National Park Service conducted a condition assessment of the Wonderland Hotel and submitted a report with recommendations to GRSM (McGrath 2001). Of the stabilization recommendations made in the report, GRSM accomplished the following using FY2000 stabilization funds: removal of trash and debris from the interior, and installation of interior supports to stabilize the second floor (particularly at the south end of the building and at the juncture of the main section and the rear wing).¹⁵ Prior to receiving the report, GRSM had already installed a security fence around the hotel and had sealed all doors at the first and second floors.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a projected high renovation expense (see “General Notes” above). Including work at the Wonderland Hotel Annex, the total cost for the hotel complex could be well over \$1,000,000. It is important to note that when the impact analysis is carried out later in the process, a more detailed cost analysis will be undertaken as well, since the scope of the alternatives will be known, and it will be possible to establish refined cost figures, not simply estimates. Of course, as with any rehabilitation/construction/demolition project, issues will arise during the actual work that will result in additional costs not anticipated or included in the refined cost figures established during the impact analysis. The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Wonderland Hotel is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop above the Little River; its placement at the center of the complex that includes the Wonderland Hotel Annex and the Servants’ Quarters; the gravel parking lot to the east; the former loop road to the west; the basketball court to the east; the stone planters at the base of the verandah; the circular planter in front of the hotel; the stone and concrete walls and steps that lead down to the road; the two planters at the base of the steps; the scattered hardwoods and rhododendrons on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest or the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape); and the larger forested areas beyond. The draft CLI plan for the Wonderland Hotel is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:22–23), the Wonderland Hotel is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Minor alterations to the building include the shed-roofed canopy to the rear of the main section, the addition at the north side of the rear wing, and the later loading dock on the west side of the rear wing. These additions are small in size and relatively inconspicuous, and they do not detract from the design, scale, use of materials, and feeling of the building. Areas of deterioration are concentrated at the façade and at the juncture of the main section and the rear wing. All other areas are in fair condition. Thus, the Wonderland Hotel evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its overall structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Contributing
TRC Recommendation:	Contributing (hotel and cultural landscape features)

¹⁵ GRSM spent approximately \$40,000 on stabilization measures in FY2000. The bulk of the money was spent to stabilize the Wonderland Hotel.

Wonderland Hotel Annex. The Wonderland Hotel Annex is located at the westernmost end of the complex on a ridge overlooking the Little River and the paved entry road (see Figure 1.4; Figures 6.179 to 6.183). This two-story frame building was built in 1920 to serve as additional guest accommodations. It is about ten yards west of the Wonderland Hotel. The first floor contains a social room and guest rooms, while the upper floor is entirely devoted to guest rooms. The building has a hipped roof, weatherboard siding, a large exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney at the south wall, and a stone and wood post foundation. There also is an exterior brick chimney at the rear, next to an exterior staircase clad in corrugated fiberglass. The Annex was designed with flanking one-story porches on the east and west sides near the front; however, the east side porch has collapsed. The west side porch exhibits log supports and framing members. Windows on all sides of the hotel tend to follow a program of one-over-one, double-hung sash on the first floor and six-over-six and two-over-four, double-hung sash on the second floor. Windows are arranged mostly in singles. The south end chimney is flanked by two window groups, each consisting of three six-light casements with four-light transom windows above.

The interior of the Annex has original wood floors and unfinished board ceilings. The large stone fireplace sits at the south wall of the social room, while two large vertical logs support the ceiling beams at the point of entry to the stairhall and guest rooms on the opposite wall. The social room also has tongue and groove beaded board walls. The original staircase leads to the second floor. There are 24 rooms in the Annex. Some of the rooms have ca. 1950 wood paneling. The hallways on both floors retain the original tongue and groove walls, and doors leading to the rooms also are original.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair to good condition, with a projected high renovation expense (see “General Notes” above). Including work at the Wonderland Hotel, the total cost for the hotel complex could be well over \$1,000,000. It is important to note that when the impact analysis is carried out later in the process, a more detailed cost analysis will be undertaken as well, since the scope of the alternatives will be known, and it will be possible to establish refined cost figures, not simply estimates. Of course, as with any rehabilitation/construction/demolition project, issues will arise during the actual work that will result in additional costs not anticipated or included in the refined cost figures established during the impact analysis. The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Wonderland Hotel Annex is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop above the Little River; its placement within the complex that includes the Wonderland Hotel and the Servants’ Quarters; the former loop road to the east; the scattered hardwoods, rhododendrons, and mountain laurel on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest or the rhododendrons in the context of the cultural landscape); and the larger forested areas beyond. The draft CLI plan for the Wonderland Hotel Annex is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:23), the Wonderland Hotel Annex is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The only apparent alteration or addition to the building is an exterior staircase clad in corrugated fiberglass. The staircase is located at the rear of the building in an inconspicuous area, and it does not detract from the building’s design, scale, use of materials, and feeling. The main area of deterioration is at the east side of the building near the façade, where a one-story porch has collapsed. All other parts of the building are in fair to good condition. Thus, the Wonderland Hotel Annex evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its overall structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (hotel annex and cultural landscape features)**

Wonderland Hotel Servants' Quarters (aka Riordan Cabin). The Wonderland Hotel Servants' Quarters is located at the west end of the complex behind the Wonderland Hotel (see Figure 1.4; Figures 6.184 to 6.185). The building sits on the back edge of the ridgetop above Catron Branch. This ca. 1930, one-story frame building has a gable roof of asphalt shingles, asbestos shingle siding, an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney, and a foundation of wood posts. The only alterations to the exterior are the replacement of round wood support posts with square pressure-treated posts and addition of later aluminum jalousie windows on all four sides of the building (one six-over-six sash window survives at the west end). The wood-panel door at the west end has been replaced by a jalousie door. All entrances to the building feature gabled canopy roofs with wood brackets. The interior has been partially remodeled, but the original material remains behind the modern paneling. Some of the rooms have retained their original plank walls and doors. The interior of the main space features an acoustical tile ceiling, paneled walls, and a stone fireplace with a stovepipe opening above.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a likely projected moderate to high renovation expense (see "General Notes" above). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Wonderland Hotel Servants' Quarters is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop above Catron Branch; its placement within the complex that includes the Wonderland Hotel and Annex; the path that leads to the access road; the scattered hardwoods on the property (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape); and the larger forested areas beyond. The draft CLI plan for the Wonderland Hotel Servants' Quarters is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:23), the Wonderland Hotel Servants' Quarters is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The replacement of the round foundation support posts with modern square support posts is a minor alteration and can only be viewed from the rear of the building. The nonhistoric jalousie windows and door, while visible, do not detract greatly from the building's overall design, scale, use of materials, and feeling. Thus, the Wonderland Hotel Servants' Quarters evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

May or Moore Cabin. The May or Moore Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on a ridgetop above Catron Branch (see Figure 1.4; Figures 6.186 to 6.189). The building is a two-story rectangular structure with a gable roof covered with asphalt roll roofing and an enclosed back porch or sleeping porch. The siding is board and batten. The cabin rests on a wood post and stone foundation and has an exterior wall cobblestone and concrete chimney at the west end. Built in 1917 by Frank May, the cabin was extensively remodeled in 1921 with the addition of a low railing of concrete and cobblestones at the full-width, shed-roofed porch, and the construction of a chimney, interior walls, and a staircase. It appears there have been no other alterations since that time. The main entrance is located in the south side and contains a wood-paneled door flanked by six-over-six sash windows. Windows found elsewhere on

the cabin contain six-over-six, four-light, and six-light sash. The main interior space features exposed framing, wallboard at the walls, and a mortared stone fireplace at the west wall.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a likely projected low to moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” above). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the May or Moore Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop above Catron Branch; the planting areas edged with stone at the front of the property; the set of stone steps leading to the front porch; the stone wall off the west end of the cabin; and the mixed hardwood forest surrounding the cabin (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the May or Moore Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:24), the May or Moore Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Major alterations to the building occurred during the historic period, but since that time only minor changes (such as the installation of a wood lattice skirt at the rear foundation) have been made. Thus, the May or Moore Cabin evidences only minor alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Paine Cabin. The Paine Cabin is located two-tenths of a mile northeast of the Wonderland Hotel on the north bank of Catron Branch (see Figure 1.4; Figure 6.190). This one-story frame structure was built in ca. 1928. It has a gable roof of standing seam metal, the exterior is board and batten, and it rests on a stone foundation. There is an interior chimney of cobblestone and concrete. The original building was a single block with a full-width back porch (currently the west section of the cabin). Another block of similar shape and size was added later and offset from the first section slightly. The whole structure has a unified appearance. Windows with six-over-six and six-light sash are used throughout the entire structure. The main entrance is in the north side of the original section, near the juncture with the later addition. The interior of the cabin was not examined during the current survey.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall fair condition, with a likely projected moderate renovation expense (see “General Notes” above). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Paine Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building’s cultural landscape include its location on the north side of Catron Branch; the long gravel drive to the Old Elkmont Cemetery road; the stone and concrete pad in front of the cabin’s west section; and the mixed hardwood forest surrounding the cabin (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Paine Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:24), the Paine Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The addition of the offset block to the original building likely occurred during the historic period,

as there is a uniformity in design, materials (the siding and the window sash), and feeling. The scale of the addition is smaller than that of the original block, and combined with the offset location, the addition does not detract greatly from the original building's design, scale, and feeling. Thus, the Paine Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Preston Cabin. The Preston Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on a ridgetop above Catron Branch (see Figure 1.4; Figures 6.191 to 6.192). Constructed in 1922 on a gabled ell plan, the building was remodeled in ca. 1930. A single-story frame dwelling, it has an exterior of cedar shingles, a cobblestone and concrete chimney on the south exterior wall, and a concrete and cobblestone foundation. There is a wraparound, screened porch on the front (south) side and a shed-roofed, screened porch on the rear side (with a basement below). The main entry is contained within the wraparound porch. Windows with six-over-six, six-light, four-light, and single-light sash are used throughout the structure. The building presents a very unified appearance. The main interior space features a flush board ceiling and walls, a stone and concrete chimney and fireplace, built-in shelves, and a wood-paneled door.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a likely projected moderate renovation expense (see "General Notes" above). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Preston Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop above Catron Branch; the retaining walls along the road in front of the cabin; the stone steps with pipe rails that lead to the front porch; the stone steps at the northwest corner; the rear patio with built-in grill and bench swing; and the mixed hardwood forest surrounding the cabin (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Preston Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:24), the Preston Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Major alterations to the building occurred during the historic period, but since that time only minor changes have been made. These changes might include the rear additions (which are inconspicuous when viewed from the front); however, the additions may have been part of the alterations made in ca. 1930. A portion of the wraparound porch on the east side might have been infilled in the past; however, the infilled area fits seamlessly with the overall building and may have been original or part of the ca. 1930 remodeling. In design, scale, materials, and feeling, the building presents a very unified appearance. Thus, the Preston Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Bowman or Brown Cabin. The Bowman or Brown Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on a ridgetop above the Little River (see Figure 1.4; Figures 6.193 to 6.194). It is set back from the access road up a moderately pitched slope. Constructed in 1913, the cabin was purchased by the E. L. Bowman family in 1920. At that time, it consisted of a single large room and a bedroom. Forty years later, it was purchased by the Fred Brown family, who extensively remodeled it in 1974, adding plywood and batten

and wood shingle siding, a large screened porch on the south side, and a basement. The cabin features modern sliding sash windows and flush doors and plywood-sided additions at the north and east sides. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey.

Because the Bowman or Brown Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC's own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at "Preliminary Condition Assessment" above).

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop above the Little River; the remnant wood fence near the access road; the path leading to the cabin from the road; the terrace with the log retaining wall off the east side of the cabin; the walkways lined in stone on three sides of the building; the mortared stone patio at the west end of the cabin; the steps, pipe rails, stone column, and "rock" chair at the main entry (north side); the rhododendrons at the northeast corner of the building; and the mixed hardwood forest surrounding the cabin. It should be noted, however, that no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the rhododendrons or the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape. The draft CLI plan for the Bowman or Brown Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:24), the Bowman or Brown Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alterations to the building (undertaken in 1974 and later) include the plywood and batten and wood shingle siding, the large screened porch on the south side, the basement, the modern sliding sash windows and flush doors, and the plywood-sided additions on the north and east sides. Thus, the Bowman or Brown Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Noncontributing
TRC Recommendation:	Noncontributing (cabin) Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Hicks Cabin. The Hicks Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on a ridgetop above the Little River (see Figure 1.4; Figures 6.195 to 6.196). It is set back from the access road up a moderately pitched slope. Constructed in ca. 1918, this one-story frame dwelling was built on the gabled ell plan with a screened porch on the west side of the projecting gabled bay. The rear (south) side of the building contains a screened porch in the east half and a glazed porch (utilizing adjustable awning sash) in the west half. A small shed-roofed addition is located at the southeast corner of the building. The cabin has a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles, and the exterior is covered with a combination of vertical beadboard and tongue and groove flooring, both of which are interior materials. There is an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney at the west end, and the foundation is a combination of brick piers, timber posts, and timber poles—the latter two resting on either concrete block or fieldstone. Although the mixture of siding and foundation supports destroys some continuity, the overall appearance is not severely affected. Wood-paneled doors and two-over-two sash windows are used throughout the cabin. The main interior space features composition board and paneled walls, an acoustical tile ceiling, and a mortared stone fireplace at the west wall.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a likely projected low to moderate renovation expense (see "General Notes" above). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Hicks Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop above the Little River; the remnant fencing and the brick and stone walls at the road; the brick and concrete path with a metal pipe rail leading up to the cabin; the planting areas and walkways lined in stone at the cabin's west end; and the mixed hardwood forest surrounding the cabin (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Hicks Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:24–25), the Hicks Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. Additions to the building include the small shed-roofed addition at the southeast corner and the two porch additions at the rear. All are inconspicuous and not visible from the front. The use of different siding materials and foundation supports is a minor alteration, as the foundation is not that conspicuous, and the siding tends to blend together in a unified whole. In design, scale, materials, and feeling, then, the building presents a very unified appearance. Thus, the Hicks Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

McMillian/Keith Cabin. The McMillian/Keith Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on a ridgetop above the Little River (see Figure 1.4; Figure 6.197). It is set back from the access road up a moderately pitched slope. Constructed in ca. 1922, this one-story frame dwelling has a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles, an exterior of T1-11 siding, and a concrete block foundation. The T1-11 siding was added in 1972. On the front or north side is an original inset porch, and on the rear is a large, modern, full-width screened porch resting on concrete blocks and metal posts. The roof of the rear porch has collapsed and is resting on the porch deck. For the most part, the cabin's windows contain six-light sash in single units or pairs. The interior of the cabin was extensively remodeled in the early 1970s. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey, however.

Because the McMillian/Keith Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC's own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at "Preliminary Condition Assessment" above).

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop above the Little River; the stone retaining walls at the road; the dirt path with stone steps that leads to the cabin; and the cleared and forested areas surrounding the cabin. The draft CLI plan for the McMillian/Keith Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:25), the McMillian/Keith Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alterations to the building (undertaken in the early 1970s and later) include the T1-11 siding, the concrete block foundation, and the extensive interior changes. The modern rear porch (now partially collapsed) is inconspicuous when viewed from the front. Overall, the McMillian/Keith Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Vandergriff Cabin. The Vandergriff Cabin is located in the middle of the complex on the south side of the road that winds through the Wonderland Club area (see Figure 1.4; Figure 6.198). Constructed in ca. 1925, the one-story frame structure has a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles and a cast concrete foundation. There also is an interior stone and concrete chimney. The original exterior of board and batten siding was replaced in ca. 1972 with the present plywood and batten strip panels. At the same time, a nearly full-length shed porch was added on the east side. A basement-level entry is located at the northeast corner, and a handicapped-access ramp and landing are located at the southwest corner. Windows feature modern sliding sash or paired six-light sash. The interior has retained most of its original fabric, although it was not examined at the time of the recent survey. Of historical interest is the fact that Tennessee Governor Austin Peay was part owner of the cabin.

Because the Vandergriff Cabin is noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC's own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at "Preliminary Condition Assessment" above).

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop; the stone retaining wall and steps at the road (to the west); the set of steps leading up to the entry porch; the mortared stone deck of the porch and the adjacent stone retaining wall; and the cleared and forested areas surrounding the cabin. The draft CLI plan for the Vandergriff Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:25), the Vandergriff Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). The major, conspicuous alterations to the building (undertaken in ca. 1972 and later) include the replacement plywood and batten siding, the nearly full-length east side porch, the handicapped-access ramp and landing at the southwest corner, and the modern sliding sash windows. Thus, the Vandergriff Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing (cabin)**
Contributing (cultural landscape features)

Tate, Beaman, and Tucker Cabin. The Tate/Beaman/Tucker Cabin is located toward the eastern end of the complex on the south side of the road that winds through the Wonderland Club area (see Figure 1.4; Figures 6.199 to 6.200). Constructed in ca. 1926, the cabin is a long rectangle with screened porches at the north and south ends. The main entry is located within the north porch. The exterior is clad with drop siding, and there is an exterior concrete and fieldstone chimney on the east wall. The foundation is concrete and fieldstone on the perimeter and posts on concrete or fieldstone beneath the cabin. The building has a full basement. Windows mostly contain four- and six-light sash. A small shed-roofed addition is located at the southeast corner of the cabin. The main interior space features exposed framing and a mortared stone fireplace. The cabin appears to have retained much of its original appearance.

The preliminary condition assessment conducted by the TRC team has found the building to be in overall good condition, with a likely projected moderate renovation expense (see "General Notes" above). The Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations form for the Tate/Beaman/Tucker Cabin is included in Appendix 2.

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop; the high stone retaining wall at the road; the concrete stairs with handrails that lead to the front porch; the stone-lined path on the west side; the various stone retaining walls on the east side; and the mixed hardwood forest around the cabin (although no information is currently available to determine the actual significance of the mixed hardwood forest in the context of the cultural landscape). The draft CLI plan for the Tate/Beaman/Tucker Cabin is included in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:25), the Tate/Beaman/Tucker Cabin is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building, along with its associated cultural landscape features, contributing to the district. The only noticeable alteration to the building is the loss of some window sash on the east side. A small addition is located at the southeast corner of the building, but it has a shallow profile and is inconspicuous when viewed from the front. Thus, the Tate/Beaman/Tucker Cabin evidences only minor or inconspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (cabin and cultural landscape features)**

Richards or Brandau Cabin. The Richards or Brandau Cabin is located at the east end of the complex, on the south side of the road that winds through the Wonderland Club area (see Figure 1.4; Figure 6.201). Constructed in ca. 1920, the building has a gable roof of 5-v metal and asphalt shingles, an exterior of weatherboard and drop siding, the usual cobblestone and concrete chimney on an exterior wall, and a foundation of cast concrete and stone on the perimeter and fieldstone or posts on fieldstone beneath the building. On the east side, there is a shed-roofed addition and a shed-roofed porch with an attached wood deck. A shed-roofed addition also is located on the west side. The interior was not examined at the time of the recent survey. Described as the worst of the Wonderland Cabins in regard to its structural condition, the building has lost most or all of its structural stability and has a damaged roof in several places. Portions of a fallen tree lie on the roof, and the same or another tree has fallen at the cabin's north end, removing part of the roofing and the top of the north wall. The cabin's main entry is at the north end, via a wood-paneled door under a canopy roof (which has been damaged by the fallen tree). The cabin's windows contain a variety of both historic and modern sash types and do not seem to follow a set pattern. To the east of the cabin is a small woodshed with vertical board walls and an asphalt roll roof. The south end of the shed has collapsed and the roof is presently caving in.

Because the Richards or Brandau Cabin and woodshed are noncontributing, as per the nomination and TRC's own recommendation (see below), no preliminary condition assessment of the building was conducted by the TRC team (see opening paragraph at "Preliminary Condition Assessment" above).

The site-specific elements of the building's cultural landscape include its location on a ridgetop; the long driveway connecting the cabin with the access road; the dirt path between the driveway and the cabin; the concrete steps and landings on the east side of the building; the stone retaining walls near the woodshed; the mortared stone patio with four raised planters at the cabin's north end; the stone planter at the northwest corner; and the cleared and forested areas surrounding the cabin. The draft CLI plan for the Richards or Brandau Cabin is presented in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:25–26; see also the Supplementary Listing Record), the Richards or Brandau Cabin is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the building noncontributing to the district (the associated cultural landscape features are recommended contributing to the district, however). Major, conspicuous alterations include the mixture of roofing, siding, and window sash types;

the east side shed addition; the east side wood deck; a modern east side door; and the west side shed addition. In 1993–1994, the structural condition of the building was described as the worst among Wonderland Club cabins. Since then, the condition has deteriorated further, as a tree has fallen on the building, damaging the roof in several places, damaging the canopy roof above the main entry, and removing the top of the north wall. Thus, the Richards or Brandau Cabin evidences major, conspicuous alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has lost its structural integrity.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:25–26), the Richards or Brandau Cabin woodshed is not mentioned. However, in conjunction with the nomination’s recommendation that the Richards or Brandau Cabin in noncontributing and as per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC recommends the building noncontributing to the district. The building evidences no major, conspicuous alterations. However, the south end of the shed has collapsed, and the roof is presently caving in. Thus, the Richards or Brandau Cabin woodshed appears to have lost its structural integrity.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Noncontributing (cabin) Not mentioned (woodshed)
TRC Recommendation:	Noncontributing (cabin and woodshed) Contributing (cultural landscape features)

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURES AND ABOVEGROUND SITES

The **Little River Stone Bridge** (Bridge 47) crosses the river at the northern end of the Appalachian Club area (see Figure 1.5; Figure 6.202). The bridge is a four-span, 201-foot-long, concrete structure with limestone facing, corrugated metal inside each of the four arches, and a keystone at the top of each arch (Blythe n.d.:7:6). The bridge was constructed in ca. 1940 by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). A draft CLI plan depicting the bridge is included in Appendix 3. As noted in Chapter 4, the Little River [Stone] Bridge is addressed in the pending Park Development Historic District.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:21), the Little River Stone Bridge is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the bridge contributing to the district. The bridge evidences no apparent alterations, and it has retained its structural integrity. According to a recent assessment, the bridge is “in fair to good overall condition” (T N & Associates 2002a:8). Thus, the Little River Stone Bridge evidences no apparent alterations to its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination:	Contributing
TRC Recommendation:	Contributing

The site of the **Little River Swimming Hole** is one-tenth of a mile southeast of the Little River Stone Bridge (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.203 to 6.205). A dam composed of rocks and logs once was used to trap water at that location. The swimming hole had been a traditional recreational area since the second decade of the twentieth century. The area of the former pool is still intact, although only fragments of the dam survive. In addition, a portion of a nearby CCC walkway is located to the west-southwest. A draft CLI plan depicting the swimming hole is included in Appendix 3. The surviving section of CCC walkway might contribute to the pending Park Development Historic District (see Chapter 4).

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:21), the Little River Swimming Hole is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the site contributing to the district. Although most of the dam has been dismantled over time, the general outline of the swimming hole remains visible, and a nearby CCC

walkway that accessed the swimming hole is still mostly intact. Thus, the Little River Swimming Hole retains sufficient integrity to communicate its historic use and design.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing (swimming hole and dam and walkway remnants)**

The Bearwallow Creek Bridge (Structure 47B) is a cobblestone and concrete bridge located between the Young and Faust Cabins (see Figure 1.5; Figure 6.206). Built in ca. 1930, it is a small, single-arch pedestrian bridge with a deck of poured concrete. Six square stone piers line each side of the bridge along the deck. The piers are connected by rebar, and the pair of piers at the south end appears to have connections for light fixtures. A draft CLI plan depicting the bridge is included in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:22), the Bearwallow Creek Bridge is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the bridge contributing to the district. The only alteration appears to be the loss of two lamps at the south end. This is a minor change that does not detract from the bridge's design, use of materials, workmanship, and feeling. Based on physical observation alone, the bridge appears to be in fair to good condition. Thus, the Bearwallow Creek Bridge evidences only minor alterations and has retained its structural integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing**

The **Old Elkmont Cemetery** is located northwest of the Wonderland Hotel (see Figure 1.4; Figure 6.207). There are approximately fifty graves dating from 1910 to the present. The cemetery served both the community of Elkmont and the surrounding area. A draft CLI plan depicting the cemetery is included in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:26), the Old Elkmont Cemetery is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the site contributing to the district. The cemetery evidences no apparent alterations, and it has retained its historic character and appearance. Thus, the Old Elkmont Cemetery evidences no apparent alterations to its design, setting, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing**

The **New Elkmont Cemetery** (aka Jakes Creek Cemetery) is located west of Jakes Creek (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.208 and 6.209). It was dedicated in 1928 and contains the graves of many of the early Elkmont residents. A draft CLI plan depicting the cemetery is included in Appendix 3.

