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Introduction

During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, a number of northern and midwestern nouveau riche families, such as the duPonts, moved to Virginia. Drawn by the area’s bucolic setting, cheap land prices, and railroad access to social and economic centers in Richmond, Virginia and Washington, D.C. during a time of rapid industrialization and urbanization, many of these Gilded Age elites settled in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains. They predominantly purchased farms in the area stretching from Albemarle County north to Loudoun County, although some also settled in Clarke County in the Shenandoah Valley. As part of what historians now refer to as the American Country House movement, these gentlemen farmers purchased old plantations and converted them into horse and cattle hobby farms. These hobby farmers and their families pursued a sporting life filled with activities like cock fighting, hunting, and racing the thoroughbreds they bred and raised. Because horse showing, foxhunting, and racing were such an integral part of their social life and culture, the gentleman farmers built stables and barn complexes. The elite hobby farmers’ material culture often reflected their idealized views of regional agricultural buildings as well as the popular Neoclassical and Georgian architecture.¹ Upper-class women like Eleonora Randolph Sears, Marion duPont Scott, and Isabel Dodge Sloane increasingly participated in the male-dominated fields of race horse ownership and breeding during the early-to-mid twentieth century as a part of the expansion of women’s gender roles during the Progressive Era. Other studies conducted on women and space, such as Daphne Spain’s *Gendered Space*, suggest that the equine landscape

---
can be analyzed to understand how horsewomen challenged gender stratification and asserted their own power through the construction and modification of equine facilities.²

As a part of the American Country House movement, notable architects who were prominent in the Colonial Revival and early historic preservation movements such as Milton Grigg; Fiske Kimball; and the firm of McKim, Mead, and White designed, updated, and restored many of these newly purchased farms. Today their work has been the focus of numerous studies such as Edward Lay’s The Architecture of Jefferson Country; however, these scholarly publications have largely ignored ancillary structures, such as stables.³ The stables, which played a huge role in the equine landscape of early-twentieth century Virginia, have only been identified and briefly described through national register nominations and cultural resource surveys. While rural historic district nominations often describe the economic and social importance of equine activities, only the Greenwood-Afton Rural Historic District nomination attempts to characterize the most prominent types of stables in southwestern Albemarle County.⁴ With so little attention being paid to ancillary structures in the region, specifically those relating to the equine landscape, it is little wonder that manifestations of gender on the built environment have remained unstudied.

The first three chapters of this study develop a context for Virginia’s equine activities, landscapes, and structures as well as women’s contestation of gender norms in the equine sports during the early-twentieth century. The contrasts between the contexts for Virginia’s eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries and late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries showed that while

Gilded Age hobby farmers often sought to imitate the sporting lifestyles of the First Families of Virginia by breeding and racing horses, their interest in Colonial Revival architecture, and scientific and technological innovations resulted in vastly different equine landscapes. Similarly, the context on gender discusses how changing gender norms encouraged upper-class girls to participate in previously male-dominated sports like foxhunting and horse showing during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, leading them to later challenge gender norms in racing as adults during the early-to-mid twentieth century. The chapter also includes an extensive discussion of the women who built or owned the farms in the study to provide insight into their approaches to challenging the gender norms in other equine sports, setting the stage for analyzing how their views on gender may have played a role in shaping their equine landscapes.

The following section contains the five case studies conducted at large breeding and racing farms dating from 1901 to 1936. The case studies examine how the settings, layouts, aesthetics, and interior stable layouts reflected the owners’ understandings of the ideas of the American Country House movement developed in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century context, regardless of their gender. Two of the case studies examined male-dominated farms, including Edward Weld’s and Walter Chrysler, Jr.’s North Wales Farm near Warrenton, Virginia, and Ellsworth and Elizabeth Augustus’s Mount Sharon farm near Orange, Virginia. The other three cases studies were conducted on female-owned farms including Burrland Farm near Middleburg, Virginia, originally owned by William Zeigler, Jr. and purchased by Eleonora Randolph Sears, Montpelier near Orange, Virginia, originally owned by William du Pont Sr. and dramatically expanded by his daughter Marion duPont Scott, as Isabel Dodge Sloane’s Brookmeade Stable near Upperville, Virginia. The case studies examined the manifestation of