In the Elkmont Historic District nomination (Thomason et al. 1993:7:22), the New Elkmont Cemetery is recommended contributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the existing nomination and recommends the site contributing to the district. The cemetery evidences no apparent alterations, and it has retained its historic character and appearance. Thus, the New Elkmont Cemetery evidences no apparent alterations to its design, setting, materials, workmanship, and feeling, and it has retained its integrity over time.

Elkmont District Nomination: **Contributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Contributing**

SUPPLEMENTARY LISTING RECORD

The following buildings, structures, and aboveground sites were not initially addressed in the Elkmont Historic District nomination but were made part of the nomination via the Supplementary Listing Record of March 28, 1994.

Two water tanks and a pump house (pre-GRSM) are located southeast of the Kuhlman Cabin (No. 40) near Tulip Creek (see Figure 1.5; Figure 6.210). They were constructed to serve the Appalachian Club cabins. A draft CLI plan depicting the tanks and pump house is included in Appendix 3.

In the Supplementary Listing Record, the pre-GRSM water tanks and pump house are recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the Supplementary Listing Record and recommends the structures noncontributing to the district. Although the structures evidence no apparent alterations, it is felt that their link to the historical and architectural themes of the district is not strong enough to support their status as contributing resources. The water tanks and pump house are utilitarian support structures that do not exemplify the “back to nature,” resort history of the district (NRHP Criterion A) or the rustic, vernacular architecture of the district’s buildings (NRHP Criterion C).

Supplementary Listing Record: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing**

A GRSM horse barn (with associated corral and fenced pasture) is located at the south end of the district at the terminus of Jakes Creek Road (see Figure 1.5; Figure 6.211). A small concrete block utility building is associated with the barn and is located about one hundred feet to the northeast. These are modern improvements. A draft CLI plan depicting the barn, corral, and pasture is included in Appendix 3.

In the Supplementary Listing Record, the horse barn is recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the Supplementary Listing Record and recommends the building (and its associated corral, fenced pasture, and utility building) noncontributing to the district due to its recent age.

Supplementary Listing Record: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing**

A GRSM pump house, two water tanks, and a holding tank are located west of the New Elkmont Cemetery near the western edge of the district (see Figure 1.5; Figures 6.212 to 6.214). They were constructed to serve the campground. A draft CLI plan depicting the structures is included in Appendix 3. These water-related resources could have potential significance under the NPS’s current Mission 66 initiative, which is taking a national look at park-related construction undertaken by the NPS in the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s.

In the Supplementary Listing Record, the pump house and the two water tanks are recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the Supplementary Listing Record and recommends the structures noncontributing to the district due to their recent age.

Supplementary Listing Record: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing**

The holding tank, still in use, was not mentioned in the Supplementary Listing Record. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC recommends the structure noncontributing to the district due to its recent age.

Supplementary Listing Record: **Not mentioned**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing**

Across the street to the south-southwest of the Wonderland Hotel, there are **two modern GRSM staff houses** (#434 and #600 Quarters; see Figure 1.4). In the Supplementary Listing Record, the houses are recommended noncontributing to the district. As per 36 CFR 60.4, TRC concurs with the Supplementary Listing Record and recommends the buildings noncontributing to the district due to their recent age.

Supplementary Listing Record: **Noncontributing**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing**

Within the district, there also are numerous **Elkmont Campground-related buildings, structures, and aboveground sites** that were not mentioned in the Supplementary Listing Record (see Figures 1.4 and 1.5). Buildings and structures include a GRSM maintenance building, an outdoor amphitheatre, numerous comfort stations, a check-in/office building, and a vending machine/supply building. Aboveground sites include the campground roads and the many trailer and tent pads.

As an architectural resource, TRC recommends the campground and all of the related buildings, structures, and aboveground sites noncontributing to the district due to their recent age. However, the campground-related resources could have potential significance under the NPS's current Mission 66 initiative (see above).

Supplementary Listing Record: **Not mentioned**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing**

The district contains a relocated, modified railroad bridge (**Bridge 76**), which was not mentioned in the Supplementary Listing Record. The bridge is located near the district's northwest edge in the vicinity of the Wonderland Hotel (see Figure 1.4; Figure 6.215). The bridge spans the Little River and is currently closed to non-GRSM personnel. A draft CLI plan depicting the bridge is included in Appendix 3.

Based on information contained in Schmidt and Hooks (1994) and Weals (1993), it appears there never was a rail crossing at the location of Bridge 76. The Little River Railroad line ran in the location of the existing paved roads to the northwest, north, and east (i.e., Little River and Elkmont roads). Thus, Bridge 76 was relocated to its current spot from a water crossing somewhere else along the Little River Railroad line. Water crossings in the Elkmont vicinity that would have required a trestle or bridge were at Laurel Branch (south of the junction of Little River and Elkmont roads) and at the Little River (east of the Jakes Creek/Little River confluence where the Little River Stone Bridge stands). The Laurel Branch crossing would not have required a trestle or bridge the size of Bridge 76. The Little River crossing could have utilized a trestle or bridge similar to Bridge 76, but it would have had to be removed at the time the Little River Stone Bridge was built (ca. 1940). Period USGS maps do not depict a crossing where Bridge 76 is located until 1956 (the previous map from 1942 shows no crossing) (see Figures 3.6–3.7). That would mean that if Bridge 76 originally crossed the Little River where the Little River Stone Bridge stands, it would have been set aside and not installed in its current location for anywhere from 3 to 16 years, which is highly unlikely. More probable is the assumption that the bridge originally was located along Little River Road, where deck truss bridges like Bridge 76 were in place at the Forks and Long Arm (Schmidt and Hooks 1994:60, 62; Weals 1993:86) and probably at Camp No. 2 and the Sinks. The Forks bridge may have been built in ca. 1902, while the other three were built between 1906 and 1908 (Schmidt and Hooks 1994:34, 56, 58). According to the pending Park Development Historic District nomination, the NPS built three replacement bridges along Little River Road (two in 1950 and one between 1947 and 1960), the locations of which match the locations of the rail bridges at Long Arm, the Sinks, and Camp No. 2 (Blythe n.d.:7:4–5). The nomination also notes that a replacement bridge was built near the Forks in

1948 (Blythe n.d.:7:5). Thus, any of the four rail bridges could have been removed and installed at the location of Bridge 76 in the late 1940s or in 1950—dates that fit well with the map evidence supplied by the 1942 and 1956 USGS maps. It is possible that another bridge along the rail line was removed and installed at the location of Bridge 76. However, the four bridges noted above were on the main line to Elkmont and were in close proximity to the Bridge 76 location (from 2.5 to 12.5 miles to the west).

The initial modification of the rail bridges is noted in Schmidt and Hooks (1994:111) and Weals (1993:88), where it is stated that the Long Arm bridge was modified for automobile use in ca. 1926–1927. The modification—which occurred at all rail bridges on the line at about the same time, owing to the need to convert the entire right-of-way to automobile use—consisted of removal of the tracks and installation of a board deck. The second modification likely occurred in the late 1940s or 1950, when, as noted, the rail bridges were removed and replaced with the NPS bridges. Owing to the narrowness of the Little River at the Bridge 76 crossing, as compared to the wider river crossings at the four rail bridges, it is very likely that only a section of one of the former bridges was installed in the location of Bridge 76. It is quite possible that Bridge 76 consists of a single truss (or a piece of a truss) set on stone piers built in the late 1940s or 1950 specifically for the new crossing. The current deck very likely is not original but may date to ca. 1950 or even much later, owing to its similarity to the decks of Bridges 49 and 77, built in ca. 1982 and ca. 1984, respectively (see below).

TRC recommends Bridge 76 noncontributing to the district due to its relocation from its original site in ca. 1950 and its resulting loss of context and feeling—from a rail line in a rocky gorge setting across a wide expanse of river, to its current vehicle/pedestrian use in a serene, lowland, creek-like setting. It also is recommended noncontributing due to the major, conspicuous alterations made to it over time, both originally when converted to an automobile bridge and then again in ca. 1950 when a section likely was removed, placed in the current setting, and updated with new supports and a new deck. Moreover, according to a recent condition assessment, Bridge 76 is “in poor condition and in need of rehabilitation” (T N & Associates 2002a:8).

Supplementary Listing Record: **Not mentioned**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing**

The district contains two vehicle bridges that are less than 50 years of age. These were not mentioned in the Supplementary Listing Record. **Bridge 77** is located in the south-central portion of the district in the vicinity of the Bagley and Gilliland Cabins (see Figure 1.5; Figure 6.216). This ca. 1984 bridge provides access to the New Elkmont Cemetery and the GRSM water tanks, pump house, and holding tank. **Bridge 49** is located near the south end of the district where Jakes Creek Road crosses Jakes Creek (see Figure 1.5; Figure 6.217). This ca. 1982 bridge provides access to the GRSM horse barn and is closed to non-GRSM personnel. TRC recommends these two bridges noncontributing to the district due to their recent age. Draft CLI plans depicting the bridges are included in Appendix 3.

Supplementary Listing Record: **Not mentioned**
TRC Recommendation: **Noncontributing**

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE SURVEY

In addition to the contributing site-specific cultural landscape features noted in the discussions of the individual buildings, the Elkmont Historic District includes a number of district-wide cultural landscape elements and features that are contributing to the district. The significant landscape characteristics and features that have defined the Elkmont Historic District over time and that, in some instances, are in evidence today are discussed briefly below. The nomenclature used is taken from the National Park Service’s National Register Bulletins 18 (Keller and Keller 1994) and 30 (McClelland et al. n.d.) and the

Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* (Birnbaum and Peters 1996). It should be noted that GRSM plans to undertake a more in-depth, more extensive investigation of the historic and cultural landscape of the district at a future date.

The landscape characteristics and features in the Elkmont Historic District can be divided into two main groups. The first group includes those characteristics and features that are indicative of both natural and human-influenced processes, such as spatial organization, natural systems and features, and land use. The second group includes those characteristics and features that are evident as physical forms on the landscape, such as circulation, topography, vegetation, buildings and structures, small-scale features, and views and vistas. Like the landscape processes, some of the physical forms are natural in origin, while others are human-influenced.

Spatial Organization

The spatial organization of the Elkmont Historic District has been determined by several of the processes and physical forms noted below. For example, natural systems and features—water resources—as well as topography and vegetation have had much to do with how the landscape developed over time and with how humans reacted to the natural conditions they encountered. Choices about land use have greatly affected the appearance of the district landscape over time. Finally, circulation patterns, heavily influenced by natural features, have played a major role in determining how the area developed, especially in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Natural Systems and Features

Natural systems and features include the water resources in the Elkmont Historic District, i.e., the rivers and streams. As noted in Chapter 2, the district is drained by the Little River and its tributaries, which include Jakes Creek and Slick Limb, Catron, Mids, Pine Knot, and Bearwallow branches. Analysis of the effect that the water resources of the district had on the development and design of the Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs is presented below under “Buildings and Structures.”

Land Use

The history of land use in the Elkmont Historic District—particularly the impact of the logging industry on the birth and development of the Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs, and then in turn the impact of those organizations on the development of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park—is presented in the Historic Overview section of the Cultural History (see Chapter 3).

Circulation

The roads and trails in the Elkmont Historic District are the means of circulation in and through the area. They functioned that way historically and they continue to do so today. Former railroad corridors gave way to automobile roads, which over time gave way to recreational trails. These corridors—the entry road off of Route 73, Jakes Creek Road, Little River Road/Trail, and the road behind the Wonderland Hotel and through the Wonderland cabins—brought people into the area and formed the spines around which the Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs developed. This linear pattern of development was in large part necessitated by the scarcity of flat, buildable land—a constraint imposed by the area's topography. Lot size and property boundary lines also played a major role in determining building placement, however.

Topography and Vegetation

Chapter 2 provides specific details about the topography and vegetation of the Elkmont Historic District. What is clear is that the ruggedness of the terrain and the density of the forest played a major role in determining how the area developed—first as a logging operation and then as a resort community. Human decisions regarding access, circulation, and development options had to be analyzed in terms of the constraints imposed by the natural conditions of the area. The resulting layouts of the Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs—even the designs of the individual buildings—were greatly influenced by the area’s natural environment, as well as by manmade constraints, such as lot size and property boundary lines.

Buildings and Structures

The individual buildings and structures within the Elkmont Historic District already have been discussed at length. However, another element worth considering is their relationship to the landscape and to one another. Each individual description noted the nature of each building’s location: elevation above a watercourse, at the base of a ridge, etc. Both by design and necessity, the cabins within the Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs were arranged in certain groupings. The narrowness of the landform between Jakes Creek and Bearwallow Branch or between Jakes Creek and the foot of the ridge to the east necessitated that buildings had to be built up on the central road, as well as close to Jakes Creek in many instances. Until ca. 1931, the “road” consisted of the Little River Railroad right-of-way with the wood ties still intact (the rails were removed by the Little River Lumber Company in 1926 when it ceased logging operations in the area) (Blythe n.d.:8:16; Schmidt and Hooks 1994:75). Lot size and the location of property boundary lines also played a major role in determining the placement of individual buildings.

Visual inspection of the club areas indicates that the cabins observed a uniform setback from the road (or railroad in many instances), and this is certainly evident in the northern section of the Appalachian Club (Figure 6.218). This can even be seen as one moves south in the Appalachian Club area (Figure 6.219). Along the Little River, available building land was more plentiful, so cabin owners did not have to build right up to the railroad. A good example is the Spence Cabin, which is hidden from the former rail right-of-way (now a trail) and instead is oriented to the river. The Faust Cabin also is more aligned with Bearwallow Branch than with the trail. Only at the Murphy and Cambier Cabins is there an orientation to the former rail right-of-way—most likely due to the narrowness of the landform there (between the river and the ridge to the south) (Figure 6.220). At the Wonderland Club, some cabins were constructed right up to the central access road because of the narrowness of the ridgetop in that particular area (Figure 6.221). Yet those cabins close to the road usually had a ridgetop view as well. Beyond the limitations imposed by topography, however, building placement decisions, as noted above, also were made based on lot size and location of property boundary lines.

Small-Scale Features

Most small-scale features within the Elkmont Historic District are located at individual cabins and buildings. Such features include stone walls along roads (see Figures 6.19 and 6.121); stone retaining walls (see Figure 6.199); stone property boundary walls (see Figure 6.20); dry laid stone walls enclosing paths or yards (see Figures 6.160 and 6.163); stones used to line walks or paths (see Figure 6.104); and property or yard fences built of wood and wire (see Figures 6.58 and 6.72). Other small-scale features include stone entry steps (Figure 6.222), mortared stone gate posts and entry walls (Figure 6.223), and stone patios (Figure 6.224). Stone planters can be found at many of the buildings (Figure 6.225).

Other small-scale features are scattered throughout the district and are not tied to any specific cabin or building. These include stone-faced culverts, used to carry the various streams and branches in the district

beneath the area roads. As noted in Chapter 4, these culverts (and the main entrance road to Elkmont—the Elkmont Spur Road—under which several of the culverts are located) are addressed in the pending Park Development Historic District. Examples of such culverts can be found along the Catron Branch and the Bearwallow Branch (Figures 6.226 and 6.227). The row of metal mailboxes near the Hale Cabin in the Appalachian Club is another example of a small-scale landscape feature in the district (Figure 6.228). While likely not 50 years of age, the row of mailboxes is a minor, relatively inconspicuous element within the larger landscape of the district that serves as a visual reminder of the area’s residential past.

Views and Vistas

Because of the topography and vegetation in the Elkmont Historic District, most current views and vistas are axial in nature, concentrated along roads, trails, or even watercourses (Figures 6.229 to 6.236). Most of these views and vistas are historic, dating to the resort era or even earlier, as some of the road views follow even earlier railroad views. Panoramic views are only available in a few locations in the district: from the Wonderland Hotel porch (contrast this with the current view from the Appalachian Clubhouse); from the GRSM horse barn pasture; and from the pre-GRSM water tanks near the Kuhlman Cabin (Figures 6.237 to 6.240). The district also includes the more modern views available within the Elkmont Campground, which are both axial and panoramic in nature (Figure 6.241). Historically, the views and vistas within the district were much more abundant and panoramic, as clear-cutting from logging and limited agriculture had “opened up” the landscape. In time, the vegetation returned, resulting in the landscape currently in place. As noted, GRSM plans to undertake a more in-depth, more extensive investigation of the district’s historic and cultural landscape at a future date and will certainly explore the issue of historic versus current views and vistas.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ELKMONT GEOMORPHOLOGY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

The preliminary geomorphic and archaeological data from Elkmont, when combined with historical maps and other information, provide considerable information concerning the potential for significant archaeological remains within the district.

The data indicate that there is a high potential for prehistoric Native American sites within the terrace and alluvial/colluvial deposits that make up much of the Elkmont District (see Figures 5.1; 5.21). Five of the six sites discovered by the present reconnaissance (40SV120, 40SV121, 40SV122, 40SV124, and 40SV125), along with the likely location of 40BT23 (see Chapter 5) are located in these areas. Three of these five sites (40SV120, 40SV121, and 40SV125) produced artifacts (including a Middle Archaic period projectile point from 40SV125) from subplowzone deposits, and the geomorphic data suggest that there is potential for buried deposits at many locations in these deposits. Prehistoric materials also have been recovered from upland locations in the Elkmont District. Although the materials at 40SV123 have likely been disturbed, their presence indicates that substantial artifact concentrations still may be present in upland environments at Elkmont as well. Intact prehistoric sites at Elkmont would have the potential to provide information important to studies of local and regional prehistory and would potentially be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D.

There are few available data relating to the early historic (pre-twentieth-century) occupation of Elkmont, although structural remains associated with one such component may be present at 40SV121. Any substantial structural remains, features, or artifact deposits that might be present in association with these occupations would potentially be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D.

Significant archaeological deposits from the Little River Lumber Company's tenure are likely present within the Elkmont District, although these have not been formally documented to date. Such remains could include structural remains, features, and deposits associated with the variety of industrial, commercial, educational, religious, and residential structures that were once present at the community. Many of these remains are probably buried beneath the Elkmont Campground, but there is potential for significant logging-era remains elsewhere in the district as well (see Figure 5.22). Although dating to the twentieth century, such features and deposits represent a significant era in the history of the Southern Appalachians, and one that was partially responsible for the ultimate creation of GRSM. The remains of these occupations are potentially eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and D.

There is also clearly visible and abundant structural and artifactual evidence of the resort-era occupations at Elkmont. Many of the standing structures at Elkmont have previously been determined NRHP-eligible as part of the Elkmont Historic District (Thomason et al. 1993), and the potential NRHP-eligibility of associated foundations and artifact deposits must be assessed as well (see Figure 5.23). Although most such remains are probably not NRHP-eligible, some resort-era remains—such as unmixed deposits relating to the early occupation of the Wonderland Hotel, the original Appalachian Hotel, and the predecessor to the current Appalachian Clubhouse—could potentially provide significant information relating to the resort-era occupation, and thus might be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D. Like all other remains, the eligibility of such remains must ultimately be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

In summary, the present investigations have demonstrated the Elkmont District's potential to contain significant archaeological remains associated with both prehistoric Native American and historic period occupations of the area. Once the proposed project alternatives have been developed, additional intensive

archaeological survey (and possibly site testing) will be required to determine the potential effect of these alternatives on the archaeological resources at Elkmont. In addition, a more comprehensive archaeological survey at Elkmont ultimately may also be required for compliance with Section 110 of the NHPA.

ELKMONT HISTORIC DISTRICT STRUCTURES AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

Of the 74 buildings located at the Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs (including outbuildings), 49 are recommended contributing to the district. This represents a minor change from the nomination in one instance. TRC now recommends the garage at the Murphy Cabin (Appalachian Club) noncontributing due to the damaged and nearly ruinous condition of the structure. Within the clubs, there also are two contributing structures and three contributing sites. An additional nine noncontributing buildings and structures were identified in the Supplementary Listing Record. TRC recommends an additional four structures and the Elkmont Campground (viewed as an architectural, aboveground resource) as noncontributing to the district. It would appear that these five resources were inadvertently left out of the nomination and the Supplementary Listing Record during the listing process in 1993 and 1994.

The cultural landscape features directly associated with a particular building or structure are recommended contributing to that building or structure and/or to the district as a whole. Many of the features are called out in the nomination and are presented as contributing to the character of individual properties and the district. The larger, district-wide landscape elements and the smaller features not directly tied to a particular building or structure that have been addressed in this study also are recommended contributing to the district. An analysis of potential impacts to the district and the identified contributing resources—buildings, structures, aboveground sites, and cultural landscape features—will be undertaken when the project alternatives have been selected.

TRC recommends no change to the configuration of the district boundary (see Figure 1.2). The current boundary includes all of the buildings, structures, and aboveground sites associated with the Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs, as well as the cultural landscape elements and features associated with the clubs and the larger environment in which the clubs are and have been located since their establishment. Although the boundary includes the campground area, which has been recommended noncontributing as an architectural resource, TRC recommends that the campground remain within the district boundary because of potential to contain significant archaeological remains relating to logging-era activities at Elkmont.

REFERENCES CITED

- Adovasio, James M., Joel Gunn, Jack Donahue, and Robert Stuckenrath
1978 Meadowcroft Rockshelter, 1977: An Overview. *American Antiquity* 43:632–651.
- Anderson, David G.
1995a Paleoindian Interaction Networks in the Eastern Woodlands. In *Native American Interactions: Multiscalar Analyses and Interpretations in the Eastern Woodlands*, edited by Michael S. Nassaney and Kenneth E. Sassaman, pp. 3–26. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.
1995b Recent Advances in Paleoindian and Archaic Research in the Southeastern United States. *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 23:145–176.
1996 Models of Paleoindian and Early Archaic Settlement in the Lower Southeast. In *The Paleoindian and Early Archaic Southeast*, edited by David G. Anderson and Kenneth E. Sassaman, pp. 29–57. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Anderson, David G., and Glen T. Hanson
1988 Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeastern United States: A Case Study from the Savannah River Valley. *American Antiquity* 53:262–286.
- Anderson, David G., Lisa O’Steen, and Kenneth E. Sassaman
1996 Environment and Chronological Considerations. In *The Paleoindian and the Early Archaic Southeast*, edited by David G. Anderson and Kenneth E. Sassaman, pp. 5–15. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Bass, Quentin R., II
1977 *Prehistoric Settlement and Subsistence Patterns in the Great Smoky Mountains*. Master’s thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee.
- Birdsong, Vincent
1997 Trip Report: Elkmont Campground Maintenance Shed. On file, GRSM.
- Birnbaum, Charles A., and Christine Capella Peters (editors)
1996 The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnerships, Heritage Preservation Services, Historic Landscape Initiative, Washington, D.C.
- Blythe, Robert W.
n.d. Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Park Development Historic District. Listing pending. Draft National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, on file at GRSM.
- Branch of Estimating, Engineering Services Division, Denver Service Center
1995 Class “C” Estimating Guide: Historic Preservation and Stabilization, April 1993. Title page reads, “These cost figures are valid through December 1995.” Prepared by the Branch of Estimating, Engineering Services Division, Denver Service Center, National Park Service.
- Broster, John B., and Emanuel Breitburg
1995 Preliminary Archaeological Investigations at 40WM31: A Possible Paleoindian/Mastodon Association in Middle Tennessee. Paper presented at the 7th Annual Meeting of Current Research in Tennessee Archaeology, Nashville.
1996 Recent Investigations at the Coats/Hines Mastodon Site, Williamson County. Paper presented at the 8th annual meeting of Current Research in Tennessee Archaeology, Nashville.
- Bryson, Reid A., David A. Baerreis, and W.M. Wendland
1970 The Character of the Late Glacial and Post Glacial Climatic Changes. In *Pleistocene and Recent Environments of the Central Coastal Plains*, edited by W. Dort Jr. and J.K. Jones Jr., pp. 53–74. University of Kansas Special Publications No. 3, Lawrence.
- Caldwell, Joseph R.
1964 Interaction Spheres in Prehistory. In *Hopewellian Studies*, ed. By Joseph R. Caldwell and Robert L. Hall, pp. 133–43. Scientific Papers No. 12. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.