---

5 While the case studies focus on farms constructed between 1901 and 1936, the time frame for the context extends to the late-nineteenth century to encompass thoroughbred farms developed earlier in the American Country House movement.
gender through studying the settings and layouts of the equine complexes, the aesthetics of the
equine structures, and the interior layouts of the stables. The settings and layouts of the equine
complexes were studied to examine how the owners applied the picturesque landscape tenets
recommended by American Country House architects and the ways in which they sought to
achieve efficiency. The complexes’ settings and layouts were evaluated using sightlines and
historic aerials as described in the Appendix. Similarly, analysis of the structures’ aesthetics
evaluated the owners’ choices to use high-style Colonial Revival architecture favored by
prominent architects active in Virginia, Colonial Revival-influenced architecture meant to
imitate vernacular farms recommended by northern American Country House architects, or
functional, sometimes prefabricated structures meant to showcase an interest in efficiency and
technological innovations. Finally, the interior layouts of the stables were examined to better
understand how the owners sought to achieve an efficient space that supported their horses.

Although the results need to be substantiated with additional research, analysis of the
case studies suggests that men used the public visibility and stylistic treatments of their stables to
serve as statements of their masculinity, wealth, and competitiveness. While perceptions of
female propriety prevented women from constructing stables as public statements of their
identities, their placements of their stables within their equine landscapes indicates that they were
willing to show their contestation of gender norms in racehorse ownership and breeding to a
select group of visitors to their properties. They placed their broodmare barns in locations of
prominence, likely serving as physical manifestations of their assertions that women could
become expert breeders. The women’s identities also played an important role in the ways in
which they shaped their landscapes. Sloane’s location of her race barn behind her main house
was likely a reflection of her intense privacy and her unwillingness to publicly contest gender
norms outside of racing events, while Scott’s placement of her broodmare barns, race barns, and racetracks in front of the Montpelier mansion but out of the public’s view paralleled her contestation of gender norms in the show ring to a limited audience. Finally, Sears’s appropriation of a highly masculine equine landscape suggests that some women, particularly feminists who aggressively challenged gender norms in public, may have viewed the takeover of male spaces as the best way of asserting their equality.

The development of a context, focusing on gendered landscapes, for the Virginia horse belt’s late-nineteenth to early-twentieth century equine landscapes has the potential to help the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) begin to identify and subsequently preserve these resources. Because these late-nineteenth to early-twentieth century landscapes are often overshadowed by the properties’ mansion houses, like Montpelier, their historical significance is often overlooked by owners, scholars, and institutions tasked with interpreting periods of significance. This study encourages preservationists to reevaluate their approach to preserving these layered landscapes. The evaluation of the influence of gender on the landscapes contributes to scholarly understandings of women’s history and contributions to the built environment, changing narratives about the extent of male domination in the horse industry and architecture during the early-to-mid twentieth century.
Virginia’s Eighteenth through Mid-Nineteenth Century Equine Landscapes

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, horses and mules played a vital role in Virginia’s economy because they provided transportation and were a source of power for agriculture. While horses were predominantly used for work, Virginia’s elites also used them for social activities like foxhunting and horse racing. Virginia’s rural and urban landscapes had numerous stables and carriage houses built by both the elites and the lower classes to support the various roles of the horses and mules. Although few eighteenth and mid-nineteenth century stables including those built by the elite survive on the landscape due to fires, the Civil War, and neglect, Virginia’s elites developed a distinctive equine material culture through their construction of public and private racetracks, as well as wood or masonry stables built with standing stalls and little fenestration located near the main house as sites for them to engage in displays of wealth and power through their exhibition of their horses.

Virginia gentlemen began importing blooded horses such as Arabians and thoroughbreds for riding, breeding, and racing during the eighteenth century, resulting in Virginia becoming the center for such activities during the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. These horses served as public displays of power and wealth, exemplifying the importance of Virginia’s elite. Wealthy plantation owners rode their horses on business, as well as for social purposes like foxhunting, allowing them to display their expensive horses and horsemanship as exemplified by Thomas Jefferson’s description of George Washington as “the best horseman of his age, and the

---

6 This context spans from the eighteenth century through the mid-nineteenth century because of changes that occurred in the mid-nineteenth century including Virginia’s declining role in the equine industry during the antebellum period, disruptions to horse breeding and racing caused by the Civil War, and changes to equine material culture brought about by the Industrial Revolution and advances in scientific and veterinary thought beginning around the 1860s.

most graceful figure that could be seen on horseback.”