- Caughron, Gayle, Cecil Baldwin, and Ken Lennon
 1993 Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Elkmont Leased Structures, Report on Evaluation of Condition and Cost Estimate. Volume 1: Report. Submitted to GRSM. Submitted by Tennessee Valley Authority, Corporate Technical Services.
- Chapman, Jefferson
 1977 Archaic Period Research in the Lower Little Tennessee River Valley – 1975: Icehouse Bottom, Harrison Branch, Thirty Acre Island, Calloway Island. *University of Tennessee, Department of Anthropology, Report of Investigations 18*.
- Coe, Joffre L.
 1964 The Formative Culture of the Carolina Piedmont. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 54(5). Philadelphia.
- Creswell, Bradley A.
 1997 Phase I Survey for Archaeological Resources in the Proposed and Existing Rights-Of-Way of State Route 66 from Interstate 40 to the Parkway Road Extension and in the Proposed and Existing Rights of Way of the Parkway Road Extension and Parkway Road from State Route 6 to 6 M South of the Forks of the River Parkway in Sevierville, Sevier County, Tennessee. Submitted to James+Associates, Nashville, TN. Submitted by the University of Tennessee Transportation Center, Knoxville, TN.
- Davis, R.P. Stephen, Jr.
 1990 *Aboriginal Settlement Patterns in the Little Tennessee River Valley*. Report of Investigations No. 50, University of Tennessee, Department of Anthropology, Knoxville, and Publications in Anthropology No. 54, Tennessee Valley Authority, Chattanooga.
- Delcourt, Paul, and Hazel R. Delcourt
 1983 Late Quaternary Vegetational Dynamics and Community Stability Reconsidered. *Quaternary Research* 19:265–271.
- Dickens, Roy S. Jr.
 1970 *The Pisgah Culture and its Place in the Prehistory of the Appalachians*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
 1976 *Cherokee Prehistory: The Pisgah Phase in the Appalachian Summit region*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.
- Dillehay, Tom D.
 1989 *Monte Verde: A Late Pleistocene Settlement in Chile, Vol. I, Paleoenvironmental and Site Context*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
 1997 *Monte Verde: A Late Pleistocene Settlement in Chile, Vol. II, The Archaeological Context and Interpretation*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Dorwin, John T.
 1975 *Upper Hiwassee River Survey, 1974–1975*. Archeology Laboratory, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee. Submitted to the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Division of Archives and History, Raleigh.
- Egloff, Brian J.
 1967 *An Analysis of Ceramics from Cherokee Towns*. Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Elder, Joe A, Samuel R. Bacon, Robbie L. Flowers, Theodore R. Love, Joseph A. Phillips. George M. Thompson, and Doyle A. Tucker
 1959 *Soil Survey of Blount County, Tennessee*. USDA, Washington, D.C.
- Faulkner, Charles H.
 1977 The winter house: an early southeast tradition. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 2:141-159.
 1978 Origin and evolution of the Cherokee winter house. *Journal of Cherokee Studies* 3:87-93.
- Goodyear, Albert
 1999 The Early Holocene Occupation of the Southeastern United States: A Geoarchaeological Summary. In *Ice Age Peoples of North America: Environments, Origins, and Adaptations*, edited by Robson Bonnicksen and Karen L. Turnmire, pp. 432-481. Oregon State University, Corvallis.
- Graham, Russell W.
 1986 Stratified Cultural and Faunal Horizons at Kimmswick, Missouri. In *Quaternary Records of Southwestern Illinois and Adjacent Missouri*, edited by Russell W. Graham, Bonnie W. Styles, Jeffrey J. Saunders, Michael D. Wiant, E. Donald McKay, Thomas R. Styles, and Edwin R. Hajic, pp. 56–67. Field

- Guide of the American Quaternary Association, Ninth Biennial Meeting, University of Illinois, Urbana–Champaign.
- Harnsberger, Douglas J.
 1993 Mayna Treanor Avent Studio (Avent Cabin), Great Smoky Mountains National Park. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, on file at Tennessee Historical Commission, Nashville. “Hotels and Resorts”
 n.d. Vertical files. Sevier County Library, Sevierville, Tennessee.
- Jennings, Jesse D.
 1989 *Prehistory of North America*. Mayfield Publishing, Mayfield, California.
- Keel, Bennie C.
 1972 *Woodland phases of the Appalachian Summit area*. Ph.D. diss., Washington State University.
 1976 *Cherokee Archaeology: A Study of the Appalachian Summit*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.
- Keller, J. Timothy, and Genevieve P. Keller
 1994 National Register Bulletin 18. How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Kelly, Robert L., and Lawrence C. Todd
 1988 Coming into the Country: Early Paleoindian Hunting and Mobility. *American Antiquity* 53:231–244.
- Kroeber, A.L.
 1939 Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 38.
- Lambert, Robert S.
 1958 *Logging in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park: A Report to the Superintendent*. On file, Great Smoky Mountains National Park Archives, Gatlinburg, Tennessee.
 1961 Logging on the Little River, 1890–1940. East Tennessee Historical Society, Knoxville.
- Lamereaux, Heidi K.
 1999 *Human-Environmental Relationships in the Coastal Plain of Georgia Based on High Resolution Paleoenvironmental Records From Three Peat Deposits*. Unpublished dissertation, the University of Georgia, Athens.
- Leigh, David
 2002 Geomorphology of the Ravensford Tract. In *Cultural and Historical Resource Investigations of the Ravensford Land Exchange Tract, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Swain County, North Carolina*, by Paul A. Webb, pp. 117-141. Submitted to Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, Cherokee, North Carolina. TRC Garrow Associates, Inc., Durham.
- Leigh, D.S., and T.P. Feeney
 1995 Paleochannels Indicating Wet Climate and Lack of Response to Lower Sea-Level, Southeast Georgia. *Geology* 23(8):687–690.
- Linzey, Donald W.
 1995 *Mammals of Great Smoky Mountains National Park*. McDonald and Woodward, Blacksburg, Virginia. *The Lure of the Great Smokies*
 1927 Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston & New York.
- McClelland, Linda Flint, J. Timothy Keller, Genevieve P. Keller, and Robert Z. Melnick
 n.d. National Register Bulletin 30. Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- McElway, Hank
 2002 *Preliminary Results of Phase I Archaeological Survey for Proposed Greenbrier Road Improvement Project, Delivery Order No. D5460010083*. On file, GRSM Cultural Resources Management Office, Gatlinburg.
- McGrath, H. Thomas, Jr., AIA
 1998 Condition Assessment Report: The Appalachian Clubhouse at Elkhorn in Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Submitted to GRSM. Submitted by Historic Preservation Training Center, National Park Service, Frederick, Maryland.
 2001 Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Wonderland Hotel: Exterior Existing Condition Assessment and Stabilization Plan. Submitted to GRSM. Submitted by Historic Preservation Training Center, National Park Service, Frederick, Maryland.

- Michalek, Daniel D.
 1969 *Fan-like features and related periglacial phenomena of the Southern Blue Ridge*. Ph.D. diss., Department of Geology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. University microfilms.
- Morrow, Juliet E.
 1996 *The Organization of Early Paleoindian Lithic Technology in the Confluence Region of the Mississippi, Illinois, and Missouri Rivers*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Washington University, St. Louis.
- National Park Service (NPS)
 1982 *General Management Plan, Great Smoky Mountains National Park/North Carolina-Tennessee*. Denver Service Center.
 2001 Environmental Assessment: U.S. Highway 321 General Agreement. Great Smoky Mountains National Park, National Park Service.
- Pace, Robert A.
 2001 Archaeological Survey of Lower Middle Creek Road (Teaster Lane to Centerview Road), Sevier County, Tennessee. Submitted to Wilber Smith Associates, Knoxville, TN and the City of Pigeon Forge, TN. Submitted by DuVall and Associates, Franklin, TN.
- Pielou, E.C.
 1991 *After the Ice Age: The Return of Life to Glaciated North America*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Prentice, I.C., P.J. Bartlein, and T. Webb III
 1991 Vegetation and Climate Changes in Eastern North America Since the Last Glacial Maximum. *Ecology* 72:2038–2056.
- Purrington, Burton L.
 1978 Archaeological investigations at the Slipoff Branch site, a Morrow Mountain cultural campsite in Swain County, North Carolina. *North Carolina Archaeological Council Publication* 15 (1981).
 1983 Ancient Mountaineers: An Overview of the Prehistoric Archaeology of North Carolina's Western Mountain Region. In *The Prehistory of North Carolina: An Archaeological Symposium*, pp. 83-158, edited by Mark A. Mathis and Jeffrey J. Crow, Division of Archives and History, North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, University Graphics, Inc., North Carolina State University, Raleigh.
- Purrington, Burton L. and M.L. Douthit
 1977 Changing patterns of habitat utilization in a southern Appalachian locality. Paper presented at the 42nd annual meeting of the Society of American Archaeology, New Orleans.
- Riggs, Brett H.
 1996 *Removal Period Cherokee Households and Communities in Southwestern North Carolina (1835–1838)*. Submitted to North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office.
- Robinson, Kenneth W., David G. Moore, and Ruth Y. Wetmore
 1994 Woodland Period Radiocarbon Dates from Western North Carolina. Paper presented at the 6th Uplands Archaeological Conference, Harrisonburg, Virginia.
- Schmidt, Ronald G., and William S. Hooks
 1994 *Whistle Over the Mountains: Timber, Track & Trails in the Tennessee Smokies*. Graphicom Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio.
- Schroedl, G.F., C.C. Boyd, Jr., and R.P.S. Davis, Jr.
 1990 Explaining Mississippian Origins in East Tennessee. In *The Mississippian Emergence*. edited by Bruce D. Smith, pp. 175-196. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Sevier County, Tennessee
 1910 Property deed. Little River Lumber Company to The Appalachian Club. Deed book 16, pages 343–345. 11 February. On file, Sevier County Courthouse, Sevierville, Tennessee.
- Shelford, Victor E.
 1963 *The Ecology of North America*. University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Soil Survey Division Staff
 1993 Soil Survey Manual. United States Department of Agriculture Handbook 18, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington.
- Stupka, Arthur
 1960 *Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Natural History Handbook, Series 5*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington.

- Sullivan, Alan P., and Kenneth C. Rozen
 1985 Debitage Analysis and Archaeological Interpretation. *American Antiquity* 50:755-779.
- Tennessee Division of Environment and Conservation
 n.d. Geological Map of Tennessee. Online at <http://www.state.tn.us/environment/tdg/bigmap.htm>.
- Thomason, Phil
 1993 *The History and Architecture of the Elkmont Community, Sevier County, Tennessee, Great Smoky Mountains National Park*. Prepared for the National Park Service Southeast Region, Atlanta, Georgia, Contract 1443PX500092696. Thomason and Associates, Nashville.
- Thomason, Phil, Michael Ann Williams, and L. Brown
 1993 Elkmont Historic District, Great Smoky Mountains National Park. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, on file at Tennessee Historical Commission, Nashville.
- Thornbury, William D.
 1965 *Regional Geomorphology of the United States*. Wiley, New York.
- T N & Associates, Inc.
 2002a Infrastructure Inventory, Elkmont GMP Amendment/Environmental Assessment. Draft (May 24, 2002). Submitted to GRSM. Submitted by T N & Associates, Inc., Oak Ridge, Tennessee.
 2002b Site Safety and Health Plan, Elkmont GMP Amendment/Environmental Assessment. April 5, 2002. Submitted to GRSM. Submitted by T N & Associates, Inc., Oak Ridge, Tennessee.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
 n.d. Great Smoky Mountains National Park: Soil Survey of the Elkmont Area. USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, Sevierville, TN.
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)
 1892 Knoxville, Tennessee, 60-minute topographic map. Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division, Washington.
 1926 Proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, North Carolina-Tennessee. Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division, Washington.
 1931a Proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park (1:62,500). Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division, Washington.
 1931b Proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park (1:24,000). Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division, Washington.
 1942 Gatlinburg, Tennessee, 7.5-minute topographic map.
 1956 Gatlinburg, Tennessee, 7.5-minute topographic map.
- Ward, H. Trawick, and R.P. Stephen Davis Jr.
 1999 *Time Before History: The Archaeology of North Carolina*. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Wauchope, Robert
 1966 *An Archaeological Survey of Northern Georgia*. Society for American Archaeology Memoir XXI.
- Watts, W.A.
 1975 Vegetation Record for the Last 20,000 Years from a Small Marsh on Lookout Mountain, Northwestern Georgia. *Geological Society of America Bulletin* 86:287-291.
 1980 Late-Quaternary Vegetation History at White Pond on the Inner Coastal Plain of South Carolina. *Quaternary Research* 13:187-199.
- Weals, Vic
 1991 *Last Train to Elkmont*. Olden Press, Knoxville.
- Webb, Paul A.
 2002 Cultural and Historical Resource Investigations of the Ravensford Land Exchange Tract, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Swain County, North Carolina. Submitted to Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, Cherokee, North Carolina. TRC Garrow Associates, Inc., Durham.
- Wetmore, Ruth Y., Kenneth W. Robinson, and David G. Moore
 2000 Woodland Adaptations in the Appalachian Summit of Western North Carolina: Exploring the Influence of Climate Change. In *The Years Without Summer: Tracing A.D. 536 and Its Aftermath*, edited by Joel D. Gunn, pp. 139-150. BAR International Series 872, Archaeopress, Oxford.
- Wheeler, Bruce, ed.
 1986 *The Gentle Winds of Change: A History of Sevier County, Tennessee, 1900-1930*. Smoky Mountain Historical Society, Sevierville, Tennessee.
- Whitehead, Donald R.
 1973 Late-Wisconsin Vegetation Changes in Unglaciated North America. *Quaternary Research* 3:621-631.

Yu, Pei-Lin

2001 Memorandum to Superintendent: Report on Archeological Investigations of the Elkmont Area. On
file, Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

APPENDIX 1:

**ELKMONT HISTORIC DISTRICT NATIONAL REGISTER
NOMINATION FORM**

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

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
REGISTRATION FORM**

Section 1 – Name of Property

Historic name: Elkmont Historic District, Great Smoky Mountains N.P.

Section 2 – Location

City or town: Gatlinburg (vicinity)
State: Tennessee
County: Sevier
Zip code: 37738

Section 5 – Classification

Ownership of property: public-Federal
Category of property: district
Number of resources within property:

Buildings:	41 contributing	26 noncontributing
Sites:	3 contributing	2 noncontributing
Structures:	12 contributing	0 noncontributing
Objects:	0 contributing	0 noncontributing
Totals:	56 contributing	28 noncontributing

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register: N/A

Name of related multiple property listing: N/A

Section 6 – Function or Use

Historic functions:

Cat/Sub: DOMESTIC/Camp
Cat/Sub: DOMESTIC/Hotel
Cat/Sub: SOCIAL/Clubhouse

Current functions:

Cat/Sub: DOMESTIC/Camp
Cat/Sub: VACANT-NOT IN USE/Leases on all but a few properties terminated 12/31/92; in NPS ownership

Section 7 – Description

Architectural classification: LATE 19TH/EARLY 20TH CENTURY–vacation cabins
EARLY 20TH CENTURY–hotel (vernacular)

Materials: Foundation: STONE/CONCRETE/WOOD
Roof: METAL/ASPHALT SHINGLE
Walls: WOOD/WEATHERBOARD; WOOD/LOG
Other: STONE and CONCRETE; BRICK

Narrative Description:

SUMMARY

The Elkmont Historic District is located in southwest Sevier County, Tennessee within the boundary of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The Elkmont Historic District contains two hotel buildings, a social clubhouse, and more than sixty dwellings and outbuildings. With the exception of two 19th century cabins, the majority of the contributing properties were built during the early 20th century. The dwellings are of log and frame construction and are located in two major areas: the Appalachian Club and the Wonderland Club. At the Appalachian Club are forty-seven cabins and various outbuildings constructed primarily between 1910 and 1930. The twelve buildings remaining at the Wonderland Club were all built between 1913 and 1928. Located between these two areas is the Elkmont Campground, which contains nineteen buildings and three structures built after 1950.

Elkmont is located in the valley of the Little River and elevations range from 2,100 to 2,400 feet above sea level. Surrounding Elkmont are heavily forested mountains rising to more than 3,000 feet. Buildings are located primarily along or near the Little River and its tributary, Jakes Creek. Elkmont is reached by a paved road off Scenic Route 73.

Of the sixty-seven buildings located at the Appalachian Club and Wonderland Club, forty-one are considered contributing to the character of the district. Also at these two locations are twelve contributing structures and three contributing and two non-contributing sites.

ARCHITECTURAL OVERVIEW

Permanent Anglo-American occupation of Sevier County occurred during the late 18th century. The Treaty of Dumplin Creek in 1785 resulted in the ceding of land within Sevier County by the Cherokee, and settlement began to take place in mountain valleys and coves. By the mid-19th century, a series of farms were located along the Little River and its tributaries. In the Jakes Creek area much of the land was owned by the Owenby and Trentham families who farmed its fertile bottomlands. These and other families built single and double-pen log dwellings at various locations which were the center of subsistence farms.

The creation of Great Smoky Mountains National park resulted in the demolition of almost all of these 19th century farm dwellings. Two, however, were incorporated into the Appalachian Club development: the Avent Cabin built ca. 1845 and the Levi Trentham Cabin built ca. 1830. The Avent Cabin was built by the Owenby family and was originally part of a small farmstead along Jakes Creek. The property was purchased in 1918 by Frank Avent, and he remodeled the cabin into its present form in 1926. Several barns and other outbuildings originally stood at this location, but only the cabin itself survives. The Trentham Cabin originally stood in the upper area of Jakes Creek, but was dismantled and moved to the Appalachian Club about 1932. The cabin was moved behind Cabin 7 and has been used for the past sixty

years as a quest cottage. The cabin is a single-pen log dwelling, which was extensively remodeled following its move.

With the exception of the Avent and Levi Trentham Cabins, the properties at Elkmont were built after 1910. The Appalachian Club was created in 1910 and many of the cabins along Jakes Creek were built over the next decade. The first section of the Wonderland Hotel was built in 1912 and most of the adjacent cabins were built during the teens and twenties. The last major area of construction was the acreage along the Little River owned by Mrs. Alice Townsend. Those cabins were built following the removal of the railroad in 1926 and are considered part of the Appalachian Club.

The lumber camp and community of Elkmont was located on the east side of Little River between the Appalachian Club and the Wonderland Club properties. The camp was built by the Little River Lumber Company in 1908 and by the 1920s consisted of several dozen dwellings, a few commercial buildings, a school and two churches. After the Great Smoky Mountains National Park was established all these buildings were either razed or moved. No above ground resources associated with the lumber camp or community of Elkmont were identified in this study. The area is presently encompassed by the Elkmont Campground created in the 1950s.

The builders of the Elkmont Cabins included carpenters employed by the Little River Lumber Company and area residents such as "Uncle" Levi Trentham. At least two cabins (numbers 5 and 7) are believed to have originally been built as section or "set" houses for workers on the railroad. These houses were built in three sections, transported on railroad flatcars, and "set" down adjacent to the railroad to provide housing for the workers. These two cabins are believed to have been purchased by the original owners and placed on their lots.

At least two cabins have been attributed to local builder, "Uncle" Levi Trentham. Levi Trentham owned a farm in the upper reaches of Jakes Creek and was a neighbor to the club property for many years. Following his death his cabin was purchased and moved to the Appalachian Club about 1932. Trentham is the presumed builder of Cabin 31 and Cabin 25, the Matthews and Franklin Cabins, and may be responsible for the construction of other buildings at Elkmont.¹⁶ Several accounts describe property owners employing "local carpenters," and Trentham may be one of the individuals so identified. Accounts also suggest that some cabins were built by carpenters brought in from Knoxville by the property owners.

The building forms and plans at Elkmont are representative of vernacular designs typical of the early 20th century. Represented at Elkmont are Pyramid Square, Gabled Ell, Single-pen, and Double-pen. The larger buildings of the Wonderland Hotel and Annex, and Appalachian Clubhouse are typical of vernacular hotel and social buildings of the early 20th century.

The majority of buildings in the Wonderland and Appalachian Club complexes were built between 1910 and 1930. Most dwellings are of balloon frame construction with exteriors of board and batten, weatherboard, and drop siding. The majority was built with the exterior siding applied directly to the studs and framing system. In recent decades a number of these dwellings have had the interior walls finished with drywall or sheet rock panels.

Common features include exterior wall chimneys of concrete and river stone; foundations of fieldstone, wood posts on poured concrete or fieldstone, or concrete block; and gable or hipped roofs. Most roofs appear to have been metal and a few of the cabins still retain their original roofs. However, most of the cabins have replacement metal roofs or roofs of asphalt shingles.

¹⁶ Interview by Phil Thomason with C. L. Matthews and Larry Franklin, Elkmont, October 19, 1992.

The cabins display a wide variety of exterior wall finishes. At the Appalachian Club the most common exterior siding is board and batten. Of the fifty-six buildings in this area, twenty-seven have this exterior siding material. Twelve cabins have weatherboard siding, and six are of log construction or have log cores. The remaining eight cabins have a combination of these three exteriors. Four others were rebuilt in 1974 after burning down. Of the twelve buildings in the Wonderland Club area, two have board and batten siding, one has cedar shingles, and four have weatherboard siding. The remaining five have post-1940 wood siding materials. The early 20th century log cabins at Elkmont have unhewn logs with concrete chinking. Logs are joined by some form of notching and were left in an unpainted and natural condition. The construction of Cabin 19 in the Appalachian Club area is typical of the log buildings.

The primary use of stone, brick, and concrete at Elkmont can be found in chimneys, foundations, and retaining walls. More than fifty of the cabins have chimneys constructed of concrete and cobblestones, also referred to as rubble, fieldstone, and river stone. These were widely used due to their availability from the nearby Little River and its tributaries. The varying sizes of these stones allowed for a variety of construction uses such as walls and chimneys. Most stones in the buildings are rounded with edges smoothed from water erosion. A common form of construction was to layer stones with a layer of concrete to create irregular horizontal bands.

Porches are integral elements to the majority of the Elkmont cabins. The outdoor recreational nature of the area resulted in the construction of large one-story porches on many of the cabins for socialization and relaxation. The wraparound porch at the Wonderland Hotel is the most obvious example of this recreational emphasis, and many cabins have porches on both the main and secondary facades.

Porches can be found on nearly all the Elkmont cabins. On primary facades, porches are generally partial width or full width with square columns and wood railings. The use of unhewn logs is evident at a number of cabins such as Cabins 1 and 18. A few dwellings display cobblestone and concrete construction in the porch piers and porch railings. A good example is the Moore Cabin in the Wonderland complex. It has a low railing of stacked river stones and concrete.

At many of the cabins, exposure to the area's high rainfall has resulted in the deterioration of porch components such as roofs, railings, columns and floors. This has necessitated porch rebuilding including replacement of these components. In many cases replacement has been sympathetic to the character of the cabins through the use of square wood columns, railings of square balusters, and wood floors that are compatible with the original design. In several cases, however, replacement has included expansion or partial infill of the original porch. Much of this replacement and extension of porches appears to have occurred in the early seventies when cabin leases were renewed.

The majority of the Elkmont properties retain their original entrance doors. Most of these are stock wood paneled doors of four-, five-, or six-panel design. An example of a four-panel door is at Cabin 5, which has four raised panels. Other popular door types found at Elkmont are cross-panel doors and single light glass and wood doors. Only a few cabins have had the original primary entrance doors removed and replaced with modern glass and/or wood solid core doors. The majority of doors on secondary and rear entrances are also original paneled wood design.

A wide variety of window designs are present at Elkmont including casement, sliding, and double-hung. The most common are casement window variations, which can be found on the majority of the cabins. Sliding track windows are usually arranged in pairs or larger groups and move horizontally in grooves or between runners. Double hung sash were also widely used, especially for the larger cabins and on primary facades. The Wonderland Hotel is primarily composed of original one over one double-hung sash windows. In several cabins window replacement has required retrofitting of window surrounds to accommodate the new window size. The Faust Cabin is an example of this.

The majority of the interiors of the cabins retain their original design, plan, and detailing. Most of these share similar characteristics in their arrangement and use of materials. The largest rooms are those used for communal living space such as living rooms and dining rooms. These are rooms that generally feature fireplace openings and surrounds. Bedrooms are generally small with room only for a bed, dresser or bureau, and a few chairs or a table. Kitchen areas are usually in rear wings or ells off the back of the dwelling and are also often small in comparison with the living or dining rooms.

The “rustic” nature of the cabins was accented through the use of exposed wood ceilings, wood walls, and floors. The focal point for most cabins was the large stone surrounds at the fireplace openings. This feature is common to the majority of the Elkmont cabins, the Wonderland Hotel Annex, and the Appalachian Club. In recent decades some cabins have had the interiors remodeled with modern materials such as plywood, wood paneling, carpeting, and acoustical tile ceilings. About twenty of the cabins appear to have been remodeled in this fashion.