Washington recorded his foxhunting activities in his diary, including preparing his land for hunts, directing “paths to be cut for Fox hunting.” As an indicator of his social status, Washington frequently rode his blooded horses on foxhunts with his neighbors and guests.

Horse racing and breeding were also important social activities for Virginia’s elite. While a number of Virginia gentlemen such as John Hoomes of Bowling Green, the Lees of Stratford Hall in Westmoreland County, and William Fitzhugh of Chatham in Stafford County were noted for breeding, owning, and racing blooded horses, the Tayloe family of Mount Airy, in Richmond County, achieved particular prominence during the mid-eighteenth through the early-nineteenth centuries. John Tayloe II began a stud farm in 1751 by importing the stallion Tayloe’s Childers. His son, John Tayloe III, continued to breed and race horses, earning a reputation as one of America’s leading horsemen.

While the Tayloes owned many successful racehorses such as Leviathan, they were most noted for their foundation bloodstock including Selima, Gray Diomed, Bellair, Traveller, and Sir Archie whose decedents included many twentieth century American racing legends such as Man O’War, Gallant Fox, Native Dancer, and War Admiral.

In addition to their substantial contribution to horse breeding and thoroughbred racing, families like the Tayloes also tangibly altered the landscape to facilitate equine activities. Chief

---


12 Ibid., 65-66.

13 Ibid., 81-84.
among these alterations were the racetracks constructed as venues for competitions. John Tayloe II constructed a mile-long race track at Mount Airy during his 1760s building campaign. While successful, the Tayloes were not alone in their creation of an equine landscape. A number of the landed gentry followed suit by building racetracks on their property such as John Hoomes and William Fitzhugh.\textsuperscript{14} In addition to these private racetracks, public tracks were also constructed throughout Virginia such as Fairfield, Tree Hill, Broad Rock, and New Market near Richmond. Although these races were competitions between gentlemen owners, people of all classes could attend the races as spectators, including wealthy women who were otherwise excluded from thoroughbred breeding and racing activities. However, people of the upper classes often had a separate building or stand to view the races from, further reinforcing the social hierarchy.\textsuperscript{15}

In addition to racetracks, Virginia’s gentry also built stables to support their breeding and training activities. Extant stables from the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries and the Mutual Assurance Policies show that the stables were located within the curtilage of the main house as exemplified by Stratford Hall’s 1795 brick stable and reconstructed 1730s stable, Mount Vernon’s 1782 stable, and Monticello’s 1809 Mulberry Row stable.\textsuperscript{16} While the Mutual Assurance Policies excluded many stables because they did not insure structures valued at less than $100 or structures located at a distance from the main buildings on the property, a sampling of policies dating from 1797 to 1816 showed that the majority of Virginia stables were one-story, frame or log structures. Of the stables sampled, 88% were one story, 8% were one-and-a-half stories, and 4% were two stories. Similarly, 82% were built of wood, 15% were brick, and 4% were stone. The stables were relatively small, averaging 862 square feet. The average value for a

\textsuperscript{14} Johnson and Crookshanks, \textit{Virginia Horse Racing}, 85-96.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 99-102.
stable was $425.\textsuperscript{17} However, these averages were not reflective of the stables built by Virginia’s wealthiest gentlemen for their fine horses. Although the gentry’s stables were located within the curtilage and were one or one-and-a-half story gable-roofed structures like Virginia’s utilitarian stables (figure 1), Mutual Assurance Policies show they had different sizes, forms, and levels of monetary investment from their owners, due in part to the owner’s role in the equine industry. Plantations that bred and raced horses appear to have had larger, more expensive stables, while plantations that predominantly purchased fine horses had less expensive and sometimes smaller stables more consistent with utilitarian stables. For example, Thomas Jefferson, who frequently purchased horses instead of breeding them, built a stable made of log pens joined together that was over 100 feet long in 1793.\textsuperscript{18} Although he was a member of Virginia’s elite, Jefferson’s log stable fit into the majority (82%) of wooden stables constructed in Virginia. While Jefferson’s stable’s square footage was likely over the average Virginia stable size of 862 square feet, in 1800 it was valued at $200, which was less than the average value at $425.\textsuperscript{19} In contrast, Virginia’s leading breeders often had larger stables averaging 1,635 square feet built of wood or masonry. Of the stables sampled, 50% of the breeders built wood stables and the other 50% used brick. Both the wood and brick stables had high values, averaging $1,278. Mutual Assurance Policies also showed that breeders often built shed additions to their stables (figure 2). All of the wooden stables built by breeders sampled had at least two shed additions appended. John Hoomes’s Bowling Green stable illustrated this shed configuration because it had two 12 foot by 30 foot sheds attached to either side of wooden stable.\textsuperscript{20}

While the Mutual Assurance Policies showed that a variety of sizes, forms, and materials

\textsuperscript{17} Mutual Assurance Society of Virginia, microfilm, 1797-1816. See the Appendix for a detailed explanation of the analysis process.
\textsuperscript{18} “04 Stable,” Landscape of Slavery, Monticello.
\textsuperscript{19} Mutual Assurance Society of Virginia, microfilm, reel 2, vol. 14, policy No. 389, 1800.
\textsuperscript{20} Mutual Assurance Society of Virginia, microfilm, reel 4, vol. 41, policy No. 1277, 1811.
existed, only surviving examples of eighteenth and nineteenth century stables constructed by the elite such as at Stratford Hall, Mount Vernon, and Monticello (Mulberry Row and North Terrace) can be examined for architectural details. Like the stables in the Mutual Assurance Policies, these stables are side-gabled and one or one-and-a-half stories. However, their masonry construction is unrepresentative of the widespread use of wood. Despite such similarities, there are some subtle differences such as Stratford Hall’s stables’ use of a Flemish bond pattern whereas Mount Vernon’s stables employ English bond because of the Stratford Hall stables proximity to the main house. Monticello’s Mulberry Row stable is of stone construction with a frame section in the center. Consistent with the widespread use of wood in stable construction, Washington’s brick stable replaced an earlier frame stable that burned in 1782. Similarly, Jefferson built a log stable on Mulberry Row in 1793, which he later replaced with the 1809 stone stable.

These surviving stables reveal that eighteenth and nineteenth century stables incorporated room for coaches, tack, supplies, and stalls all under one roof. Additionally, these uses were conveyed on the exterior through the fenestration as exemplified by Stratford Hall’s large brick barn (figure 3). The barn was initially constructed around 1752 as a coach house and was expanded to include two bays of horse stables on the east end around 1795 after the Lee’s horse breeding operations outgrew their smaller 1730s stable. The 1752 section of the building is comprised of three large bays for carriages flanked by two tack rooms. The eastern-most bay of the 1795 addition contains three box stalls while the other bay contains a row of four standing

---

22 “04 Stable,” Landscape of Slavery, Monticello.
23 “Final Report: The Last Year of Tree Growth for Selected Timbers within the Buildings of Stratford Hall Plantation as Derived by the Key-Year Dendrochronology Technique,” Herman J. Heikkenen, Principal Investigator, American Institute of Dendrochronology, Inc., April 1987. p. 13-14 (dates for coach house and stable building, sections I & II)
stalls. Similarly, Mount Vernon’s stable has three bays: the first and third bays contain stalls while the second is the carriage room (figure 4).

Additionally, the existing stables show that earth floors were common, although Stratford Hall’s stable aisles were paved with brick. Similarly, the four stables had little fenestration as they were all accessible by a single door and had few windows. Stratford Hall’s stable had a single window, while Mount Vernon’s stable had two front louvered windows and one rear window for each bay. The stables also featured similar standing stalls, which were divided with horizontal boards sloping diagonally downward and terminating in a post (figure 5). Similarly, the stalls all had wooden hay racks located inside the stalls, indicating that the horses would have been tethered with their heads facing the wall and their hind ends to the stable aisle. The widespread presence of standing stalls and the numbers of horses exceeding the number of stalls shows that horses were only kept inside the stables when they were being used. Only Stratford Hall’s stable has box stalls to accommodate horses who needed to be stabled for extended periods of time (figure 6).