The construction of the Wonderland Hotel and Annex between 1912 and 1928 followed vernacular hotel designs of the period. By the early 1900s at least ten major hotels operated in the mountain areas of Blount and Sevier counties. Historic photographs show that most were of frame construction or two to three stories in height, and built with large porches on one or more facades.¹⁷ These buildings lacked decorative detailing. Other mountain hotels exhibiting this type of construction were at Tremont, Line Springs, Henderson Springs, and Dupont Springs.

The Wonderland Hotel and Annex are of frame construction with hipped roofs and weatherboard siding. The Wonderland has a one-story porch that wraps around three facades of the building. The building has interior brick chimneys and a large fireplace in the social room. The Annex has similar construction with a large stone chimney on an exterior wall, and one-story porches adjacent to its social room.

The original Appalachian Clubhouse was also a frame vernacular design of the period with large porches. It burned in the early 1930s and was replaced with the present structure in 1934. The present clubhouse is of frame construction with a large porch on the east side. The interior has two large stone fireplaces in the social room along with exposed ceiling beams and paneled walls.

During the twenties and early thirties, cabins continued to be constructed. The cabins built after 1928 along the Little River Road are similar in style to earlier ones in design, detailing, and materials. The last cabin to be built at Elkmont during this period was the Cambier Cabin, which was completed in 1940.

In addition to the cabins, a number of outbuildings were also constructed at Elkmont. These include guest cottages, servants’ quarters, woodsheds and garages. A fine example of a servant’s quarters is located at the rear of Cabin 7 in the Appalachian Club area. This one-story frame building housed servants who stayed with the family during the summer season.¹⁸ Frame garages were built adjacent to Cabin 40, the Murphy Cabin, and the Faust Cabin.

The creation of Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the acquisition of the lands and buildings at Elkmont ended the sale of lots at the Wonderland and Appalachian Club complexes. Little new construction occurred at Elkmont over the next several decades. A fire in 1974 resulted in the destruction of four cabins in the Appalachian Club area. New cabins (Numbers 12, 14, 16, and 17) were constructed on these lots in 1974 and 1975. These are the most recent buildings in either the Wonderland or Appalachian Club areas.

¹⁷ *Sevier County Saga*, Bicentennial Committee of Sevier County, 1976, n.p.

¹⁸ Interview by Phil Thomason with Dale Mayo, Elkmont, October 19, 1992.

Many of the cabins in the Elkmont District are examples of Craftsman or Craftsman-influenced designs. The Craftsman movement in America is an outgrowth of the English Arts and Crafts movement. In the United States it flourished from the turn of the century until about 1930. It emphasized interiors that were functional with rooms directly connected to each other. Numerous windows and front or side porches created continuity between the house and its surroundings. The buildings carried out this theme of harmony with nature through the use of natural readily available materials in construction. Fireplaces and dormers are other features of Craftsman design. Landscape features such as walks or paths, simple entry gates, or walls of stone were used to emphasize the link between the structure and its surroundings. Closely associated with bungalows in urban and suburban areas, these same design elements were found in summer or vacation cottages.

In the Appalachian Club portion of the Elkmont Historic District low rock walls line both sides of Jakes Creek Road and gravel paths lead from openings in the walls to the front porches of the cottages. In other locations stone walls delineate the boundaries between the small lots. Cabins along Little River have decks and patios adjacent to the river with simple gates of wood and stone along the road. Stone steps lead up from the road to the Wonderland Hotel. The cabins or cottages in Elkmont have large fireplaces and chimneys built of cobblestone or river rock in the largest or central room with other rooms leading off from it.

In recent decades, alterations and additions to the majority of the Elkmont properties have consisted primarily of enclosing or extending porches and adding rooms or wings to the side and rear facades. More than half of the properties retain most of their overall historic design and detailing. Of the sixty-seven buildings at Elkmont, twenty-six are considered to no longer retain integrity.

Individual Property Descriptions

The following description and assessment of individual structures within the Elkmont Community is based on an architectural and historical survey by Thomason and Associates, Preservation Planners of Nashville, Tennessee, a separate but similar survey by preservation professionals of the National Park Service, and a structural analysis of each building by architects and engineers from Tennessee Valley Authority. See attached maps for locations of buildings.

APPALACHIAN CLUB TOWN

Cabin # 1, Sneed Cabin. One and a half story log dwelling with front porch and gabled roof located on quarter-acre lot. The fireplace and chimney are built of cobblestone and concrete. Built in a gabled ell plan ca. 1910 the building appears to be relatively original. At the roofline is a gable dormer with paired four light casement windows and wood shingle siding. On the north side is a one-story log kitchen wing added about 1948. The foundation of wood posts on stacked fieldstone, the log walls chinked with grout, and porches are in good condition needing replacement of 20 percent or less of existing materials. The roof will need replacement in the next several years. **The building has retained its integrity and is a contributing element.** The most notable landscape feature is a stone retaining wall along the road in front of the property.

Cabin # 2, Smith Cabin. Original core of this cabin was a square block with pyramid roof constructed ca. 1910. Present roof is metal standing seam. Siding is board and batten. There is an interior brick chimney. On the main or east façade there is a shed roof porch that was rebuilt in 1970. The north part of the porch has screen panels while the remaining portion is open. The shed roof screened porch on the rear of the building is on concrete block piers. It appears the building may have housed two families based on two front entry doors and interior arrangement of rooms. A gravel walk leads up from the stone wall across the front of the lot to the porch. There is some settlement of the building mostly at the rear. The floor on

the rear porch is rotten and will need to be replaced. Some of the front porch has been replaced and about half will need replacement. **The building has retained sufficient integrity and is considered to be a contributing element.**

Cabin # 3, Higdon Cabin. A one-story frame dwelling with a gable roof of standing seam on a third of an acre. The exterior is board and batten. Built about 1910 the building has retained much of its original appearance. The foundation is stone and concrete. There is an interior brick chimney. There is a full width porch across the front that was rebuilt about 1980. On the rear is a large ell with gable roof and board and batten siding. There is obvious settlement leading to uneven interior floors, exterior walls that lean out at the top. The roof sags along the ridgeline. **The building is considered a contributing element of the district.** A stone retaining wall is along the road in front to the building.

Cabin # 4, Swan Cabin. One-story frame dwelling with gable roof and horizontal lap siding on a half-acre lot. There is a cobblestone and concrete chimney. The cabin has a wrap around porch that is a recent addition (ca. 1970). A side addition that dominates the main façade has changed the appearance of the building. It appears that additions have been added to additions. There are a number of concrete block piers placed beneath the building, however the foundation is out of plumb resulting in obvious sagging and settlement of the floor. Rafters are rotten and broken in the roof requiring an estimated 50 to 60 percent replacement. **The Swan cabin is a non-contributing element because of loss of original appearance.** A stone retaining wall runs parallel to the road.

Cabin # 5, Addicks. Building rests on a stone foundation. It is a one-story frame rectangular dwelling with drop siding and a gable roof. There is an interior concrete block chimney. On the front is a shed roof porch that has been altered by the addition of beadboard to the beltline. On the rear is a shed roof wing built in the 1930s with board and batten siding. The walls and floor show signs of settlement and the roof sags with a poor connection with the rear porch. Building was moved from town of Elkmont and is an example of the set houses moved from one location to another by railroad.

Ten feet north of the cabin is a one-story playhouse built of unhewn logs with saddle notching and concrete chinking. The building has a gable roof and a stone and concrete exterior chimney. At the southeast corner is a shed roof addition with board and batten siding. Named “Adamless Eden” the playhouse was built in 1921. **Both buildings are considered contributing elements to the historic district.** A stone retaining wall runs parallel to the road in front of the main cabin.

Cabin # 6, Creekmore. The building originally rested on timber posts, which have been reinforced by concrete blocks. It is a one-story frame structure with board and batten siding and a gable roof on a half-acre lot. A gravel walk leads up from the stone wall along the road. The interior chimney is built of cobblestone and concrete. On the front, east side, is a full width porch that was added or rebuilt in 1975. At the north end of the porch is a recent addition (ca. 1970). On the south is a shed roof wing built about 1980 and on the west or back is a wood deck constructed at the same time. The additions are finished with a mixture of board and batten, T1-11 (exterior plywood), and horizontal lap siding. Structurally the building is in poor condition—some foundation piers may be moved by hand, older exterior walls have rot, there is evidence that the roof leaks, and some of the original plank roofing appears to be rotten. **Despite the modern additions and its structural condition the cabin is considered a contributing element to the district.**

Cabin # 7, Mayo Cabin. In addition to the main cabin there is a log cabin and a frame cabin on the property. The main cabin rests on a concrete block foundation. It is a one-story frame structure with a gable roof, board and batten siding and an interior cobblestone and concrete chimney. There is a full width porch on the west or front of the building and 1930 shed roofed wing on the rear. Like Cabin 5 it was moved to this location from the town of Elkmont.

The single pen log cabin was built on Jakes Creek about 1830 and was moved to its present location in 1932. It sits on a stone foundation and the logs have half-dovetail notching and concrete chinking. The gable roof is metal standing seam. The exterior chimney is cobblestone and concrete.

The third structure is a frame servants quarters built about 1920. The single story structure rests on a stone foundation, has a board and batten exterior and gable roof of metal. A shed roof porch was added about 1970 on the front or west side. **All three structures retain enough of their original appearance and contribute to the historic district.** Like other cabins in the vicinity a significant landscape feature is a stone retaining wall along the road.

Cabin # 8, Cain Cabin. This one story frame dwelling rests on a combination of wood posts and concrete blocks on a half-acre lot. Built about 1915 the cabin has board and batten siding. The gable roof is of metal, and there is an interior brick chimney. On the front or east side is a shed roof porch that wraps around the side of the building. It appears that the original porch was expanded in 1970. There also have been recent additions to the rear of the dwelling. Structurally there has been some settlement or sagging of floors and walls with some deflection in walls and roofs. **Because of recent additions and general lack of craftsmanship the cabin is considered non-contributing.** A stone retaining wall and gravel walk are in front of the cabin.

Cabin # 9, Galyon. The stone foundation of the dwelling has been infilled. This one-story frame dwelling has a board and batten exterior, a metal gable roof, and an interior chimney of cobblestone and concrete. Initially the cabin was two rooms and a back porch. In 1919 the bedrooms and kitchen were added. On the west (front) and north sides of the building is a shed roof porch that was rebuilt and expanded about 1970. Several additions pile off the rear of the cabin. On the rear is a modern deck with a catwalk leading to a one-room cabin. This gable roof cabin rests on a wood post foundation with board and batten and drop siding and has a small screen porch on the front. **Because of multiple additions and change in the "footprint" of the building the cabin is considered non-contributing.** A stone retaining wall runs parallel to Jakes Creek Road in front of the cabin.

Cabin # 10, Baumann. Resting on a concrete block foundation this single story frame dwelling has board and batten siding, an exterior wall concrete and cobblestone chimney, and a hipped roof of metal. It is on a third of an acre lot with a gravel walk and stone wall in front. At the roofline is a raised hipped roof with six light clerestory windows. There is a shed roof porch with unhewn log posts and lattice panels on the front. The cabin was built in 1910 with the clerestory added in the twenties. A rear ell, added in 1936, has a brick chimney. A screened shed roof porch is on the south side. **Because the overall feeling has been maintained and the appearance of the building on the main facades has not changed since 1931, the building is considered a contributing element to the Elkmont historic district.**

Cabin # 11, Scruggs-Briscoe. The foundation of the cabin is stone and concrete block. The single story frame dwelling has a gable roof and board and batten siding. The interior chimney is constructed of cobblestone and concrete. This building along with Cabins 9, 13, and 15 has had the original porch expanded about 1970 to wrap around two sides of the cabin. The many additions made to the side and rear have overwhelmed the original massing and altered the exterior appearance. **For these reasons the cabin is considered non-contributing.** A stone retaining wall runs parallel with the road in front of the cabin.

Cabins 12, 14, 16, and 17 were reconstructed in 1974 after burning down. **All four are considered as not contributing to the Elkmont historic district.**

Cabin # 13, Cook. Located on a third of an acre lot this one story frame dwelling (ca. 1912) rests on a foundation of wood posts and concrete blocks. It has board and batten siding and a metal gable roof. The

shed roof porch on the north and west side of the cabin was built or expanded about 1970. Two rear additions built sometime between 1930 and 1950 doubled the size of the original cabin. These additions have altered the exterior appearance. **The historic integrity of the building has been compromised. It is a non-contributing element.** There is evidence of settlement in the main structure and water damage is visible on the porch roof. A stone retaining wall is at the road.

Cabin # 15, Hale. The present foundation is concrete block piers. This single story frame building has a hip roof of metal and the exterior is board and batten. The interior chimney is cobblestone and concrete. The floor sags and there is some rot and splitting of the walls. It is on a quarter-acre lot with a stone wall across the front. The original structure has been engulfed by additions and the wrap around porch (ca. 1970) has changed the appearance of the building. **However after consultation with the staff of the State Historic Preservation Office this November the building is considered contributing.**

Cabin # 18, Gilliland. Also known as Walnut Lodge this story and a half log and frame building rests on stone and wood post piers. Originally it may have been a single pen log cabin with a board and batten half story added later. The logs are saddle notched with concrete chinking. The chimney is stone and stucco, and the gable roof is metal standing seam. On the main or east façade is a one-story porch recessed beneath the half story. The porch has original unhewn wood columns and a railing of birch branches. There is some settlement and rot in the floor and walls. **The cabin retains its exterior feeling and is considered a contributing element.**

Cabin # 19, Heinson. A one-story log dwelling resting on wooden posts. The exterior is log and board and batten and the gable roof is metal. A cobblestone and concrete chimney is on the exterior wall. Additions include a back porch using horizontal lap siding and an extension off the back porch of board and batten with board and batten enclosing the area below. There is an exterior wood staircase on the rear wing. **Because the additions do not intrude on the main block the building is considered a contributing element to the historic district.** Structurally the front porch, roof, and floor are sagging and there is rot in the wooden piers.

Cabin # 20, F. Andrews (also known as Hemlock Cabin). The building rests on brick piers and is a one and a half story frame and log dwelling. The original building (ca. 1910) was a single pen log cabin. It is possible that the half story board and batten addition was added to the log cabin at an early date. The logs on the original section are unhewn and saddle notched. In 1956, a frame wing on the south side was added. Other additions have been added to the sides and on the rear a one story shed roof wing with horizontal board siding has been added. The cabin has a gable roof of metal and an interior chimney of cobblestone and concrete. **Because the 1956 addition and other changes have compromised the original appearance, the building is considered to be non-contributing.**

Cabin # 21, Andrews-Sherling. Built about 1912 the cabin located on a quarter-acre lot was originally a long rectangle with a porch on the south side. The foundation is wooden posts resting on fieldstone and the exterior is weatherboard siding. There is a gable roof of metal standing seam with an exterior cobblestone chimney. A rear addition has board and batten and horizontal lap siding. The porch on the front or east side is screened. **Although additions and changes have occurred the cabin retains sufficient integrity to be considered contributing to the historic district.** The cabin will need replacement of twenty-five to fifty percent of the exterior fabric.

Cabin # 22, Congleton-Brownlow. This cabin, built about 1915, is a wide rectangle with a front porch on the east side, gable roof of asphalt shingles, and board and batten siding. While the porch rests on concrete and cobblestone piers the main structure is on a stone foundation. A rear deck of pressure treated lumber rests on fifteen-foot concrete block piers. A shed roof addition on the north side has a large picture

window. **Although modified, the appearance of the cabin from the road is relatively unchanged and thus is considered a contributing element of the historic district.**

Cabin # 23, McDonald. Cabin (ca. 1910) is a single story frame building with board and batten siding resting on a concrete block foundation. The roof is hipped and the interior chimney is cobblestone and concrete. A second story addition with an outside wood staircase is located on the west side. These additions date to the historic period. A screened porch of modern materials is on the rear, however, it is not visible from the front of the building. **The property is considered a contributing element.**

Cabin # 24, W. Arnett. Constructed in 1910 as a single rectangle cabin with hipped roof and board and batten siding. A cobblestone and concrete chimney is on an exterior wall. A projecting gabled wing was constructed on the east or front façade about 1970. The addition has wood shingles on the exterior. On the rear is a wood deck constructed about 1970 that rests on metal columns. **Due to the large addition on the main façade, Cabin 24 has lost integrity of design and is considered a non-contributing element.** Structurally the floor is buckled and the interior walls are bowed and leaning.

Cabin # 25, Franklin. Built on a gabled ell plan the foundation is a combination of wood posts on fieldstone and concrete block. The exterior is board and batten. On the front or east side is a partial width porch and on the rear is a modern deck built 1970 and a shed addition with board and batten siding. The cabin is considered one of the worst in regard to structural condition. There is extremely bad settlement of the floors, the walls bow, the roof sags and is rotten, and all the siding would need to be replaced. **Because of loss of structural integrity the building is considered non-contributing.**

Cabin # 26, Hutchins or Laurel Lodge. Built about 1912 the cabin was originally a square block with pyramid roof and board and batten siding. Presently it has a hipped roof of roll roofing, retains the board and batten siding, and has a cobblestone and concrete chimney on an exterior wall. It rests on a stone foundation. A partial width porch is on the front or east side, however, a gabled roof has been grafted onto the pyramid. On the rear is a 1960 addition with a combination of board and batten and T1-11 siding. **Because of the degree of modification of the original appearance the building is considered non-contributing to the historic district.**

Cabin # 27, Gaines. Built in 1910 it has been occupied by the Gaines family for the last sixty years. The cabin rests on a combination of fieldstone piers and wooden posts on fieldstone. The exterior is board and batten siding and the hipped roof is metal. On the exterior wall is a cobblestone and concrete chimney. A porch was added on the east or front of the building in 1970 and a room on the porch was enclosed with board and batten. A two-story porch has been constructed on the rear and the foundation enclosed to create a partial basement. **Because of modifications to the original structure this building is considered not to contribute to the historic district.** Structurally there is severe settlement and uneven interior floors. The deterioration of the mortar on the foundation piers has contributed to this condition. Located on a third of an acre lot.

Cabin # 28, Spengler-Schmid. This began as a single rectangle with horizontal lap siding and a gabled roof. The exterior is weatherboard and a brick chimney is on an exterior wall. The foundation is a combination of wood posts on fieldstone and concrete block. There is a wraparound porch on the east and south side and a screen porch on the rear or west side. There is a second story addition that is a loft for storage. A shed roof wing, added to the south side about 1960, has T1-11 siding. **Because the side addition and other modifications dominate the building, it is considered as not contributing to the historic district.** There is a gravel walk leading to a stone retaining wall at Jakes Creek Road.

Cabin # 29, F. Arnett. This one and a half story double pen log dwelling rests on posts and timber on fieldstone. The exterior is unhewn saddle notched logs. The usual cobblestone and concrete chimney is on

the exterior wall. On the rear is a shed roof addition of frame and logs. The breezeway or dogtrot is screened. Along Jakes Creek Road in front of the cabin is a stone retaining wall. **This building with its limited changes is a contributing element to the historic district.** Its structural condition is very good.

Cabin # 30, Wright. Constructed in 1921 this one and a half story frame dwelling has a gable roof, board and batten siding, and a foundation of wood posts and rock. A cobblestone and concrete chimney is on an exterior wall. On the front or east is a full width porch recessed beneath the half story. On the rear is an enclosed screen porch. A variety of materials in addition to board and batten have been used on the exterior including drop siding, tongue and groove flooring and tarpaper. The structural condition is very poor. Some piers are not plumb. There is settlement (some of it severe) on both floors, there is some rot of the siding and the roof sags badly on both the house and porch. **Despite the deteriorated quality of the building and loss of structural integrity it was determined after consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office that the building contributes to the historic district.**

Cabin # 31, Matthews Cabin and Little Cottage. The gable roof cabin (ca. 1910), also known as Wilderness Lodge, is a double pen one and a half story log building resting on wood posts on fieldstone. The metal roof dates to about 1940. The logs are hewn and square notched with concrete chinking. There is a cobblestone and concrete chimney on the exterior wall. The full width porch on the front was added in 1940. On the rear are a frame wing and a rear single pen log wing. The former may date to 1940, while the log wing was either part of the original cabin or added about 1920. A stone retaining wall runs along Jakes Creek Road.

The Little Cottage adjacent to the cabin is a one-story frame dwelling built about 1925. It is a single pen design with a roof of metal standing seam, an exterior of board and batten siding, and rests on concrete block foundation. A shed roof screen porch is on the back. **Both structures are contributing elements in the historic district.** Their structural condition is very good.

Cabin # 32, Allen. A one-story frame dwelling resting on fieldstone and concrete block piers. The exterior is board and batten and there are both an exterior and interior chimney of cobblestone and concrete. The cabin has a gable roof of metal standing seam. On the front or east side is a full width porch of cobblestone and concrete with unhewn log posts and a shed roof. The cabin has been added to about four times including a large back porch and a deck built of modern materials on the rear. Structurally the roof has shifted off the interior walls and the floors are uneven. **The additions are not visible from the road and the structural problems are not sufficient to make it non-contributing, thus it is considered a contributing element of the district.**

Cabin # 33, Jeffords. A single rectangle frame dwelling built about 1920 with a gable roof of roll roofing, weatherboard siding, and interior chimney of cobblestone and concrete. The foundation of the main house is wood posts on fieldstone while the porch rests on mortared fieldstone. This partial width porch was added about 1970. On the right or north side of the dwelling is an addition that extends from front to rear with non-matching horizontal siding. The shed porch on the rear has board and batten siding. There is obvious deflection of the floors and the roof sags. This structure is severely compromised and has lost its integrity. **It is not a contributing element to the historic district.**

Cabin # 34, McAmis. Built about 1920, this one story frame dwelling rests on a mixture of poles on fieldstone and old and new concrete block. Located on a quarter-acre lot the cabin has a hipped roof of metal, board and batten exterior, and an interior concrete and cobblestone chimney. There is a shed roof entry porch on the front or east façade. On the rear is an attached storage shed and screen porch with a sleeping room underneath. **This is a contributing element to the district.** A stone retaining wall is in front of the cabin along Jakes Creek Road.

Cabin # 35, Culver. This one-story frame dwelling was built in 1922. The cabin has a gable roof, exterior of weatherboard siding, an interior cobblestone and concrete chimney and a concrete block foundation. A partial width porch is on the front or east side and on the rear is a lateral wing. Structural condition is fair to good. **Although altered the structure has maintained its original massing and is a contributing element to the historic district.**

Cabin # 36, Knaffl. The one story frame cabin has a gable roof. The exterior siding is a mixture of board and batten and shingles. The foundation is a mixture of post on stone, stone piers, and concrete block. The interior chimney is concrete and cobblestone. The original small front porch has been modified to a full width screen porch. A large, six by six foot picture window has been added on the south wall. The kitchen, laundry room, side rooms and a back porch have been added. **Because of the extent of the alterations, this building is considered non-contributing to the character of the historic district.**

Cabin # 37, Johnston. Like Cabin 36 this frame dwelling has been extensively altered. The exterior is board and batten siding and the gable roof is metal. Fieldstone, wood posts on fieldstone, and concrete block make up the foundation. A modern wraparound porch is on the front and side. Other changes include an exterior concrete block chimney, a large picture window (ca. 1950), as well as smaller windows of the same period. There is a stone retaining wall along Jakes Creek Road. **Because of the alterations this cabin is a non-contributing element of the Elkmont Historic District.**

Cabin # 38, Byers Cabin. This one-and-a-half-story frame dwelling was owned by Col. David Chapman, one of the “fathers” of Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The cabin rests on posts and concrete block piers, has a board and batten exterior, and a gable roof of metal. There is a one-story entry porch on the front or east side. A half-story sleeping porch was added later over the porch. At the roofline, two shed roof dormers were added. It appears that the entire left or south side was another addition. A one story shed roof porch is on the back. Because of additions and modifications the appearance of the original structure is lost. **This is not a contributing element to the historic district.**

Cabin # 39, Dudley. Built in 1923 this frame cabin has a gable roof, weatherboard siding, the usual concrete and cobblestone chimney on an exterior wall, and concrete block foundation. There is a full-length porch on the east or front that connects on the north with the original screen porch. On the west or rear is a redwood deck with a concrete block basement with recreation room and kitchen underneath. **It is considered a contributing element to the district.**

Cabin # 40, Kuhlman. Resting on a combination of mortared fieldstone and fieldstone piers this wood frame dwelling has a gable roof of asphalt shingles, an exterior of horizontal lap siding, and an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney. On the front or west is a gable roof porch. This and other porches on the side and rear are the major alterations. All porches are finished with horizontal lap siding. The consistency of design and materials give this cabin a sense of unity. The original wood entry gate is in front of the cabin along Jakes Creek Road. At the rear is an original one story single bay garage with gable roof, weatherboard siding, and double doors of vertical board design. Adjacent to the garage is a shed roof woodshed with horizontal siding and a stone and concrete foundation. **All the elements in the complex contribute to the historic district.**

Cabin # 41, McNabb. This one story frame dwelling has a gable roof, interior concrete block chimney, and a stone foundation. About 1970 the exterior was covered with wood shingles and at the same time a shed roof porch was added on the north side and a storage shed at the northeast corner. The storage shed has vertical board siding. Plastic skylights have been installed in the ceiling of the main room. A small shed roof privy of vertical board construction built about 1960 is located to the rear. **The cabin has lost integrity of design, materials and craftsmanship and is considered non-contributing.**

Appalachian Clubhouse. Located at the northern end of the complex between Jakes Creek and Jakes Creek Road. Constructed in 1934 the clubhouse replaced an earlier structure that burned two years earlier. It was designed by Knoxville architect, Albert Baumann, Jr. The building has a large social room, a kitchen, and various meeting and storage rooms. The exterior is weatherboard siding, and there are exterior chimneys of cobblestone and concrete on the north and south ends of the building. The structure is on a wood post foundation and has a metal gable roof. On the main or east side is a full width porch, sections of which have been enclosed with screen panels. The social room has a king post truss system of unhewn logs supporting the roof and at the north and south end are large cobblestone and concrete chimneys. There have been only minor modifications to the original design. **The building is definitely a contributing element to the Historic District.** There is some evidence of termites, rot in the foundation posts, and about ten percent of the siding needs to be replaced. The northeast porch has settled significantly. A final structural note by TVA engineers is that the floor, “is probably not designed for assembly usage.”