Despite Virginia horsemen’s successful breeding and training operations reflected by the prevalence of their racetracks and stables, the state’s role in thoroughbred breeding and racing decreased during the early-to-mid nineteenth century due in part to the poor economy. After the Panic of 1837, many Virginians moved their farms or sold their breeding stock to farms in Kentucky where the soil had not been depleted from extensive tobacco farming. Thoroughbred breeding and racing also gained prominence in Tennessee during this time as highlighted by Andrew Jackson’s fame as a breeder and owner. Jackson owned part of the Clover Bottom

---

24 A 1785 inventory lists 130 horses at Mount Vernon. Similarly, a 1775 inventory lists 20 named riding or carriage horses which exceed the eight stalls at Stratford Hall.


racetrack near Nashville and Thruxton, a Virginia-bred racehorse who was sired by John Hoomes’s and John Tayloe’s Diomed. A disagreement over Joseph Erwin cancelling a race between his horse Ploughboy and Thruxton escalated, leading to Jackson’s most famous duel with Erwin’s son-in-law Charles Dickinson in which Jackson killed Dickinson.27 Virginia’s decreasing role in the industry is further illustrated in race course and match listings as noted in the period publication American Turf Register and Sporting Magazine. In 1837, there were eighteen Virginia race tracks listed in the magazine, while there were six in Kentucky and four in Tennessee.28 However, by 1839 Virginia only had thirteen active tracks while Kentucky had seventeen and Tennessee ten.29 In addition to the gradual disappearance of Virginia’s race tracks from the built environment as their locations at the edges of urban areas often led to them being consumed by the expanding cities after they fell out of use, the westward movement of elite Virginians and their horses also decreased the numbers of new breeding farms founded by the wealthy Virginia during the early-to-mid nineteenth century and resulted in the construction fewer new stables. Exacerbated by the Civil War, the decline in Virginia’s thoroughbred breeding and racing continued until the Gilded Age hobby farmers revived it during the late-nineteenth century.

Illustrations

Figure 1 shows the Tayloe family's Mount Airy. Note the stable's (building E) proximity to the house (building A) and other buildings within the curtilage.

Figure 2 depicts Stapleton Crutchfield's stables at Mattapony in Spotsylvania County. The shed surrounds the larger stable in its entirety.
Figure 3 shows the carriage house and stables at Stratford Hall. The ca. 1752 carriage house is located on the left with the ca. 1795 stables appended to it. The reconstructed ca. 1730s stable is to the right. The bays in the carriage house and stable show the division of functions. The largest doors open to areas where the carriages were stored, while the medium doors lead to the stables. The smallest doors flanking the carriage bays provided access to tack and harness storage.

Figure 4 depicts the stables at Mount Vernon. The carriages were kept in the center bay, while the stables were in the flanking bays. Image courtesy of George Washington's Mount Vernon.
Figure 5 shows the standing stalls at Stratford Hall. The floors of the stalls are clay, while the aisle is paved in brick.
Figure 6 depicts the box stalls at Stratford Hall. These stalls were used for horses that had to be kept inside for an extended period of time. Note the lack of fenestration in the exterior wall on the right.
Virginia’s Late-Nineteenth and Early-Twentieth Century Equine History and Landscapes

In the decades after the Civil War, thoroughbred breeding and racing began to experience a resurgence in Virginia. A number of northern and mid-western nouveau riche families, such as the duPonts, moved to the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains, predominantly in the area stretching from Albemarle County north to Loudoun County, bringing with them interests in horse breeding, showing, and racing. These Gilded Age elites were drawn by the area’s bucolic setting, accessibility by rail, and relatively low land prices. As part of what historians now refer to as the American Country House movement, these gentlemen farmers purchased old plantations and converted them into horse and cattle hobby farms, often building agricultural structures that idealized eighteenth and nineteenth century Virginia architecture.\(^{30}\) Although the Gilded Age elites romanticized and sought to imitate what they perceived as the leisurely lifestyles of Virginia’s eighteenth and nineteenth century planters by engaging in equine sports and horse breeding, the American Country House movement’s embrasure of picturesque landscape aesthetics, Colonial Revival architecture, and advances in science and technology led to the development of an equine built environment during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries that were distinctive from the one created by Virginia’s elites in eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth century.

During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, the gentleman farmers and their families pursued a sporting life filled with activities like cock fighting, hunting, horse showing, and thoroughbred racing. Initially, Gilded Age elites were most interested in forming sporting clubs to organize foxhunts and horse shows, as well as to provide the wealthy with a place to

socialize. Some of these clubs provide some of the earliest examples of the gentleman farmers’ equine material culture such as the Keswick Hunt Club of Albemarle, which was established in the 1896. Its Queen Anne style clubhouse was built in 1898, and the grounds continue to be used for horse shows and steeplechase races. Additionally, the equine social activities conducted by the gentleman farmers drew additional Gilded Age elites to Virginia. For example, the Orange County Hunt of New York relocated to Fauquier County in 1903 after a well-publicized competition between English-bred and American-bred foxhounds drew attention to the area.

Although many of the Virginia breeders initially focused on producing show horses and fox hunters for use in their equine social activities, some began to breed successful thoroughbred race horses despite Kentucky’s continued dominance of the thoroughbred industry. The earliest thoroughbred stud farms developed around the turn of the century and included Ellerslie (late 1860s) and Nydrie (1890) in Albemarle County and Blue Ridge Farm (1903) in Fauquier. Ellerslie farm was unusual because it was a continuation and intensification of the Hancock family’s antebellum breeding operations. However, the Hancocks gradually moved most of their operations to Claiborne Farm in Kentucky during the early-twentieth century where they produced a number of winning horses including the 1930 Triple Crown winner Gallant Fox. Nydrie and Blue Ridge Farm were more representative of the equine enterprises established by the Gilded Age hobby farmers. Banking and sugar tycoon Harry Douglas Forsyth built the

---

Nydrie estate, which later produced the 1947 Kentucky Derby winner Jet Pilot.\textsuperscript{34} Similarly, beet sugar magnate Henry T. Oxnard began to develop Blue Ridge Farm in 1903 and 1904, turning it into a leading stud farm. After Oxnard’s death, Rear Admiral Cary T. Grayson and Samuel Ross purchased the property in 1927 and continued to produce winning racehorses.\textsuperscript{35}

Many of the Virginia gentlemen farms also bred and raced steeplechase horses because the national thoroughbred industry suffered during the early-twentieth century due to Progressive reforms banning gambling at flat racetracks, which severely impacted the profitability of horse racing. Virginia banned gambling on horse racing in 1897, although some racetracks continued to find loopholes through the first decade of the twentieth century. While the laws decreased the profitability of racing in Virginia, the prohibition of gambling in New York during the early-twentieth century was even more detrimental to the Virginia breeders and owners because they sold and raced their horses in New York’s prominent auctions and races.\textsuperscript{36} These laws resulted in Virginia breeders and owners shifting to steeplechase racing, resulting in a brief “golden age” of steeplechase racing during the 1920s and 1930s.\textsuperscript{37} Unlike flat racing, steeplechase races were not profitable because they did not offer large purses or use gambling systems like pari-mutuel betting.\textsuperscript{38} Such profitability had little impact on the Virginia hobby farmers because they never derived their primary income from horse breeding and racing. The gentleman farmers formed a

\textsuperscript{34} “NPS Form 002-5045_Southern_Albemarle_RHD_2007_NRFinal.pdf,” accessed January 10, 2016, \url{http://www.dhr.virginia.govregistersCountiesAlbemarle0025045_Southern_Albemarle_RHD_2007_NRFinal.pdf}.
\textsuperscript{36} Virginia Horse Racing and Gambling, accessed January 27, 2016, \url{http://www.virginiaplaces.org/agriculturehorseracing.html}.
\textsuperscript{38} A type of betting where gamblers bet against each other instead of the track by creating a pool of bets. The amount the gamblers won was influenced by the odds on the horse winning and the size of the pool. Before pari-mutuel betting laws were enacted, the tracks funded the bets and were able to make huge profits by fixing the winners and losers.
number of new steeplechase races in Virginia including the Middleburg Hunt Cup (1921), the Virginia Gold Cup (1922) in Warrenton, and the Montpelier Hunt Races (1934). Steeplechase races were run cross country, often using features of the landscapes like fences, hedges, and streams as obstacles, which, unlike flat tracks, often left few tangible signs on the landscapes owned by participating hobby farmers. Some of the most notable breeding and steeplechase racing farms that emerged were Edward M. Weld’s North Wales (1914) and J. Temple Gwathmey’s Canterbury Farm (1915) in Fauquier County, and Marion duPont Scott’s Montpelier (1928) in Orange County. Other prominent stud farms founded in the late-1920s and 1930s include Charles Stone’s Morven Stud (1926) and Herman Danforth Newcomb’s Wavertree Hall Farm (1921) in Albemarle County; John Phipps’s Rockburn Stud (1930), Paul Mellon’s Rokeby Farm (1931), and William Ziegler Jr.’s Burland Farm (1927) in Fauquier County; and Isabel Dodge Sloane’s Brookmeade Farm (1928) in Loudoun County.