Avent Cabin. This one story log dwelling is the subject of a separate nomination. It was never considered part of the Appalachian Club complex. Built about 1850 it was purchased by Frank Avent in 1918 and remodeled into its present appearance in 1926. The building has a gable roof, an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney and stone foundation. The logs are half dovetail notched with both mud and concrete chinking. Two of the entrance doors are vertical board design and date to about 1910. On the rear or east is a shed roof wing with vertical board siding that contains a kitchen and enclosed porch. It was rebuilt in 1974.

The following cabins are located in the eastern portion of the Appalachian Club complex toward the Little River. See map of Appalachian Town for location of specific cabins.

Spence Cabin or River Lodge – Building consists of three sections joined at two slight obtuse angles. The center section is built of unhewn logs with concrete chinking. On the south or front side is a large cobblestone and concrete chimney and a section of the chimney encloses the main entrance. The entrance opening is arched and there is a vertical board door with diagonal bracing. The west wing has both horizontal and board and batten siding. There is a gable roofed entry porch. The east wing, which appears to have been added later, has weatherboard and board and batten siding. The log section has one large room while the two frame sections contain bedrooms, a kitchen and bathrooms. The building has a gable roof and rest on a foundation of stone and concrete blocks. At the rear is a stone and concrete deck and a separate deck of the same materials is located next to Little River. There are stone and concrete entry gates on Little River Road. **All elements of the property are considered as contributing to the historic district.** There is some rot of foundation posts and exterior siding on the north or rear of the structure.

Brandau Cabin – A one-story frame dwelling built in 1928 with a gable roof of asphalt shingles, weatherboard siding, a stone foundation and an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney. Additions include the right hand bedrooms, kitchen, bathroom, shed roof screen porch, and latticed storage room. All additions are well integrated and finished with drop siding to match the original. On the west side is a concrete and stone patio. **The cabin is a contributing element to the historic district.** It is described as being in reasonably good shape structurally.

Parrott Cabin – This single story frame building rests on a stone foundation, has weatherboard siding, the usual cobblestone and concrete chimney on an exterior wall, and a gable roof. All the siding and asphalt shingles on the roof are recent. A large rear addition with ell and front porch, which doubles the size of the original cabin, have recently been added. There is a loft over half the building. The original rear wall of the cabin has been removed and the footprint of the building has been radically changed. The building has some deflection in the foundation and evidence of water leakage around the fireplace. **For the above reasons the Parrott Cabin is not considered a contributing element of the historic district.**

Murphy Cabin – Built about 1928 the entire cabin appears to be original. The one story frame building has a hipped roof of asphalt shingles, an exterior of board and batten, an interior foundation of cobblestone and concrete and an exterior of wood posts, and a cobblestone and concrete chimney. There is a shed roof entry porch on the front or south side. On the rear is a shed roof screen porch. A portion of the roof is raised to accommodate clerestory windows. Ten yards to the southeast of the main building is an original shed roof board and batten garage with two open bays, and at the rear of the garage is a shed roof storage wing. About twenty yards to the southwest is a one story open gazebo with gable roof that was rebuilt about 1980 based on an original design at this location. **All elements of the Murphy property are considered as contributing to the historic district.** Overall the cabin is in fair condition.

Cambier Cabin – Built in 1940 the cabin is one and a half stories high and has a gable roof of metal. The exterior siding is board and batten and the entire structure was upgraded with a continuous concrete block foundation. The interior chimney is also concrete block. At the rear is a wood staircase leading to an entrance in the half story. The only apparent addition is the one side room that is also enclosed in board and batten siding. There is some water damage around the fireplace and some sagging of the roof, but structurally it is in good to fair condition. **The property is considered as contributing to the character of the Elkmont historic district.**

Young Cabin – This one story frame dwelling has a gable roof, board and batten siding, both an exterior and interior chimney of concrete and cobblestone, and a stone and concrete block foundation. Some steel jack posts have been added under the house. On the north side is a single story screen porch. Windows on the north façade are original wood sash, however, the remaining windows are 1960 (c) metal louvered and sliding design. On the west side is a lateral one story wing with board and batten siding and a gable roof that was built in 1970. Structurally there is some rot and cracking of the siding and evidence of sagging in the roof. **Because of the changes in windows (1960) and the 1970 addition, the structure is not considered a contributing element to the district.**

Faust Cabin – Located on a 1 to 2 acre tract this one story frame dwelling (circa 1928) has been altered several times. Walls have been removed to create interior spaces, external porches are now part of the interior, and windows have been modified to picture window dimensions. On the east a shed roof porch was added in 1980. The building has a gable roof, weatherboard siding and a stone foundation. Adjacent to the cabin is a 1930 period gable roof frame two bay garage. The dry stack river rock wall that encloses the yard is considerably higher (3 to 4 feet) than other walls in the complex. **Despite significant alterations the exterior appearance merits inclusion as a contributing element of the district.** The building has the usual structural problems of settlement of foundation and floors and some rotten siding.

Miller Cabin – Originally a cantilever frame structure built about 1928 and remodeled into a dwelling about 1950. It is two stories in height, has weatherboard and board and batten siding with a rock faced concrete block foundation. The main entrance is on the east on the second story and is reached by a staircase. At the roofline is a gable roof belfry with louvered vents that appear to vent the interior fireplace. Leading to the cabin from Little River Road is a dry stack rock wall with entrance gates. Overall the cabin is in good condition, but may need a new asphalt roof in a few years. **Both the building and the rock wall/entrance gates are considered to be contributing to the district.**

Structures other than cabins that are part of the Appalachian Club Town.

The Little River Stone Bridge crosses the river at the northern end of the Appalachian Club Town area. It is a four span stone bridge with each span having a keystone in the arch. It was constructed about 1940 by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). There was a CCC camp on the site of the present Elkmont

Campground. The bridge is of rock faced limestone construction. **The stone bridge is a contributing element of the historic district.**

Site of the Little River Swimming Hole is one-tenth of a mile southeast of the stone bridge. Until recently a dam composed of rocks and logs trapped water. The swimming hole had been a traditional recreational area since the second decade of this century. **It contributed to the character of the district.**

Bearwallow Creek Bridge is a cobblestone and concrete bridge located between the Young and Faust Cabins. Built about 1930, it is a small single span pedestrian bridge with a deck of poured concrete. **It contributes to the district.**

The New Elkmont Cemetery is located west of Jakes Creek. It was dedicated in 1928 and contains the graves of many of the early Elkmont residents. **The cemetery is a contributing site in the historic district.**

Sites of Lem Owenby Cabin and Lee Higdon Cabin are about a mile south of Cabin 41; all that are left are a few scattered stones at Owenby and the chimney and foundation of the Higdon Cabin located west of Owenby. **Neither is considered as a contributing element.**

WONDERLAND CLUB

In contrast to the Appalachian Club where most of the cabins are arranged along a street in close proximity to each other the cabins of the Wonderland Club are widely scattered and screened by vegetation.

Wonderland Hotel – This two-story frame hotel was built in two stages. The front section that faced the Little River Railroad was constructed in 1912, while the two-story rear wing was added about 1928 and contains the dining room and rooms on the second floor. The building has a hipped roof of roll roofing. The exterior is weatherboard siding. The foundation is stone and there are two interior brick chimneys. On the front or south side is a one story wraparound porch with original wood columns and diagonal bracing. To the south of the hotel are an original cobblestone and concrete retaining wall and steps that lead to the road below.

The first floor contains the lobby, social room and ballroom in the original section. The original wood check in counter is still present in the lobby. Drywall and acoustical tiles have been added to the social room and ballroom. The ballroom has a post and lintel central support system with diagonal bracing. In the northeast corner is a raised wooden stage. The dining room, part of the later addition, has its original flooring. An acoustical tile ceiling has been added.

Access to the second floor is by stairwell from the lobby. Originally an open stair it was enclosed in 1972 to meet fire code. There are 27 rooms arranged on either side of a central corridor. While the wooden floor is original, hallway walls were covered by drywall in 1985. The rooms have wood paneling added in 1965 and drop ceilings installed about 1980.

A structural evaluation of the hotel states that the exterior siding, roof, interior partitions, and interior finishes are in poor to fair condition. On the first floor there is significant settlement at the interior posts, and the center beam for the second floor is clearly sagging in the south wing. A similar situation exists in the newer north section dining room. The sagging in the west end of the second floor is both “seeable and feelable.” With the exception of some settlement of the foundation, the front porch is in fair to good condition. **The Wonderland Hotel is a contributing element of the Elkmont Historic District.**

Hotel Annex – This two-story frame building was built in 1920 to serve as additional guest accommodations. It is about ten yards west of the hotel. The first floor contains a social room and guest rooms while the upper floor is entirely guest rooms. The building has a hipped roof, weatherboard siding, a large exterior wall cobblestone and concrete chimney and a stone foundation. There are one story porches on the east and west sides.

The interior of the annex has original wood floors and unfinished board ceilings. The social room has tongue and groove beaded board walls and exposed ceiling beams. The original staircase leads to the second floor. There are 24 rooms in the annex. Some of the rooms have circa 1950 wood paneling. The hallways on both floors retain the original tongue and groove walls, and doors leading to the rooms are also original. The building is in good condition with some, but not severe, settlement. **The building is a contributing element of the district.**

Wonderland Hotel Servant's Quarters (aka Riordan Cabin) – This one story frame building with a gable roof of asphalt shingles, asphalt shingle siding, an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney, and a foundation of wood posts was built about 1930. The only alterations to the exterior are replacement of round wood posts with square pressure treated posts and addition of some aluminum window units on all four sides of the building. The interior has been partially remodeled, but the original material remains behind the modern paneling. Some of the rooms have retained their original plank walls and doors. There has been severe settlement of the south wall. **The building is a contributing element of the district.**

May or Moore Cabin – A two-story rectangular structure with an enclosed back porch or sleeping porch. The roof is gabled and the siding board and batten. The cabin rests on a stone foundation and has an exterior wall cobblestone and concrete chimney. Built in 1917 by Frank May, the cabin was extensively remodeled in 1921 with the addition of a low railing of concrete and cobblestones being added to the full width shed roof porch, and the construction of a chimney, interior walls and a staircase. It appears there have been no other alterations. **The building is a contributing element of the historic district.**

Preston Cabin – Constructed in 1922 on a gabled ell plan the building was remodeled about 1930. A single story frame dwelling, it has an exterior of cedar shingles, the usual cobblestone and concrete chimney on an exterior wall, and a concrete and cobblestone foundation. There is a partial width screen porch on the front (east) side and a shed roof screen porch on the back. **The building presents a very unified appearance and contributes to the historic district.** No major structural problems noted.

Paine Cabin – Located two-tenths of a mile northeast of the hotel, this is a one story frame dwelling built in 1928. It has a gable roof of metal standing seam, the exterior is board and batten siding, and it rests on a stone foundation. There is an interior chimney of cobblestone and concrete. The original building was a single block with a back porch. Another block of similar shape and size was later added and is offset slightly. The whole structure has a unified appearance. **This property contributes to the character of the historic district.** There is some settlement of the foundation and evidence of rot where the siding comes in contact with the ground.

Bowman Cabin or Brown Cabin – Constructed in 1913 the cabin was purchased by the E. L. Bowman family in 1920. At that time it consisted of a single large room and a bedroom. Forty years later it was purchased by the Fred Brown family who extensively remodeled it in 1974, adding plywood and batten and wood shingle siding, a large screen porch on the south side and a basement. Because of these additions, the cabin no longer retains its integrity of design and craftsmanship. **It is not a contributing element of the district.**

The Hicks Cabin – This one story frame dwelling was built on the gabled ell plan with a porch built on the west side of the projecting gabled bay. The cabin has a gable roof of asphalt shingles and the exterior is enclosed in a combination of vertical beadboard and tongue and groove flooring, both of which are interior materials. There is an exterior cobblestone and concrete chimney and the foundation is a combination of brick piers, timber posts, and timber poles, the latter two resting on either concrete block or fieldstone. Although the mixture of siding and foundation supports destroys some continuity, the overall appearance is not severely affected. It is in good structural condition. **The cabin is a contributing element to the historic district.**

McMillian/Keith Cabin – Built about 1922 this one story frame dwelling has a gable roof, an exterior of wood panels and a concrete block foundation. The wood panel siding was added in 1972. On the front or north side is a full width shed porch, and on the rear a full width screen porch resting on concrete blocks and metal posts. The interior of the cabin was extensively remodeled in the early 1970s. **Because of the exterior siding replacement, addition of two porches, and interior alterations, this building does not contribute to the historic district.** The foundation is described as “bad” with posts and concrete block out of plumb. Some posts are not in contact with the floor beams.

Vandergriff Cabin – A one-story frame dwelling with a gable roof of asphalt shingles resting on a cast concrete foundation. The original exterior of board and batten siding was replaced about 1972 with the present plywood and batten strip panels. At the same time a shed porch was added on the north side. Although the interior has retained most of its original fabric, the exterior has lost its integrity of materials and craftsmanship. **For this reason the building is not considered a contributing element.**

Tate, Beaman, and Tucker Cabin – This cabin is a long rectangle with a porch. The exterior is drop wood siding. There is a concrete and cobblestone chimney on an exterior wall and the foundation is concrete and fieldstone on the perimeter and posts on concrete or fieldstone beneath the cabin. The building has a full basement. The building appears to have retained much of its original appearance. Its structural condition is also very good. **The property contributes to the character of the historic district.**

Richards or Brandau Cabin – The building has a gable roof of metal standing seam, an exterior of weatherboard siding, the usual cobblestone and concrete chimney on an exterior wall, and a foundation of cast concrete on the perimeter and fieldstone or posts on fieldstone beneath the building. There is a shed roof porch on the north. Described as the worst of the Wonderland Cabins in the structural assessment, the building has very obvious settlement, has lost most or all of its structural stability, the roof is distorted and the porch is rotten. Essentially the cabin would need to be totally replaced. **Because of this degree of deterioration the cabin is not considered a contributing element in the Elkmont Historic District.**

One site in addition to the cabins exists within the Wonderland Club area.

The Old Elkmont Cemetery is located northwest of the Wonderland Hotel. There are approximately fifty graves dating from 1910 to the present. The cemetery served both the community of Elkmont and the surrounding area. **It is considered a contributing site in the historic district.**

Section 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.

- 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:

- A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- B removed from its original location.
- C a birthplace or a 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.

Areas of Significance: Architecture
 Entertainment/Recreation

Period of Significance: 1908 to 1940

Significant Dates: (none given)

Significant Person: N/A

Cultural Affiliation: (none given)

Architect/Builder: (none given)

Narrative Statement of Significance:

SUMMARY

The Elkmont Historic District meets National Register eligibility under Criteria A and C for its architectural and historical significance. The district is significant under Criterion A as the only remaining collection of early 20th century resort cabins retaining integrity in the Appalachian Mountains of Tennessee. The district is significant under Criterion C as representative of the rustic or vernacular architecture of the early 20th century. The district’s period of significance extends from 1910 when the Appalachian Club was formed to 1940, when the last cabin was constructed.

Criterion A – Entertainment and Recreation

Elkmont is significant under Criterion A in the area of entertainment/recreation. Elkmont was formed during the outdoor recreation movement of the early 20th century. This movement stressed a return to nature and resulted in the construction of hotels and mountain camps throughout America. The universal enthusiasm of Americans for the “back to nature movement” could be seen in the vast expansion of the national park and forest system under presidents Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft, the popularity of outdoor adventure stories, creation of the Boy Scouts in 1910 and the Campfire Girls in

1912, and the vogue of birdwatching and sportsman's clubs.¹⁹ In the Southern Appalachians this renewed interest in outdoor life led to the construction of numerous hotels and mountain cottages.

The Little River Lumber Company of Sevier County, Tennessee, realized the possibilities of such mountain camps for its property, and in 1910 and 1911 it deeded land for two private developments, the Appalachian Club and Wonderland Park. Summer cabins were soon built at both locations primarily for Knoxville businessmen and their families. The formerly inaccessible location deep in the mountains was a major attraction for the well-to-do eastern Tennesseans who built summer homes at Elkmont. Although earlier resorts in Sevier County such as Glen Alpine and Henderson Springs attracted prominent Knoxville families, Elkmont is probably unique in its permanent long-time association with individuals prominent in the business, professional, social, and civic life of East Tennessee.

Elkmont has both local and state significance. Not only is this resource unique in Sevier County, but no similar collection of early 20th century cabins and mountain hotels is known to exist in the Appalachian Mountains of East Tennessee.²⁰ Other summer resort complexes in the vicinity such as Line Springs and Dupont Springs have been razed, while the resort cabins at Kinzel Springs in Blount County have been modified and no longer retain integrity.²¹ The creation of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the 1930s largely halted construction at Elkmont resulting in few changes to its pre-1940 appearance.

The buildings and structures at Elkmont are especially notable for their survival to the present day. Tourist facilities are particularly vulnerable to the pressures of remodeling and rebuilding. With the creation of the National Park, tourist visitation to the area increased by many fold, especially on the Tennessee side of the mountains. The Great Smoky Mountains National Park is the most visited national park in the country. This has brought considerable pressure for new development, particularly in the Gatlinburg area. Immediately outside the boundaries of the Park on the Tennessee side, no similar hotels or summer colonies survive intact from the early twentieth century.

The buildings at Elkmont are also unique in terms of the extant structures now within the boundaries of the National Park. At the time of the creation of the National Park the architecture of the Great Smoky Mountains included early twentieth century timber camps and structures associated with timber related industries (much of it vertical-plank, "boxed" construction), nineteenth and early twentieth century agricultural complexes and communities (log, frame, and "boxed" construction), and early twentieth century structures associated with tourism and recreational use of the mountains (mostly of frame construction). On the Tennessee side of Great Smoky Mountains National Park, most of the latter type of structures was located in the area of Elkmont, though elsewhere in the park some families with larger homes did take in borders that were visiting the area.

With their emphasis on the preservation of the natural environment in parks such as Great Smokies, the National Park Service in the past tended to treat the cultural landscape as an intrusion and few buildings were preserved. Great Smoky Mountains National Park was somewhat unique in its early official policy of preserving mountain culture and the buildings and structures. During the 1930s and early 1940s, structures within the park were documented and photographed and plans were made to preserve certain

¹⁹ Clifford E. Clark, Jr. *The American Family Home, 1800–1960*. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 180.

²⁰ Interview by Phil Thomason with Steve Rogers and Claudette Stager, Tennessee Historical Commission, December 18, 1992.

²¹ "The Historical and Architectural Resources of Blount County, Tennessee." National Register nomination on file at the Tennessee Historical Commission, 1989.

structures. Many structures, however, were demolished or burned. Preservation was quite selective, favoring 19th century dwellings and agricultural structures (especially those built of log).

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the Great Smoky Mountains were transformed by logging and tourism. Architectural evidence of this transformation has all but disappeared except for a few early twentieth century frame dwellings that may have been used as boarding houses, such as the Caldwell House in Cataloochee, North Carolina. The structures at Elkmont were preserved not because of the recognition of their significance, but because lifetime leases were granted to the cabin holders. The Voorheis complex, built by a well-to-do Ohio businessman near Gatlinburg, is the only other summer home surviving on the Tennessee side of the Park.

Criterion C – Architecture

The building forms and plans of the cabins at Elkmont are typical of rural building traditions in the Tennessee mountains. House forms include Gabled Ell, Pyramid Square, Single or Double Pen, and Rectangular. The larger buildings, Wonderland Hotel and Annex and the Appalachian Clubhouse, are typical of vernacular hotel or social halls of the period. However, there is evidence of craftsman or craftsman-influenced designs in some of the cabins. The builders of the cabins at Wonderland and Appalachian Club used materials that were most available such as river or cobble stone and locally milled weatherboard, board and batten, or drop siding. Most of the buildings are balloon frame construction representing the availability of sawn lumber. The few log buildings were either moved to the area or represent original locations. Some of the log cabins have frame additions. The mixture of stock window and door elements is also common for building construction of the period.

All the buildings from the smallest cabin to the hotel reflect simplicity of form and function. In addition they conveyed an impression of shelter, safety, and comfort. The front porches tied the building directly to the surrounding environment. Natural materials including fieldstone piers and cobblestone in chimneys and fireplaces as well as wood exterior walls tended to blend with the site and in most cases required little maintenance.

The use of natural materials readily found in the immediate area was also expressed in the landscape elements at Elkmont. Cobblestone was used not only for fireplaces and chimneys, but also for walls dividing property from the road or to mark property lines, as retaining walls and gates, and in decks or patios.

The focal point of the Wonderland Club development was the hotel built in two stages in 1912 and 1928. The Wonderland Hotel is typical of the type of hotels built in the southern Appalachian Mountains during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when railroads such as the Little River Railroad made the mountains accessible to tourists or individuals building and possessing cabins in close proximity to the hotel. The Wonderland Hotel and the adjacent annex built in 1920 were constructed in this vernacular tradition. They are of frame construction with hipped roofs and weatherboard siding. The hotel has a porch that wraps around three sides of the building while the annex has two small porches adjacent to the social room. Both have chimneys and fireplaces. The hotel chimney is of brick rather than stone.

The Wonderland Hotel was unique. Unlike other resort hotels on commercial rail lines or roads it was located deep within the mountains in an area accessible only by a logging train that was also used as an excursion train for tourists. As a result it became a popular tourist destination. No similar hotel was located within the boundaries of Great Smoky Mountains National Park. As a result, Elkmont was the center of tourist activity on the Tennessee side of the park.

Similar in style to the Wonderland Hotel and Annex, the original Appalachian Clubhouse served more as a social center for the residents of the cabins that lined Jakes Creek Road than as a destination for tourists. The original clubhouse burned and was replaced in 1934. The present building has a large porch on the front and cobblestone chimneys and fireplaces at each end of the large social room.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The scenic beauty and moderate climate of the southern Appalachian Mountains have long attracted visitors who came for short or extended stays, particularly in the summer months. However the difficulty of transportation through the mountains in the 19th century limited the type of visitors and the areas developed for summer visitation. Soon after the construction of the Buncombe Turnpike, which connected Greeneville, Tennessee, to Greenville, South Carolina, in the 1820s, summer colonies of wealthy South Carolinians developed in the North Carolina mountains south of the Great Smokies. The purported healthy climate of the mountains was a particular lure for visitors during the mid- and late-nineteenth century.

Various types of health resorts, many located on springs, developed in both western North Carolina and eastern Tennessee. One of the earliest in Sevier County was Henderson Springs, known as a health retreat as early as the 1830s. Later in the century a two-story frame hotel and twenty-two cabins were built at Henderson Springs, attracting the patronage of prominent Knoxville families.²²

The construction of railroads vastly enhanced the potential of the Great Smokies region for recreational purposes, particularly for those with more moderate incomes. The railroad did not reach Asheville until 1880, but as it extended into western North Carolina, summer resorts began to flourish. Knoxville, Tennessee, was accessible by rail prior to the Civil War, but rail lines did not extend into Sevier County until after the turn of the century.²³ While resorts did develop prior to the building of the railroad in these counties, they grew along the more accessible roads or water routes. An advertisement in an 1897 *Knoxville Journal* for Dupont Springs, located 12 miles west of Sevierville, touted not only its three kinds of water, but also its “cool and invigorating” air and “unequaled” scenery. Visitors were advised to take a boat or hack for Sevierville.²⁴ The more remote reaches of the Smokies, however, remained out of reach of most summer visitors until after 1900.

The construction of railroads also allowed the timber resources of the southern Appalachians to be utilized for commercial purposes. After 1900, large northern timber companies faced with depletion of the timberlands in the northeast and Great Lakes area moved into the Great Smoky Mountains and began to develop the means to extract the timber.²⁵ Among the several large timber companies that worked within the Great Smokies was the Little River Lumber Company. Under the direction of the General Manager, Col. W.B. Townsend, the company began to purchase land in eastern Tennessee in 1901. The Little River Lumber Company was especially interested in cutting the hardwood and hemlock at the higher elevations. To enable them to extract this wood, they created the Little River Railroad Company. Chartered in 1901, it existed until 1940 when the company was dissolved.

²² Vertical files, “Hotels and Resorts,” Sevier County Library.

²³ *The Gentle Winds of Change: A History of Sevier County, Tennessee, 1900–1930* (Smoky Mountain Historical Society, 1986), 64–68.

²⁴ Vertical files, “Hotels and Resorts,” Sevier County Library.

²⁵ For a history of timbering in Southern Appalachia, see Ronald D. Eller, *Miners, Millhands and Mountaineers: Industrialization of the Appalachian South, 1880–1930* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1982), 86–127.

A standard-gauge railroad, the Little River Railroad connected to the Knoxville and Augusta Railroad, which the previous year had extended its line in Blount County from Maryville to Walland.²⁶ The Little River Lumber Company set up headquarters, established a large band mill in Tuckaleechee Cove, and established the town of Townsend, named after the General Manager. The railroad ran from Walland to Townsend and then ultimately into the heart of the mountains. By 1908 the railroad had extended through the narrow Little River Gorge and up the East Prong of the Little River in Sevier County. The Town of Elkmont was established as the base for operations along the East Prong.²⁷

The Little River Company must have soon realized that its railway through the gorge provided more than an efficient means to extract timber from the mountains. An observation car was added to the lumber train for passengers who wished to view the scenery along the Little River, and by 1909 daily train service was available from Knoxville's Southern Station to Elkmont.²⁸ In that year a local paper reported an outing by a party of young people from Wears Valley who took the train up to Elkmont.

The lumber company not only encouraged, it also promoted the development of cutover land. In 1910, the Little River Lumber Company deeded the Appalachian Club, 50 acres "more or less" along Jakes Creek just upstream from Elkmont. The lumber company retained timber and mineral rights, while the Appalachian Club was "to construct at its own expense, a Club House for the accommodation of members and guests, and the right or privilege, of constructing such cottages, or cabins, by itself, or by its members as may be desired."²⁹

The Appalachian Club was a Knoxville-based social club. A 1915 brochure describes the Appalachian Club as "composed principally of Knoxville business men, for the purpose of providing a place for recreation and rest for themselves."³⁰ In 1919 the club was reconstituted and formally incorporated as the New Appalachian Club with its headquarters in Knoxville and its principle clubhouse at Elkmont.³¹ Membership in the Appalachian Club and the New Appalachian Club included banker J. Wylie Brownlee, university professor R.C. Matthews, several attorneys including Forrest Andrews and James B. Wright, as well as a couple members associated with the Little River Lumber Company or the Railroad (General Manager W.B. Townsend and Railroad Superintendent J.P. Murphy).³²

While predominantly based in Knoxville, members of the Appalachian Club did come from other places in the South. Testimony by H.E. Wright in 1933 stated that, "we have located at Elkmont now 65 summer homes owned by the very best citizens of Knoxville, some from Memphis, some from Athens, some from Nashville, and some from Kentucky, and other places."³³ However most of the former cottage owners at the Wonderland and Appalachian clubs who became leaseholders were from Knoxville. Their Knoxville business affiliations included Richards Loan Company and Bowman Hat Company (Margaret

²⁶ Inez E. Burns, *History of Blount County, Tennessee* (Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1957), 236.

²⁷ Robert S. Lambert, "Logging on Little River, 1890–1940," *East Tennessee Historical Society Publications*, no. 33 (1961); *Gentle Winds of Change*, 103–128; Ed Trout, "Logging in Sevier County" and Elkmont files, Great Smoky Mountains National Park Archives (hereafter cited as GRSM Archives).

²⁸ Vic Weals, *Last Train to Elkmont* (Knoxville: Olden Press, 1991), 29.

²⁹ Deed Book 16, page 343, Sevier County, Tennessee.

³⁰ Copies of Elkmont country brochures are located in the Elkmont file, GRSM Archives.

³¹ Deed Book 40, page 228, Sevier County. The Club conveyed to the New Appalachian Club their tract of land at Elkmont with the exception of 49 cottages and lots. Charter of Incorporation for the New Appalachian Club, March 5, 1919, Book 288, page 216.

³² Wright, Townsend, Murphy, and Brownlee were all cabin owners by 1919.

³³ Condemnation against James B. Wright, 1933, testimony of H.E. Wright, Tennessee condemnation files, GRSM Archives.

Richards and E.L. Bowman of Wonderland) and Price-Baumann Tire, Swan Brothers Bakery, and Galyon Lumber (J. Fred Baumann, Charles Swan, and Eugene Galyon of the Appalachian Club).³⁴

One year after the Appalachian Club established its clubhouse at Elkmont, the Little River Lumber Company deeded to C.B. Carter a tract of land immediately downstream from the town of Elkmont. Carter and his brothers founded the Wonderland Park Company and the next year purchased an adjacent tract of land from the lumber company. The Wonderland Hotel was begun in the spring of 1912 and was ready for business by June 15 of that year.

After construction of the Appalachian Club and Wonderland Hotel, a daily passenger train, the Elkmont Special, ran from Knoxville up the Little River with its final three stops, just minutes apart, at the Wonderland Park Hotel, Elkmont, and the Appalachian Club. The trip took approximately two and a half hours from Knoxville. The Little River Railroad and the Knoxville and Augusta Railroad also promoted "Elkmont Country" through brochures. A 1914 brochure assured the reader that besides being noted for its beautiful scenery, Elkmont country, "is becoming more popular each year as a recreation place for people from all over the South, some of whom have built summer cottages so they and their families may spend the summers in one of the most delightful mountain climates in the entire country." In the same brochure the Appalachian Club was described in the following terms:

The Appalachian Club . . . has made extensive improvement on its club house and annex since last year, and is now in position to serve its members better than ever before. A complete water and sewerage system has been installed, also a new and up-to-date electric light plan.

Here, situated at an elevation of twenty-five hundred feet above sea level and commanding a magnificent view of the Smoky Mountains, some forty or fifty cottages have been built by members of the club. The natural surroundings of the cottages are so beautiful that the possibilities for enhancing the natural beauties are manifold, and this is one of the charms of the place. On the west side of Townsend avenue flows a tumultuous little mountain stream which furnishes running water in each summer home, and the cottages, rustic and simple, can boast of bath rooms, shower baths and sewer connections together with a natural swimming pool near the club house.

Wonderland Park is described in equally glowing terms in a 1915 brochure.

One of the most beautiful recreation places in the Elkmont country. Elevation two thousand five hundred feet. Hotel new and modern situated in the heart of the Great Smoky Mountains. Wonderland Park is noted for its picturesque scenery, with river and mountains in delightful vista. A number of rustic cottages have been built here, which add to the attractiveness of the place. Excellent mountain and rainbow trout fishing in Little River. Horseback riding, bathing and mountain climbing. Accommodations for two hundred guests.³⁵

Wonderland Park and Appalachian Club were not the only resorts served by the Little River Railroad. Mount Nebo Springs near the Melrose station, the Chilhowee Inn near Walland, and Kinzel Springs at Sunshine all received visitors who used the railroad in Blount County. In Sevier County the Line Springs Hotel overlooked Wears Valley and was accessible from the Line Springs depot. As at Wonderland Park,

³⁴ List of Sevier County leaseholders, Land Acquisition II-24, GRSM Archives.

³⁵ Copies of brochures in the Elkmont file in GRSM Archives.

additional cottages were built near the hotel, but families took their meals in the big dining room. The Line Springs Hotel was demolished in 1969.

While the Wonderland Park Hotel was fairly typical of the resorts of the day, the owners of the Wonderland Park Company, the Carter brothers from Knoxville, had grander schemes in mind. The original plat for Wonderland had more than 650 tracts, and the Wonderland Park Addition had thousands more. The land, which had cost \$5 per acre and less, was subdivided into 16 lots per acre.³⁶ Had it actually been built, Wonderland Park would have had the density of a major city for its time. However, even if the grid of streets had been laid, many of the tracts were tiny and on sites not suitable for building.

It seems probable that the Carter brothers were engaged in land speculation of the type that seized Florida and the western North Carolina towns of Asheville and Hendersonville and crashed in the 1920s. The President of the Wonderland Company himself sold land through agents in Orlando, Florida. Aside from the hotel and annex, less than twenty structures were built at Wonderland. Many of the purchasers of land, in fact, never saw the tracts they had bought, and it was not until decades later, after creation of the National Park, that some of the business practices of the Carter brothers became known.

After the Carters conveyed this land to the Great Smoky Mountains Conservation Association, the deeds and title papers of all prior lot owners in this section were canceled as clouds upon the title, since the Carters had possession of the land and the locations of the owners of the tracts were unknown. However, even those who had clear title seldom recouped their purchase price and taxes in the creation of the Park. Many were notified that their tracts were only 25x100 feet and were on the side of a hill or mountain. Generally they were offered from \$2 to \$25 for each tract, depending on location.³⁷

Despite the legal nightmare it was to create, the activities of the Wonderland Park Company were short-lived. By 1913, legal disputes developed between the Carter brothers and the subsequent lawsuit dragged on for a number of years, during which time the defendant, T. M. Carter, died. In 1915, the Wonderland Park Hotel and immediately adjacent lands and buildings were sold to a group of Knoxville citizens who formed a private club, similar in nature to the Appalachian Club. Both clubs operated hotels that were available to members, but were apparently also rented to paying guests. The Appalachian Club Hotel burned in 1933 and was replaced by the Club House. In 1920 the Wonderland Club built the hotel annex, which provided additional rooms for club members.

For almost a decade and a half, recreational and industrial use of the East Prong of the Little River existed side by side. The train from Knoxville made day trips to Elkmont possible. Some stayed at the hotels for short periods, while club members often made more extended visits. Passengers could debark at the imposing frame hotel on the hill. The next stop was the town of Elkmont. The final passenger stop was the Appalachian Club Station where visitors would cross the river on a footbridge to the Clubhouse.³⁸ The lumber town of Elkmont with its plain, vertical plank boxed structures must have contrasted starkly with the quaint rusticity of the Wonderland and Appalachian Clubs' cabins. The Elkmont Hotel, almost indistinguishable from the other boxed houses, served a different clientele than the Wonderland Club.

It should be noted that industrial and recreational users of the East Prong of the Little River were not mutually exclusive groups. Several members of the Appalachian Club were at some point connected to the Little River Lumber Company. Furthermore, in 1928, a 65-acre tract of land belonging to Little River

³⁶ Wonderland Files, GRSM Archives.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Just beyond the Appalachian Club Station, Shays or geared engines replaced the piston driven locomotives and continued up the steep hills to where lumbering was occurring.

Company, adjacent to the Appalachian Club holdings, was deeded to Alice U. Morier who had married the aging Col. Townsend. Townsend had been listed as a lot owner in 1919. These properties along “millionaires row,” although not part of the original Appalachian Club deed, were later included in the negotiation of leases.

By 1923 much of the accessible timber above the East Prong was removed and the lumber company began to focus its efforts on its operations on the Middle Prong. The train to Elkmont was discontinued in 1925 and the tracks torn up. In 1926, a gravel road was built through the gorge from Townsend to Elkmont, providing an easier route than the steep mountain road from Gatlinburg through Fighting Creek Gap.

The development of roads into Elkmont in the middle years of the twenties is reflective of the fact that by then a sizeable number of Americans owned cars. Many of the cottage owners were driving as far as Townsend and taking the train from there to Elkmont.³⁹ In those same years auto-tourism eclipsed the importance of the railroad in development of the southern mountains for recreational purposes. It was later to be a major contributing factor in the creation of Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The road from Townsend to Elkmont and on to Gatlinburg was part of the hundred mile scenic loop that began and ended in Knoxville. This road, passing through Maryville, Walland, Elkmont, Pigeon Forge, Sevierville, and along the route of present day I-40, exists today. The section from Townsend to Gatlinburg is within the national park.

Tourism grew and some of the structures within the town of Elkmont were purchased to be developed to meet the needs of tourist and visitor to the Wonderland and Appalachian clubs who arrived by bus and private car. In 1927 hotel rooms at the Wonderland Park rented for \$2.50 per day. The weekly rate was lower. Cottages were also available for rent. At the Appalachian Club residents and visitors stayed in cabins and dined at the clubhouse. Some residents brought their servants along for the summer. Recreation at both locations included hiking, picnicking, horseback riding, outdoor games including horseshoes and badminton, and dances both formal and informal. In an area of the Little River dammed by the Appalachian Club was the Swimming Hole, a popular spot during the summer.⁴⁰

Construction of cabins continued through the twenties. By 1931 nineteen cabins were located at Wonderland.⁴¹ At the Appalachian Club a number of cabins were built during the decade. Some seventy-five cabins were located in the two areas just before the Depression. A few cabins were built in the 1930s, most notably those built by Mrs. Alice Townsend along the Little River. The Elkmont area in the early thirties consisted of the cabins, hotel, clubhouse, the small community of Elkmont, and a few mountain farmsteads. When the community of Elkmont was created about 1908 a cemetery was established. Located north of the Wonderland Hotel it was the only cemetery in the area. In 1928 a new Elkmont Cemetery was dedicated adjacent to the Appalachian Club. The cemetery was given by Levi Owenby in memory of his wife.⁴²

The enthusiasm that led to the growth of the Appalachian and Wonderland clubs was one of the reasons for the movement to create either a national forest or park in the Great Smokies to manage or preserve the scenic and natural resources of the region. The movement started in Tennessee and later was embraced by supporters in North Carolina. Knoxville businessmen along with the Chamber of Commerce and the

³⁹ Weals, *Last Train to Elkmont*, 85–86.

⁴⁰ *The Lure of the Great Smokies* (Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927), 302. A film taken late in the 1920s shows life at the Appalachian Club. It is on file in the GRSM Archives.

⁴¹ Interview by Phil Thomason with Vernon and Helen Moore, Wonderland Hotel, November 3, 1992.

⁴² Interview by Phil Thomason with J.T. Higdon, Caretaker of the Appalachian Club, October 19, 1992.

Knoxville Automobile Club launched the campaign. In 1923 the Great Smoky Mountains Conservation Association was formed. Initially its concern was more with building roads than creating a park or forest preserve. In 1926 Congress passed a law authorizing the creation of several national parks in the Appalachians—land would be acquired by the states involved. Eight years later Congress authorized the establishment of Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and it was formally dedicated by President Roosevelt in 1940.

Considering the role that Tennessee politicians and businessmen had in promoting and opposing the establishment of the park, it is not surprising that major players on both sides were associated with the Elkmont communities. Governor Austin Peay who spearheaded the purchase of the first large tract of land was a member of the Wonderland Club. Mr. and Mrs. Willis P. Davis and Col. David Chapman were some of the organizers of the Conservation Association along with J. Wylie Brownlee and attorneys Forrest Andrews and James B. Wright. Wright, who supported the establishment of a national forest, but not a national park, resigned from the Conservation Association and became one of the park movement's strongest foes.

Despite the role several members played in the Great Smoky Mountain Conservation Association, many in the Appalachian Club eventually opposed condemnation of land for the park, possibly when they discovered that their properties would be among those condemned. They retained James Wright to represent their interests. Faced with political opposition particularly by members of the Appalachian Club, Congress in 1932 consented to a plan in which landowners could be offered long-term leases. As a result Appalachian and Wonderland Club properties were acquired from the members for half the appraised value, plus a lifetime lease. Some cabin owners chose to sell their land for full value. At the Wonderland Club some nine or ten cottages were acquired and demolished during the 1930s.⁴³

Leases were also offered to some long-term full time residents of the park area. However, restrictions on use of the natural resources, particularly wildlife and timber, and the loss of the rural communities that made life in the mountains viable presented major obstacles for them. Despite these restrictions some mountain families remained in the Elkmont area until the 1950s.

With the creation of the national park, commercial development ended at Elkmont. Development of Gatlinburg at the northern entry began to grow. However, Elkmont retained some commercial activity. Park Superintendent J. Ross Eakin, in a letter to the Director of the National Park Service in 1934, noted that some of the lessees were subletting their cabins and the Wonderland and Appalachian Clubs were entertaining paying guests and were in effect hotels.⁴⁴

The community of Elkmont was gradually removed during the thirties and forties. Many of the frame buildings were dismantled for their lumber. Others were moved. The Elkmont Baptist Church was moved to Wears Valley where it stands today as Valley View Church. A 1943 Geological Survey map shows only two buildings and the Elkmont School remaining on the site. The last class in the school was held that same year. A Civilian Conservation Corps camp was established on the site in the late thirties. The post office closed in 1950. In 1952, the National Park Service established a campground at Elkmont on the site of the community and the CCC camp, which destroyed the last remaining evidence of the town and the camp. However, the road system that followed the same alignment of the Little River Railroad and that historically tied the town and the Wonderland and Appalachian Clubs together remains in use today.

⁴³ Interview with Vernon and Helen Moore, November 3, 1992.

⁴⁴ Chapman Files, GRSM Archives.

The creation of the National Park preserved, perhaps inadvertently, a fragment of the architecture that was typical of the recreational use of the mountains in the four decades prior to the park's dedication in 1940. Restrictions on further commercial development or transfer of property and new construction after 1932 have preserved much of the original character of the communities. Physical evidence of the railroad, except for the road system, the timber industry, and the town of Elkmont has disappeared. The buildings that made up the Appalachian Club and the Wonderland Club remain.

Section 9 – Major Bibliographic References

Previous documentation on file (NPS): (none given)

Primary Location of Additional Data: Federal agency

Name of repository: (none given)

Interviews

Conducted by Phil Thomason of Thomason and Associates, Nashville, Tennessee

Baumann, Fred. Elkmont, October 18, 1992.

Higdon, J.T. Caretaker, Appalachian Club, October 19, 1992.

Matthews, C.L. and Larry Franklin. Elkmont, October 19, 1992.

Mayo, Dale. Elkmont, October 19, 1992.

Moore, Vernon and Helen. Wonderland Hotel, November 3, 1992.

Rogers, Steve and Claudette Stager. Tennessee Historical Commission, December 18, 1992.

Primary Source Material

Deed Books Numbers 16, 40, 288, and 636. Sevier County Courthouse.

Great Smoky Mountains National Park Archives

Appalachian Club Files

Chapman Files

Conservation Association Files

Elkmont Files

Film on Appalachian Club (ca. 1928)

List of Sevier County Leaseholders

Tennessee Condemnation Files

Wonderland Files

Secondary Works

Burns, Inez E. *History of Blount County, Tennessee*. Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1957.

Campbell, Carlos C. *Birth of a National Park in the Great Smoky Mountains*, revised edition. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1960.

Clark, Clifford Edward. *The American Family Home, 1800–1960*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Comstock, William Phillips, and Clarence E. Schermerhorn. *Bungalows, Camps, and Mountain Houses*. Chicago: AIA Press, 1990.

Eller, Ronald D. *Miners, Millhands, and Mountaineers: Industrialization of the Appalachian South, 1880–1930*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1982.

The Gentle Winds of Change: A History of Sevier County, Tennessee, 1900–1930. Smoky Mountain Historical Society, 1986.

“Historical and Architectural Resources of Blount County, Tennessee.” National Register of Historic Places Nomination, 1989. Files of the Tennessee Historical Commission.

Lambert, Robert S. “Logging on Little River, 1890–1940.” *East Tennessee Historical Society Publications*, no. 33: 1961.

The Lure of the Great Smokies. Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927.

Morrell, John. “A Brief History of the Appalachian and Wonderland Clubs Within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.” Not dated.

Sevier County Saga. Bicentennial Committee of Sevier County, 1976. Sevier County Library: Vertical Files.

Stickley, Gustav. *Craftsman Bungalows: 59 Homes from The Craftsman.* New York: Dover Publications, 1988.

Thornborough, Laura. *The Great Smoky Mountains.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1937.

Trout, Ed. “Logging in Sevier County.” Manuscript Files of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Weals, Vic. *Last Train to Elkmont.* Knoxville: Olden Press, 1991.

Yarbrough, Willard. “Elkmont, Rooted in Smoky Park History, is Proud of Tradition.” *Knoxville News–Sentinel*, August 29, 1965.

Section 10 – Geographical Data

Acreeage of Property: 516 approx.

VERBAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

The boundary of the Elkmont Historic District is marked on the enclosed USGS Gatlinburg Quadrangle (7.5 minute series) and is described as follows:

The boundary begins on the south where Meigs Mountain Trail crosses Jakes Creek. It turns north following Jakes Creek and the 2400-foot contour line and continues east along that line to Bearwallow Branch. The boundary goes down the branch to the Little River and runs along the north side of Little River and then follows the west side of the nature trail. At the point where the nature trail turns east the boundary goes north to the 2400-foot contour line and follows that contour line across Catron Branch to the point where the contour line touches UTM Coordinates 266 Easting and 3950 Northing. The boundary runs along 3950 Northing to Pine Knot Branch and follows it to and across Little River and up the dirt road to the 2200-foot contour line. The boundary follows that contour line to the point shown on the map at the southern end of the campground loop then turns due west to the 2400-foot contour line and follows that contour line to a point shown on the map. It then runs on a straight line south and west to Meigs Mountain Trail and follows the trail to the point of beginning on Jakes Creek.

The boundary of the Elkmont Historic District includes all existing properties associated with the Elkmont Historic District. This boundary is enclosed in a quadrilateral whose corners are marked by the following UTM reference points.

Zone	Easting	Northing
A. 17	265060	3950000
B. 17	266320	3950000
C. 17	267200	3948180
D. 17	266060	3947080
E. 17	265560	3947080

VERBAL BOUNDARY JUSTIFICATION

The boundary encloses both the Appalachian Club and Wonderland Club that make up the Elkmont Historic District and the environment or setting in which the resources are located. The area between the two complexes, which was the town of Elkmont, is now a National Park Service campground. The boundary follows contour lines, streams, and features such as roads and trails.

Section 11 – Form Prepared By

Name/title: Phillip Thomason/Dr. Michael Ann Williams; revised by L. Brown, SE
Regional Office
Organization: Thomason and Associates; National Park Service
Date: April and July 1993
Street & number: PO Box 121225; 75 Spring Street SW
Telephone: (none given)
City or town: Nashville; Atlanta
State: TN; GA
Zip code: 37212; 30303

*

*

*

Supplementary Listing Record

NRIS Reference Number: 94000166
Date Listed: 3/22/94
Property Name: Elkmont Historic District, Great Smoky Mountains NP
County: Sevier
State: TENNESSEE

This property is listed in the National Register of Historic Places in accordance with the attached nomination documentation subject to the following exceptions, exclusions, or amendments, notwithstanding the National Park Service certification included in the nomination documentation.

Date of Action: 3/28/94

Amended Items in Nomination:

This nomination is amended to show the following buildings as contributing to the character of the historic district:

Cabin # 8, Cain Cabin—the changes to the rear are not conspicuous, the impact of the enclosure of a portion of the front porch is not great, and the very simple design and detailing of the cabin have been preserved.

Cabin # 9, Galyon Cabin—most of the alterations occurred during the historic period and the impact of the enclosure of the porch is not great. The two recent outbuildings in the rear of the main cabin should be added to the count as two separate non-contributing buildings.

Cabin # 11, Scruggs–Briscoe—additions to the side and front are not intrusive. Changes to the open front porch, which may have been expanded, do not compromise the character of the cabin.

Cabin # 13, Cook Cabin—alterations to the rear are not conspicuous and the rebuilt porch probably replaces an earlier porch original to the cabin.

Cabin # 36, Knaffl Cabin—additions in rear are unobtrusive and porch may be historic. Picture window on the side may date to the period of significance for the district and is not intrusive enough in and of itself to compromise the character of the cabin.

Cabin # 38, Byers Cabin—sleeping porch over the entrance is obtrusive, but may be historic. Sleeping porches are features commonly found on cabins of this type.

The following cabins are non-contributing to the significance of the district:

Cabin # 20, F. Andrews Cabin—very large addition to the south, apparently added in 1956, has greatly altered the appearance of the original cabin.

Cabin # 25, Franklin Cabin—gable roofed addition on the front of the cabin has altered the appearance of the original cabin.

Cabin # 26, Hutchins Cabin—very large gable front porch has compromised the integrity of the original cabin.

Parrott Cabin— replacement of siding, enclosure of portion of front porch, and addition of blinds has greatly changed the appearance of the original cabin.

Richards or Brandau Cabin (Wonderland Club area)—engineers report indicates that this building has lost its structural integrity.

The following non-contributing buildings should be added to the count (see map attached):

In the Appalachian Club area: 2 water tanks and a pump house (pre-NPS), a horse barn, pump house, and two water tanks (NPS).

In the Wonderland Club area: two houses (NPS).

These changes have been confirmed by phone with the Southeast Regional Office (3/17/94) and the Tennessee SHPO (3/18/94).

APPENDIX 2:

**PRELIMINARY CONDITION ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FORMS**

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Appalachian Clubhouse

Structure #52, SV 939

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

A porch with rustic wood railings and posts stretches along the entire length of the east side; part of the porch has been screened in. Some stabilization efforts have already taken place, and at the moment, the structure is in fairly good condition. Renovations should address the following:

- The metal roof has some surface rust; it needs to be coated with a paint coating designed specifically for metal roofs. The flashing between the chimneys and the roof should be inspected, and it should be replaced or repaired as appropriate.
- The lattice skirting around the crawlspace should be repaired where the wood has rotted or is broken.
- An enclosed area below the clubhouse shows extensive rotting of the wallboards and windows in the wall. This area should be rebuilt and the missing sashes should be replaced with new constructed units to match the existing.
- The main stairs to the building need to be replaced.
- The porch floor sags and has subsided at its outside edge; it should be jacked and reinforced to reverse the sagging. It may be necessary to replace some of the foundation posts and the rock footings to correct the subsidence. The porch railings and the posts that support the porch roof need to be repaired and replaced.
- Some of the foundation posts show signs of rotting at the base. These should be replaced. All replacements should be logs to match the existing posts.
- All exterior and interior finishes need to be renewed. The floors should be sanded and refinished on the interior; the porch floor should be scrapped and stained.
- The electrical and plumbing systems need to be upgraded; the kitchen should be replaced if required by the reutilization plan. The restrooms will need to be redesigned to provide accessibility.
- At present, the Appalachian Clubhouse is inaccessible to the physically impaired. If it is designated for public use, it will need to be made totally accessible.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Sneed Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #1, SV 940

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low to Moderate
-----------------	-------------------------------------

The Sneed Cabin is a one-story log cabin with a stone chimney and fireplace. At the front of the cabin, the lowest logs form a sill and sit directly on stone footings; at the rear, the foundation system has vertical wood posts resting on stone footings. The cabin is in good shape due to recent stabilization efforts. Renovations should address the following:

- The roll roofing needs to be replaced. There is a sign of a leak at one valley.
- The pole foundation at the back appears to be destabilized by erosion on the bank at the back of the house. Several of the posts show termite damage and should be replaced.
- The lattice skirt around the crawlspace needs to be replaced.
- Most of the windows have been removed. If they are salvaged, they need to be reinstalled; otherwise, new windows should be fabricated to match the original windows.
- There has been water damage to the flooring; these areas will need to be replaced. The kitchen floor needs replacement.
- The plumbing and electrical systems should be upgraded, and the kitchen and plumbing fixtures should be replaced.
- Many of the interior doors are modern slab doors; these should be replaced with doors that match the historic character of the structure.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Smith Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #2, SV 938

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The Smith Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed building with a pyramid-shaped main roof. The siding is vertical board-and-batten. On the interior there are back-to-back brick fireplaces that share the same brick chimney. Renovations should address the following:

- The 5-v metal roofing is rusted; selected pieces need to be replaced. The hip covers need to be replaced. Then the existing roofing needs to be coated with appropriate coating for galvanized metal.
- Twenty-five percent of the decking on the side porch has rotted and will need to be replaced.
- The front porch sags at the posts; apparently, they have rotted at the lower end and need to be replaced. At the same time, the porch floor should be leveled along its front edge.
- This cabin also has some composition board walls and ceilings. Pieces are falling off and many of the ceiling boards are water-stained and sagging. The composition board should be removed and replaced with a material more impervious to the humidity.
- The brick chimney needs to be repointed.
- As is the case with most of the cabins, the electrical and plumbing systems need to be completely upgraded. The kitchen is unusable and should be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Higdon Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #3, SV 941

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Poor	Renovation Expense: High
-----------------	--------------------------

The Higdon Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed house. The cabin is in a generally poor condition, and is marred by an ill-designed, intrusive addition at the rear. Renovations should address the following:

- Evidence of considerable sagging in floors indicates that the foundation system has probably failed; like most of the buildings at Elkmont, the cabin sits on wood posts or piers that have most likely rotted at the lower end and collapsed. The cabin needs to be jacked up, and the post must be replaced; there are some difficulties associated with this because the cabin is very close to grade at some points. It may be necessary to remove flooring to access the posts.
- There are signs of several roof leaks with the probability that there is some damage to roof sheathing and framing. The 5-v metal roof needs to be replaced.
- Part of the porch floor is rotted and must be replaced.
- On the interior, composition board has been applied to walls, and in some cases, over the original 1 x 3 tongue-and-groove paneling. Between humidity and actual water damage, the composition board must be replaced with a more appropriate material. Once the ceiling is exposed, the 1 x 3 paneling is in good condition; however, it is equally likely that there is a fair amount of water damage from roof leaks.
- Upgrade the plumbing and electrical systems; replace the kitchen and plumbing fixtures.
- Based upon a criterion of architectural integrity, it is recommended to remove the intrusive addition.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Addicks Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #5, SV 942

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate to High
-----------------	--------------------------------------

The Addicks Cabin is a wood-framed, single-story cabin. It has a stone fireplace facing and chimneybreast, while the exterior portion of the chimney is concrete masonry. Renovations should address the following:

- The 5-v metal roof is in marginal condition; it may be able to be refurbished, but many of the panels are damaged and deformed. Total replacement is probably the best course of action.
- The front porch is in poor condition. The perimeter stone foundation wall has collapsed in several locations. The band has rotted causing the roof supports to subside. The porch wall and railing need considerable renovation. The porch was made deeper at one time by splicing rafter extensions to the original rafters. The roof is sagging at that point. The roof must be jacked to its proper elevation, and the rafters need to be reinforced (or replaced). A similar situation exists where a back porch has been extended and enclosed.
- The stone foundation wall at the perimeter of the house needs repair.
- In some interior spaces, plywood paneling has been installed as a wall finish. It is out of character and as an intrusive element, should be replaced with the 1 x 6 or 1 x 4 boards found in other portions of the interior.
- Upgrade the plumbing and electrical systems; replace the kitchen and plumbing fixtures.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Addicks Cabin Playhouse, "Adamless Eden"
Appalachian Club

Structure #5A, SV 942

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

This small playhouse is a log cabin with a stone fireplace and chimney. It has a small wood-framed alcove at the right rear. At the moment, a fallen tree is lying across the roof. In spite of this affront, the playhouse is in generally good condition. Renovations should address the following:

- The roof will need to be repaired once the tree trunk is removed. There is water-damaged sheathing over the alcove. The roll roofing needs to be replaced. The gutters also need replacement.
- One tree right beside the playhouse should be removed. The roots are heaving the playhouse.
- The alcove contains plumbing fixtures that should be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Creekmore Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #6, SV 936

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate to High
-----------------	--------------------------------------

The Creekmore Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed house with a stone fireplace and chimney. Its interior has suffered from a piecemeal series of improvements that give a very inconsistent feel to the space. The same is true for parts of the exterior. Renovations should address the following:

- There are three large trees very near the house that should be removed.
- The 5-v metal roof appears to be in good shape; it requires some preventive maintenance: check and tighten the fasteners, straighten bent and dented panels, check all flashing and drip edges, and coat the metal with an appropriate coating for galvanized steel.
- The appearance of the house on the rear can be greatly improved by applying a siding consistent with the original treatment (in this case, a vertical board-and-batten).
- On the interior, some walls are covered wholly or in part with composition board. It should be removed and replaced with a more appropriate and durable material. The same is true of the ceilings. Again, the cabin would be vastly improved if some intrusive finishes were removed and the interior finishes were made consistent with the original treatments.
- Upgrade the plumbing and electrical systems; replace the kitchen and plumbing fixtures.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Mayo Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #7, SV 943

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low to Moderate
-----------------	-------------------------------------

The Mayo Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed structure with back-to-back brick fireplaces and a brick chimney. This cabin was in better shape than most that were surveyed. It would require only minor repairs. Renovations should address the following:

- The rear porch was enclosed at some point in the history of the cabin; rafters were spliced to create a deeper space. There is exaggerated deflection at the juncture of the new and old. The rafters should be jacked to their proper elevation and reinforced.
- There are several instances where aluminum windows have been used. The architectural integrity of the cabin would be improved by replacing these with appropriate wood windows that reflect the general vocabulary of windows found in this section of the Appalachian Club.
- The plumbing fixtures and the kitchen can be reused with only minor upgrading. The plumbing piping should be examined to determine whether it needs replacement. The electrical system needs to be upgraded.
- The brick chimney needs repointing.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Mayo Cabin, Levi Trentham Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #7A, SV 944

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low
-----------------	-------------------------

This cabin behind the main cabin was built in 1860 and moved to this location in 1932. There was no access to the cabin, but since it was a single room, an evaluation of the interior condition could be made. The cabin has a stone fireplace and chimney. Renovations should address the following:

- The lowest log on the rear is partially rotten and has been consumed by termites. This log should be repaired, either by stabilization to prevent further rot and infestation or by replacing it if it is too damaged. Since there was no access to the interior, it will be necessary at a later date to determine whether there has been any damage to floor joists.
- The 5-v metal roof is in sound condition, but needs application of an appropriate coating.
- The small awning over the door needs to be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Mayo Cabin, Servants Quarters
Appalachian Club

Structure #7B, SV 945

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low
-----------------	-------------------------

This small, wood-framed, single-story structure was not accessible for interior inspection. Exterior problems that must be addressed in a renovation program include the following:

- Rafter extensions on the rear of the roof are missing; they should be reinstalled.
- The 5-v metal roof is rusted, particularly on the rear half of the structure; it should be treated to the renovation package: refasten panels and apply appropriate metallic paint coating.
- The porch is extensively damaged; it is recommended to replace the floor framing, the decking, and the roof fascia. Install a new metal drip edge as part of the roofing renovations.
- It is presumed that the plumbing and electrical systems will need upgrading.
- Repaint the exterior and interior.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Cain Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #8, SV 935

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate to High
-----------------	--------------------------------------

The Cain Cabin is a wood-framed, single-story cabin on a rustic-post foundation. The house has had several awkward adaptations that will probably be difficult to untangle. Renovations should address the following:

- The 5-v metal roofing is in fair to poor condition; it needs the standard maintenance package: refasten, replace damaged panels or trim, and coat with an appropriate paint coating. There are roof leaks over the kitchen and bathroom.
- Some of the foundation posts have been replaced. Others are showing signs of rot at the base and should be replaced with rustic posts to match the existing.
- The latticework around the crawlspace needs repair.
- The interior of this cabin lacks cohesiveness because of the variety of finish materials that have been introduced in new additions and remodeling. This condition suggests that one attempt to take the finishes back to a more integrate state.
- Upgrade the plumbing and electrical systems; replace the kitchen and plumbing fixtures.
- Finally, there is the issue of the intrusive additions and remodeling. The poor condition of the addition raises the possibility that the addition should be removed. This issue needs to be addressed by the historic preservation consultants as well as the architectural consultant.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Galyon Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #9, SV 946

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Poor	Renovation Expense: Moderate to High
-----------------	--------------------------------------

This single-story, wood-framed cabin was added to and modified several times. The last addition, a one-room cabin, is considered intrusive and was not examined during the assessment. As with several cabins in this area, the latter additions and modifications seem intrusive; also, the detailing of the additions were not well developed, leaving the structure susceptible to leaks. Renovations should address the following:

- There is considerable sagging and subsidence visible on the interior of the house. Clearly, the wood-post foundation is failing in several locations, and it may also be the case that the floor framing is failing. The foundation system needs to be replaced; a portion of the house is high enough above grade to make this easy, but there are areas where there is no working room under the house.
- The roof is in fair to poor condition. The 5-v metal roof needs to be refastened, the damaged panels or trim need to be replaced and painted with the appropriate paint coating. There is evidence of leaks at several locations in the interior.
- Some of the board-and-batten siding needs to be replaced where it has rotted near the ground.
- On the interior, some of the walls are covered with composition board paneling; other walls in more recent additions have modern plywood paneling. These should be replaced with a more suitable and durable material.
- Upgrade the plumbing and electrical systems; replace the kitchen and plumbing fixtures.
- Again, the intrusive additions raise the issue of whether they should be removed; in this case, the additions have also created some structural problems.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Baumann Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #10, SV 934

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair to Good	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-------------------------	------------------------------

The Baumann Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed cabin with a stone fireplace and chimney. The structure is architecturally noteworthy for the central portion of the house, which rises above the porch roofs to provide space for a ring of clerestory windows. At the rear, there is an ungainly addition with a brick fireplace; it appears to have been built as a living room. Renovations should address the following:

- The 5-v metal roof has some leaks around the skylight; repair these and refurbish the metal roofing by refastening, and coat with a paint coating appropriate for galvanized metal.
- The wood-post foundation has been replaced by concrete masonry piers. There is still exaggerated sagging along the edge of the screen porch.
- Some of the plumbing fixtures could be refurbished; most need to be replaced. The electrical system and the kitchen must be upgraded to be usable.
- The addition at the rear should be addressed regarding its intrusive nature.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Scruggs-Brisco Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #11, SV 947

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair to Poor (at rear)	Renovation Expense: Moderate to High
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

This cabin is a wood-framed, single-story structure with a stone fireplace and chimney. It has had extensive modifications including enclosure of the back porch and an addition with a newer stone chimney. The addition became the main social space of the house, and the front portion of the house was subdivided by various walls to create bedrooms. A portion of the front porch has been enclosed and added to an existing room in the original configuration. There are large quantities of rustic shelves and cabinets built into the house. Renovations should address the following:

- The 5-v metal roofing over the original portions of the house is in fair condition and will need the normal refurbishment. On the rear, the metal roofing was extended, resulting in extremely low slopes, so that there have been many damaging leaks. It will be almost impossible to correct the leaks without going to a more appropriate roofing system over the low-slope areas.
- The porch sags at the front steps; the sill beam may have failed.
- The foundation wall under the porch is in poor condition; in some locations where the original stone collapsed, the wall has been replaced with concrete masonry. The stone wall should be restored, replacing the later concrete units with stone.
- Upgrade the electrical and plumbing system as well as the kitchen.
- The rear addition is in bad condition, due to roof leaks. This addition also destroys the architectural integrity of the original cabin. If the ultimate plans call for restoring this area, then there will be great deal of work necessary to refurbish and replace wall and ceiling finishes.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Cook Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #13, SV 948

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

This single-story, wood-framed cabin has a stone chimney and fireplace. It has extensive additions at the rear under a very low-slope roof. Renovations should address the following:

- The low-slope roof at the rear leaks; there is a leak in the kitchen that may have caused structural damage to the roof. The metal roof over the main portion of the house should undergo the standard refurbishment, while the roofing material on the low-slope area at the rear should be replaced with a system that is more appropriate.
- The front porch needs many minor repairs to the roof and floor framing as well as the decking itself.
- The vertical board skirting at the rear of the cabin is in poor condition with boards missing or broken; this needs to be replaced.
- Upgrade the electrical and plumbing system as well as the kitchen.
- The additions should be considered from an historic as well as architectural point of view, as in the case of other adjacent cabins.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Hale Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #15, SV 949

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Poor	Renovation Expense: Moderate to High
-----------------	--------------------------------------

This single-story, wood-framed house has a pyramid roof and was probably surrounded on three-and-a-half sides by a shed-roof porch. The interior of the pyramid is open above the dividing walls. The rear porch was enclosed and one or more additions were made later. The additions completely encircle a large tree. The character of the additions are unique, even a touch bizarre. Renovations should address the following:

- The encircled tree needs to be removed before it causes great damage.
- The metal roofing over the original portions of the house are in fair condition and need to be refastened, have new hip covers, and have a paint coating applied. The roof structure at the rear is water-damaged and rotted at the overhangs. The framing should be repaired. There is a major leak in the kitchen and serious leaks in a couple of other locations. These may have resulted in damage to the roof structure.
- The front porch area sags between the existing supports; it has insufficient strength to span between the piers. Intermediate supports should be introduced.
- Upgrade the electrical and plumbing system as well as the kitchen.
- The additions were poorly designed so there are many problems due to the incorrect detailing of joints and flashings. The case for removing the additions could be made; however, this cabin, as much as any at Elkmont, is a good example of the later do-it-yourself approach to designing and constructing additions. It identifies the cultural history of these structures.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Gilliland Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #18, SV 933

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low
-----------------	-------------------------

This two-story cabin is of log construction on the first floor and frame construction above. It shows signs that it was recently inhabited. Renovations should address the following:

- The metal roofing should receive a paint coating. A small awning roof over the second-story windows on the south side of the cabin should be replaced.
- The lattice skirting around the crawl space should be replaced.
- The stone wall under the front porch should be repaired. Also, the rustic pole porch railing is in need of repair.
- The electrical and plumbing systems and the kitchen should be upgraded. The plumbing fixtures can be reused.
- On a lower level behind the house, there is an odd room with three-quarter-height walls, doors, and sashes. It was apparently a laundry room. It should be removed. The underside and rear of the house are a prime example of the extent of debris that will have to be removed from and around the cabins.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Thomas Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #19, SV 932

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Low to Moderate
-----------------	-------------------------------------

The Thomas Cabin is a single-story, log structure with some areas of frame construction; the cabin has a stone fireplace and chimney. Renovations should address the following:

- There is a leak at the rear of the cabin; water has damaged the roof and floor structures, and the exterior wall. After repairing the damage and fixing the leak, the roof needs the typical renovation package: refasten and apply a paint coating on rear half of roof.
- The front porch is in bad condition on the southwest corner and will need extensive repairs.
- Some of the perimeter foundation posts are rotted on their lower end and should be replaced.
- The lattice screen around the crawlspace is in bad condition and needs to be completely replaced.
- The electrical and plumbing system need to be upgraded as well as the kitchen.
- The exterior stairs at the rear need replacement.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Andrews-Sherling Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #21, SV 930

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Low to Moderate
-----------------	-------------------------------------

The Andrews-Sherling cabin is a single-story, wood-framed structure with a lower level on the backside where the land falls away to the creek behind the cabin. Renovations should address the following:

- The underbrush around the cabin should be removed.
- The 5-v metal roof is in poor condition; some of the panels need to be replaced. For a uniform appearance, it would be best to replace the entire roof; however, the economics of the entire project may require selective replacement. For the rest of the roof, refasten of the remaining panels and trim, and apply a roof coating for galvanized metal roofs.
- Replace the gutter sections which exist only over the entrances.
- Repair siding boards, which are rotted at the lower end.
- Both porches require extensive repair to the flooring system.
- The kitchen has a composition board ceiling, which should be replaced with a more appropriate material.
- The foundation consists of wooden posts on rocks; in some cases, the post goes into the soil, and it is not clear what type of footing, if any, they rest on. There are several places where the structure has subsided, which is probably due to rotting at the bottom of the posts. These posts should be replaced after jacking the house back to its proper level.
- The rear stairs must be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Congleton-Brownlow Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #22, SV 929

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Low to Moderate
-----------------	-------------------------------------

This single-story, wood-framed cabin has a stone fireplace and chimney, and there is a loft over two-thirds of the cabin. The remaining third opens up to exposed rafters and sheathing. The cabin retains good architectural integrity. Renovations should address the following:

- The asphalt shingle roofing should be removed and replaced after repairing any water damage. There are several leaks that are evident, including a damaging leak at the rear screened porch.
- The roof trim around the porch should be replaced.
- The board-and-batten siding on the left front of the cabin is rotted at its lower end and should be replaced.
- Some window sashes are missing and will need to be replaced with units constructed to match the existing.
- Although the rear deck has been rebuilt with pressure-treated lumber at some point in the past, it is very weathered and appears slightly underbuilt. It should be replaced.
- The roof overhang sags in some areas. The rafter tails need to be reinforced or new rafter tails should be spliced to the existing rafters.
- Upgrade the electrical and plumbing systems as well as the kitchen.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: McDonald Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #23, SV 928

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The McDonald Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed cabin with a stone fireplace and chimney. The main portion of the cabin is a tall open space with clerestory windows. There has been a two-story addition at the south side. Except the addition, this cabin has good architectural bones. Renovations should address the following:

- The 5-v metal roof is in fair condition; it is rather low sloped, which indicates that it should receive careful renovation. One leak over the bathroom has caused structural damage. The panels and trim need to be refastened, and a coat of paint needs to be applied.
- The floor of the front porch should be replaced.
- The covered stairs and landing to the south side of the cabin need to be replaced.
- Damage to the roof and floor in the bathroom need to be repaired; also, the cause of the exaggerated slope in the kitchen floor needs to be determined and repaired.
- The river stone hearth extension has partially collapsed and must be repaired.
- Some plumbing fixtures might be refurbished; in addition, the electrical and plumbing systems and the kitchen should be upgraded. The main electrical panel should be removed from the living room.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: F. Arnett Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #29, SV 922

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low to Moderate
-----------------	-------------------------------------

The F. Arnett Cabin is one of the more architecturally unique structures at Elkmont. It consists of two log rooms, each with a loft over it, that are separated by a screened dogtrot that leads to a rear screened porch. Renovations should address the following:

- The metal roofing should receive the standard repair package.
- The stone chimney is pulling away from the house; it may be necessary to underpour a new foundation to arrest this subsidence. In the end, it may have to be rebuilt on an adequate footing.
- The deck at the rear of the house was constructed of pressure-treated materials, but the high humidity over the creek has weakened it. It should be replaced.
- The floors are somewhat springy, but there is no evidence of failure. Mid-span reinforcement would help alleviate this problem.
- The kitchen has a conglomeration of wall treatments; it would help the architectural integrity of the space to harmonize the wall treatments. In particular, remove the southern yellow pine plywood and replace it with board paneling that will be compatible with the hardwood board paneling in the space.
- The plumbing and electrical systems and the kitchen require upgrading. Some plumbing fixtures might be able to be refurbished.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Wright Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #30, SV 921

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Poor	Renovation Expense: High
-----------------	--------------------------

The Wright Cabin is a two-story, wood-framed structure with a brick and stone fireplace, and stone chimney. The second story extends over the front porch. It is in generally poor condition. The quality level of interior finishes is less than many of the other cabins. Renovations should address the following:

- The 5-v metal roof is in need of the same repairs as most of the metal roofs in this area: locate leaks and repair, refasten the panels, repair flashings, and coat with a paint coating designed for refurbishing galvanized metal roofs.
- The foundation system consists of stone piers and wood posts bearing, presumably, on stone, although the posts are in direct contact with the ground in most locations. There is evidence of subsidence along the rear of the two-story portion and floors are out of level. The house needs to be jacked to level, and new footings and posts should be installed.
- The rear screen porch is collapsing and should be replaced.
- Replace some siding boards where the lower ends are rotting.
- There is water damage near the stairs; repair the damage.
- Interior wall and ceiling finishes include composition board with battens. These finishes should be replaced with some material more impervious to moisture damage.
- Some plumbing fixtures can be refurbished; however, the plumbing and electrical system should be upgraded to meet current codes. The kitchen should be completely renovated.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Matthews Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #31, SV 920

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition:	Renovation Expense:
------------	---------------------

There was no access to this structure and its accessory building. The main structure is a log cabin with a second story. There are two, single-story sections at the rear that appear to be additions. One is constructed of hewn logs, the other is wood framed. In general, the exterior was in good condition. Exterior renovations should address the following:

- Some of the posts in the foundation system need to be replaced due to rotting at the lower end.
- The stone chimney at the south end of the cabin is leaning away from the side of the house. The repair strategy will depend on access to specialized services. It may be possible to undermine the footing and to lift the chimney on its lower edge. It could be stabilized by reinforcing the footing and repairing the flashings between the chimney and roof. Based on the economics of the labor forces available, it may be best to just rebuild the chimney.
- The front porch railing needs minor repairs.
- There is severe erosion on the north side. The steep banks around the house need to be stabilized. Erosion may be affecting the chimney problem on the south side of the house as well.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Matthews "Little Cottage"
Appalachian Club

Structure #31A, SV 919

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition:	Renovation Expense: Low
------------	-------------------------

The little cabin is a single-story, wood-framed structure with a screen porch at the rear. There was no access to this structure; however, from the exterior, it appears to be in good condition and renovation expenses are likely to be low.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Allen Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #32, SV 918

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Poor	Renovation Expense: High
-----------------	--------------------------

This cabin is a single-story, wood-framed structure with stone fireplaces and chimneys. This cabin is in poor condition and will be expensive to salvage and renovate. Renovations should address the following:

- The 5-v metal roofing material is in fair condition and needs the standard metal roof renovation package.
- The porch has a large deflection in the roof due to the loss of one of the porch columns. The roof edge beam needs to be jacked to level and the column needs to be replaced.
- One tree has grown too close to the house and requires removal.
- The front door has been removed, but is still on site. It needs to be repaired and reinstalled.
- Although the previous foundation system has been replaced with 8" x 16" concrete masonry piers, there is widespread evidence of uneven subsidence. One fireplace is tilting.
- The interior finishes are all in bad condition. There are multiple colors of carpet on the floor; the walls are covered with a modern plywood paneling, and the ceiling is plywood with wood battens.
- Most of the interior doors are missing.
- The plumbing and electrical systems and the kitchen all need to be replaced.
- The rear screen porch is sagging; the 2 x 8 joists are probably spanning too great of a distance, but the foundation has subsided.
- The rear deck should be replaced or removed altogether.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: McAmis Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #34, SV 915

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low to Moderate
-----------------	-------------------------------------

The McAmis Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed structure with a lower level addition at the rear. The cabin is in generally good condition with the exception of the wall surfacing. Renovations should address the following:

- Many of the perimeter foundation posts have been replaced by CMU piers, but the remaining rustic posts on the edge of the building show signs of rotting at the lower end. These should be replaced.
- Two trees are encroaching on the house and should be removed.
- The lattice skirting around the crawl space needs to be repaired.
- The 5-v metal roof needs the standard renovation package.
- The ceilings, including the screen porch ceilings, are composed of composition board, and need to be replaced due to damage from high humidity.
- A small number of siding boards need to be replaced.
- The tub and lavatory need to be refurbished; the plumbing and electrical infrastructure need to be upgraded as well as the kitchen.
- The bedroom on the lower level at the rear is somewhat quixotic, but does have charm. It needs minor repairs and renovations.
- The rear stairs are weathered and will need to be replaced soon.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Culver Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #35, SV 914

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The Culver Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed house with a heavy, rough-sawn lap siding. The stone fireplace is one of the nicer ones in the Appalachian Club cabins. The interior finishes have been degraded or are in poor condition. Renovations should address the following:

- There is a roof leak over the dining room. The metal roof should then be refastened and coated with a paint coating.
- The skirting around the crawlspace is T1-11 plywood siding, clearly a later addition. If it is possible to determine the original skirting, it should be reconstructed. Otherwise, replace the plywood with the latticework found on most of the other cabins.
- The electrical and plumbing systems need to be upgraded as well as the kitchen.
- At the rear, the deck and stairs have collapsed. These should be replaced.
- A portion of the porch has been enclosed; the closets and storage units show a low level of craftsmanship. One approach to properties at Elkmont would be to remove some of the later accretions that were not consistent with the quality and character of the original cabin.
- This cabin is filled with composition board ceilings and walls. These will need to be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Knaffl Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #36, SV 916

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Poor	Renovation Expense: High
-----------------	--------------------------

The Knaffl Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed house with back-to-back stone fireplaces. It has some good interior finishes, but it has suffered severe water damage. Renovations should address the following:

- A large section of the metal roof has peeled back, causing a great deal of water damage to the front porch and living room. The roof sheathing and framing need to be repaired, and the roof should also be replaced.
- The front porch, living room ceiling and floor are collapsing; these areas need extensive structural repair and replacement of finishes.
- On the exterior, a shingle cladding at the front and rear porches is rotting. The shingles should be completely replaced.
- Much of the vertical board-and-batten siding is rotting at the lower end. These boards should be replaced.
- The electrical and plumbing systems should be upgraded, and the kitchen needs to be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Byers or Chapman Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #38, SV 912

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Poor	Renovation Expense: Moderate to High
-----------------	--------------------------------------

This one-and-a-half story, wood-framed house is unique because of the sleeping porch that sits over the front entry. Renovations should address the following:

- The metal roof needs to be replaced; there is water damage from leaks in the living room and the back bedroom.
- There are numerous areas where it appears that the foundation system or the sill beams have failed. The sleeping porch and the upper floor area tilts badly to one side. One sill beam at the rear shows termite damage. Clearly, it will take a major effort to replace the foundation and level the house.
- While the living room has what appears to be an original rough board and batten wainscoting, many walls have been covered with more modern finishes including 1/4" paneling.
- Some posts that support the rear deck have rotted and fallen off the concrete base pedestals, leaving the deck in danger of collapsing.
- The inside of the house is badly trashed, which further obscures the condition of the house.
- This house may very well be worth saving due to its history; however, it will require considerable renovation costs.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Dudley Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #39, SV 911

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Fair to Good	Renovation Expense: See Below
-------------------------	-------------------------------

From the front, the Dudley Cabin looks like a single-story building. However, a large, two-story addition has been added to the rear of the original section, with the lower level of the addition set into the hillside at grade. The treatment of the interior and the character of the addition suggest that a suburban ranch house has been slipped into a structure that started out as a rustic cabin. The interior walls are all sheetrock; the living room has been given a cathedral ceiling with no high windows. The effect of all the changes is intrusive. There is a well-designed stone fireplace, which could be original to the house. In a sense, there are no major renovation issues. Most of the house is in decent condition, although the basement/"rec" room is open and has had minor vandalism. Architecturally, the front portion of the cabin does retain integrity on the exterior; however, there is nothing left of the character on the interior other than the fireplace. The question becomes whether or not to remove the intrusive additions and to return the cabin to its original character.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Kuhlman Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #40, SV 910

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Fair to Good	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-------------------------	------------------------------

The Kuhlman Cabin is unusual among the cabins located on Jake's Creek Road, in that it sits on a large parcel of land. It is a wood-framed, single-story structure with two stone fireplaces. Its appearance is also unusual, more resembling a farmhouse than a vacation cabin. Renovations should address the following:

- The area around the house is overgrown with shrubs and brambles that need to be cleared. There are two trees that have grown too close to the porch and should be removed if they cannot be pruned back.
- The asphalt shingle roof is old; there are signs of leaks over a bedroom and the bath; it appears that the nails are beginning to back out of the shingles. There appears to be three layers of shingles on the building; therefore, the shingles should be removed and replaced. The gutters should also be replaced.
- The porch sags, suggesting some subsidence in the foundation. The foundation is stone pillars, and it should be possible to jack up the framing and slip in stone shims. The latticework around the porch should be replaced.
- The exterior of the house needs to be scrapped and repainted.
- One window sash is missing and will need to be replaced.
- On the interior, some portions of the walls and all of the ceilings are finished with composition boards and wood battens. The composition board should be replaced with a more durable material. There are also some lightweight cabinet doors with composition board panels; the panels sag and should be replaced.
- When replacing the composition board ceilings, it may be necessary to replace some of the framing where the roof leaks.
- Some plumbing fixtures may be able to be refurbished; however, it is necessary to replace the electrical and plumbing infrastructure and to upgrade the kitchen.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Garage at Kuhlman Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #40A, SV 910

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-18-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low
-----------------	-------------------------

This single-width garage with an earthen floor is in good condition; there is a single room at the rear, which served as servant quarters. Renovations should address the following:

- The roof needs to be replaced.
- The driveway in front of the garage doors needs to be regraded; soil has washed up and begun to block the doors.
- The garage doors sag, and need to be drawn back into square. This may require rebuilding the doors with the existing material.
- A sill beam at the rear of the garage should be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Spence Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #42, SV 952

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-19-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low
-----------------	-------------------------

The Spence Cabin is the finest cabin in the Elkmont District. It is a single-story house composed of a central bay of log construction with two, wood-framed wings that angle toward the front of the house. The stone chimneys and fireplaces, and the stone terraces are very well designed and executed. Renovations should address the following:

- The underbrush needs to be cleared and the shrubs need to be pruned around the structure.
- The drainage around the house needs to be reworked. There is some subsidence that might be associated with water-soaked foundations. There is a depression at the front of the house that has no visible means for water to drain away.
- The latticework at the rear porch needs to be replaced, as well as the access door to basement.
- The areas where there is visible sagging from the exterior need to be inspected to ascertain whether there is damage to the structure.
- The bathroom and kitchen need to be refurbished, and the plumbing and electrical infrastructure should be upgraded.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Brandau Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #43, SV 953

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-19-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

This single-story, wood-framed house is in generally good shape, except in the area of a roof leak. It contains some finely crafted cabinetry constructed of Southern yellow pine. Renovations should address the following:

- The foundation posts are inaccessible; they should be closely checked for rot at the base and replaced as necessary.
- The structural damage at the southeast corner of the house and near the fireplace needs to be repaired. The asphalt shingle roofing needs to be replaced.
- The broken rafters on the screen porch need to be repaired.
- The half-log benches on the front porch need to be replaced.
- The plumbing and electrical systems, and kitchen need to be upgraded.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Murphy Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #45, SV 955

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-19-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The Murphy Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed cabin with a tall central space ringed by clerestory windows. In the central space, the stone fireplace has benches on both sides. From an architectural point of view, the cabin has a strong design scheme and well-developed details. It has suffered major damage in one section where a tree trunk broke off from its base and fell through the roof. Renovations should address the following:

- The site should be cleared of underbrush, and one tree next to the house plus the offending tree that lost its top should be removed.
- The roof damage, both where the log penetrated the roof and on the east overhang, should be repaired. In other areas, the frame of the roof sags. The framing should be jacked to its original position and reinforced. The asphalt shingle roofing must be replaced.
- There is superficial water damage elsewhere, including the porch ceiling. These areas should be repaired.
- The crawl space access door should be replaced.
- Damage to the flooring system where the fallen log allowed water to enter the structure needs to be repaired.
- The bathroom plumbing fixtures have the potential to be refurbished, but the plumbing and electrical infrastructure, as well as the kitchen, should be upgraded.
- A freestanding garage and a shed attached to the back have been severely damaged; they do not appear to be salvageable. Very little of the historic fabric of the two structures is intact.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Miller Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #46, SV 960

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-17-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The Miller Cabin is a house above stables. The second floor (which is the main living space) cantilevers beyond the stables at the base. The house is in good condition; the interior, which is finished in knotty pine tongue-and-groove paneling and in rough sawn plywood paneling, lacks a sense of authenticity; it appears that the interior finishes have been replaced at some point in the history of the structure. Renovations should address the following:

- The shingle roofing should be replaced.
- The rear porch is cantilevered in two directions and is sagging. It would take some extensive structural gymnastics to jack up the sagging areas and to reinforce the structure, but it could be done. Posts at the corners should not be installed.
- The same is true for the cantilevered structure along the sides of the house.
- Some siding boards need to be replaced on the north side of the house.
- The cupola is weathered and rotting at its base; it should be repaired.
- The plumbing and electrical infrastructure, and kitchen should be upgraded.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Faust Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #47, SV 959

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-19-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The Faust Cabin is a pleasant one-story, wood-framed cabin beside a small stream. The living room opens onto a shed-roofed porch through a unique set of bi-fold windows, and a rear screen porch epitomizes comfort with the simplest means. Renovations should address the following:

- The 5-v metal roofing needs to be replaced due to poor condition with much damage on the west side. The roof framing is damaged and needs to be repaired.
- A sill beam needs to be replaced due to rotting at the intersection of the house and the screened porch.
- The floor has rotted at the former location of the bathtub. This damage should be repaired.
- The plumbing and electrical systems need to be upgraded, and the kitchen needs to be replaced.
- There is a wood-framed double garage beside the house. The floor structure is plank flooring on wood joists. The sill beams have suffered termite damage and are sagging. The roof sags in the middle. The sill beams need to be replaced, and the roof structure should be reinforced after jacking all members to their original position. The siding boards that are rotting at the lower end also need to be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Cambier Cabin
Appalachian Club

Structure #49, SV 956

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-19-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The Cambier Cabin is a single-story, wood-framed structure with what appears to be habitable attic space accessible only by means of an exterior stairway. That stairway has rotted and collapsed, making access to the attic space impossible for the survey team. The kitchen has been suburbanized, ca. 1970, and seems like an intrusive element in the cabin. Renovations should address the following:

- The metal roofing requires the standard renovation treatment; the gutters should be replaced.
- Some of the siding boards, especially on the east side, are rotting at the lower end and should be replaced.
- The stairs to the attic need to be replaced.
- Upgrade the electrical system and the plumbing infrastructure; also, replace the kitchen with a layout more reminiscent of the period in which it was built.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Wonderland Hotel

Structure #58, SV 961

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Fair

Renovation Expense: High

The Wonderland Hotel is a two-story, wood-framed building with an “L”-shaped plan. At first glance, it appears to be in the worst of conditions. Both ends of the front porch have collapsed. A dormer over the front entrance has collapsed from water damage, and subsequent damage has occurred as water has poured through the roof. There is extensive damage at the junction of the two legs of the “L.” On the second floor, the hotel rooms seem to have undergone renovations at diverse times, resulting in a hodge-podge of aesthetics.

On the other hand, there are significant sections of the building that do not have extensive damage. Also, there are some interior features that would be difficult or expensive to construct present-day. One of the more prominent of such features is the hardwood floor in the dining room. The strip flooring was carefully chosen so that adjacent strips alternate light and dark wood.

Recommendations start from the premise that all work at Elkmont should be guided by, which is the spirit and letter of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation. Therefore, the first recommendation is that the Wonderland Hotel be restored rather than replaced. Renovations should address the following:

- A fire safety plan that addresses current code requirements for exits and fire-protection should be drafted. This planning will determine whether the steel fire stairs can be re-used. It also will generate additional requirements for fire alarms and annunciators.
- An accessibility plan needs to be drafted. This should include the annex building. At present, there are no guest rooms that are wheelchair accessible.
- The foundation system, as with most buildings at Elkmont, consists of wood posts bearing on concrete or stone footings. At many of the footings that are visible, the post bases are rotting; as a consequence, walls sag as well as the rest of the structure that bears on those walls. It is recommended that all footings with new concrete footings that extend at least 8” above grade be replaced, and that all existing posts with pressure-treated wood posts be replaced. Selected lengths of the sill beams also need to be replaced.
- The severely damaged areas will have to be completely rebuilt. These include porches and entire sections of the building where the worst damage has occurred. This will also include the main stair.
- Many elements of the floor structure are sagging; they need to be jacked and the members need to be reinforced.
- Roof framing should be reinforced to remove the sag from framing members and a new roof must be installed. During the re-roofing process, all gutters should be replaced. The downspouts should

be collected in a drain system, and the discharge should be diverted away from the vicinity of the building footings.

- Almost all traces of site features have disappeared. The site should be restored to its historical condition; the historical assessment of this building should be able to pinpoint a time at which the full historic character of site development was in place.
- Interior finishes need to be renewed. In some areas, it will be necessary to replace finishes, and where possible, these should be more compatible with the historic fabric. Gypsum wallboard as well as the composition wallboard should be replaced.
- The electrical and plumbing systems need to be upgraded. A strategy for conditioning the build against cold (and, depending upon the reutilization plan, against heat) needs to be determined. The latter may dictate installation of thermal insulation. The public restrooms will need to be redesigned to provide wheelchair accessibility.
- If the reutilization plan calls for full dining service, new kitchen facilities will be required.
- All exterior finishes need to be renewed.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Wonderland Hotel Annex

Structure #58, SV 962

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Fair to Good	Renovation Expense: High
-------------------------	--------------------------

The Hotel Annex is a two-story, wood-framed structure with a large, stone fireplace and chimney. The fireplace is in a large gathering room. There are two porches on either side of the gathering space; one is open, and the other is screened. The open porch has collapsed.

In general, the Hotel Annex is in much better condition than the hotel itself. There is significant water damage from a roof leak at one rear inside corner. There is also damage around the fireplace where the roof flashing at the chimney has failed. This building could be restored at much less expense than the hotel.

Assuming that the decision is made to restore the hotel complex, it is recommended that the same rehabilitation plan for the hotel be used. Renovations should address the following:

- A fire safety plan needs to be drafted to bring the building into compliance with the current code requirements for exits and fire-protection. In particular, this planning must address the stairs from the second story. It will also generate requirements for fire alarms and annunciators.
- A comprehensive accessibility plan for the complex needs to be drafted. This particular building presents the problem that, on the first floor, the lounge, the screened porch, and the guest rooms are on three different levels. The second floor is not accessible; hence, the first floor guest rooms should be made accessible.
- While there is no visible evidence that the foundation system is failing on this building, it would be prudent to replace the perimeter posts. At the same time, increase the thickness of any footings that are undersized.
- Any sagging elements of the floor and roof structure should be jacked to level and the members reinforced.
- Roof framing for the screen porch consists of rustic poles; turnbuckle tension members have already been installed along the bottom chord of the roof rafters. These tension ties should be replaced.
- The roof should be replaced. All structural damage as well as damage to the finishes that resulted from the leaks in the roof should be repaired. There are no signs that this building ever had gutters, but it is recommended that new half-round gutters be installed to help manage water around the base of the building. The downspouts should be collected in a drain system, and the discharge should be diverted away from the vicinity of the building footings.
- The site area around the annex should be restored as part of the restoration of the entire hotel complex.

- Interior finishes need to be renewed. In some areas, it will be necessary to replace finishes, and where possible, these should be more compatible with the historic fabric. All exterior finishes need to be renewed; the lattice skirting around the crawl space needs to be repaired and repainted.
- At present, some of the accommodations take the form of efficiency apartments. If these are retained in the re-utilization, they will need complete modernization.
- The electrical and plumbing systems need to be upgraded. A strategy for conditioning the building against cold (and, depending upon the reutilization plan, against heat) needs to be determined. The latter may dictate installation of thermal insulation.

Restoration of the Wonderland Hotel and the Annex represent the single largest project at Elkmont, and it is also likely to be the largest dollar-per-square-foot cost.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: Wonderland Hotel Servants' Quarters (Riordan)
Wonderland Club

Structure #58, SV 963

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Fair

Renovation Expense: Moderate to High

The so-called Wonderland Hotel Servants' Quarters is a wood-framed, single-story structure behind the hotel. It rests on a pole foundation at the edge of a drop-off and is over 8 feet above the grade at the rear. It has been extensively remodeled over the years, and has a confusing mixture of wall and floor treatments. Renovations should address the following:

- There is considerable evidence of subsidence, and it is recommended that the entire pole foundation system be replaced, leveling the structure in the process. Measures need to be taken to work to the current elevation of the fireplace, which has also been subsiding. More serious measures should be taken to stabilize the fireplace/chimney mass.
- The roofing needs to be replaced.
- The exterior siding needs minor repairs. The siding material should be tested for the presence of asbestos.
- The windows are all aluminum jalousie windows; they are out of character with the other buildings in the hotel complex. It seems appropriate to replace these windows with double-hung windows, such as those found in the hotel.
- Areas where the original wall and floor materials are in place should be identified, and all of the more modern additions should be removed. A more historically compatible wall and floor treatment should be installed.
- The future function of this structure will have to guide other work on this building. Bathrooms and the kitchen need to be refurbished. The electrical and plumbing system needs to be replaced.
- An end door of the building opens out into space—this needs to be addressed by adding stairs or a deck, or by removing the door. The door at the left front has no steps or landing.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The May or Moore Cabin Structure #58-1a, SV 901
 Wonderland Club

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low to Moderate
-----------------	-------------------------------------

This cabin is a one-and-a-half story, wood-framed cabin. It is very rustic on the interior with no wall or ceiling finishes; the framing, siding, and floorboards are exposed on the interior. The foundation has been replaced and is in good condition. In general, this cabin is in good condition and only requires a few repairs. Renovations should address the following:

- The leaking roof has minor damage and needs to be repaired, and the roll roofing needs to be replaced.
- The lattice skirting around the crawl space needs to either be repaired or replaced.
- The electrical and plumbing systems need to be upgraded, and the kitchen needs to be modernized.
- The interior and exterior finishes need to be renewed.
- The rear stairs and covered landing both need to be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Paine Cabin
Wonderland Club

Structure #58-2b, SV 964

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Fair	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The Paine Cabin is a one-story, wood-framed structure with a screen porch to the rear and a later addition to the north. There was no access to the interior of this property during the preliminary survey. The exterior survey did not reveal major damage, but the following items were noted:

- The metal roof is in poor condition and it should be replaced.
- The board and batten siding has rotted in a couple of locations where it goes to the ground.
- The gutters must be replaced; the discharge needs to be designed to carry water away from the structure.
- The stairs to the rear porch have collapsed and must be replaced. There appears to be water damage to the porch floor.
- The exterior finishes need to be renewed.
- The foundation system should be inspected as described in the general notes.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Preston Cabin
Wonderland Club

Structure #58-3c, SV 902

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The Preston Cabin is a one-story cabin with a lower story at the rear. It has a stone fireplace and chimney. The siding consists of cedar shakes. While in generally good condition, the roof has failed, and at present, there are active leaks along the edge of the porch; these leaks are beginning to cause structural damage. Renovations should address the following:

- The existing asphalt shingle roof needs to be removed, and damages caused by leaks need to be repaired. The roofing also needs to be replaced.
- Cedar shakes that have rotted or are broken need to be replaced.
- The exterior and interior need to be refinished.
- The electrical and plumbing systems need to be upgraded, and the kitchen needs to be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Hicks Cabin
Wonderland Club

Structure #58-5e, SV 907

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Low to Moderate
-----------------	-------------------------------------

The Hicks Cabin is a single-story cabin with vertical board siding (some with battens, some without) on all exterior walls except those on the screen porch. The latter are covered with a beaded tongue-and-groove paneling. Renovations should address the following:

- The rotted posts in the foundation system need to be replaced.
- The roof over the screen porch has failed in one area; damage to the roof sheathing and structure need to be repaired, as well as the floor structure and decking. The entire house needs to be re-roofed.
- The guttering needs to be replaced.
- The rotten boards in the skirting around the crawlspace need to be replaced.
- The walls and ceilings are covered with a composition board paneling. Most of it sags, and it should be removed and replaced with a material less pervious to humidity.
- The exterior and interior finishes need to be renewed.
- The electrical and plumbing systems need to be upgraded, and the kitchen needs to be replaced.

Preliminary Condition Assessment and Recommendations

Building: The Tate/Beaman/Tucker Cabin Structure #58-8h, SV 904
 Wonderland Club

Elkmont, Tennessee

Date of Field Assessment: 4-16-02

Condition: Good	Renovation Expense: Moderate
-----------------	------------------------------

The Tate/Beaman/Tucker Cabin is a one-story-framed structure with a stone fireplace and chimney, and drop siding. This cabin has a moderate amount of damage. Renovations should address the following:

- The foundation system is posts bearing on stones. These should be double-checked for rot, and rotted posts should be replaced.
- Rotted and termite damaged boards in the crawlspace skirting need to be replaced.
- The roll roofing on the house needs replacement. There may be some damage where leaks have occurred. If so, affected framing and sheathing need to be replaced.
- The guttering needs to be replaced.
- The flooring must be replaced in the kitchen and on the floor below where it has been damaged by leaks in the roof.
- Water damage to kitchen ceiling needs to be repaired.
- Some window sashes for the sliding windows are missing and need to be reconstructed to match the original.
- The screen door at the rear screen porch and screening all need to be replaced.
- The electrical and plumbing systems need to be upgraded, and the kitchen needs to be replaced.