Because horse showing, foxhunting, and racing were important activities in the elite’s social life and culture, they designed their equine landscapes to be statements of their wealth, power, and personal tastes. The hobby farmers’ stables and barn complexes often reflected their idealized views of regional agricultural structures, desire to emulate Virginia’s eighteenth and nineteenth century planter class, understanding of Virginia’s colonial and antebellum architectural history, and interest in new building materials and technologies. The owners of stud farms undertook large building campaigns, transforming working farms into idealized

---

equine estates. The monetary impact of this conversion is illustrated clearly in the Scott District of Fauquier County tax assessment values from 1933, which note the equine landscape as constituting a half of the total value despite only accounting for a quarter of the acreage.\(^\text{42}\) The land improvements led to the gentrification of the area, attracting additional wealthy horse people while minimizing traditional agricultural production.

Although the equine landscapes and structures built during this period had some aesthetic variances due to the owners’ personal preferences, the settings and layouts of the equine estates were heavily influenced by the picturesque landscape style espoused by proponents of the American Country House movement as reflected in period books of architectural plans. Of the farm complex’s setting in the landscape, New York architect and leading designer of country estates Alfred Hopkins wrote, “The irregularities of site frequently offer equally interesting opportunities […] the architect may then greatly increase the interest of his work by […] letting his structure adapt itself more to the confirmation of the ground.”\(^\text{43}\) He urged “not to mar [Nature’s] beauty by unnecessary cuts, fills, or embankments, nor with roads of too great a prominence.”\(^\text{44}\) He also recommended locating the farm complex in a pastoral setting away from the house “where they may be visited only by a pilgrimage through pleasant fields and lanes.”\(^\text{45}\) The farm complexes’ distances from the main house and their picturesque settings advocated by Hopkins sharply contrasted the stables built within the working areas and curtilages of eighteenth through mid-nineteenth century Virginia plantations.

\(^{44}\) Ibid., 19.
\(^{45}\) Ibid., 17.
Both Hopkins’s southern counterparts and the Virginia estate owners appear to have shared Hopkins’s picturesque landscape design tenants. Virginia horse-country estate architects like William Lawrence Bottomley frequently located the equine complexes and the main house away from major roads, making them accessible only through winding farm lanes, which took advantage of the scenic vistas offered by the Blue Ridge Mountains. They also often situated the buildings on the tops or sides of the rolling hills, a scenic walk’s distance from the main house. Property owners who employed local architects and builders like William du Pont, Sr. also followed these practices, sometimes manipulating the landscape to increase its visual appeal, a practice still carried out today by present owners of the estates. Du Pont located his Montpelier farm complex down the hill from the mansion house around a scenic manmade pond.

Although many of the Virginia horse farm owners observed Hopkins’s landscape recommendations, they did not often follow his design suggestions for stable complexes, which often featured Romantic aesthetics inspired by the Gothic Revival, Italianate, and Tudor Revival styles. Rather, due to the prevalence of Georgian and Federal designs exhibited by many of Virginia’s late-eighteenth and nineteenth century farm houses, southern country house architects and their clients preferred the Colonial Revival aesthetic. Because the combination of picturesque landscape designs and formal, Colonial-Revival influenced equine architecture caused logistical and aesthetic difficulties in designing complex layouts, Hopkins stated “The strictly formal plan […] seems entirely out of place when [the architect] comes to the humbler problem of the farm. Here the rambling, happy-go-lucky type of plan will yield fully as much in artistic value and will hamper the architect less in his effort to combine the practical with the

beautiful.”47 Despite Hopkins’s advice, some Virginia country house architects designed highly-formal complex layouts to match their high-style, Colonial Revival-influenced equine structures such as those at North Wales Farm. Others architects and owners such as William du Pont, Sr. followed Hopkins’s suggestions more closely by designing the complexes that “rambled” to follow the topography but were loosely arranged in a rectangular quads to help mediate between the picturesque landscape and formal architecture to create a “vernacular” or “historic” -looking complex. Other designers took an even more picturesque approach than advocated by Hopkins by avoiding large complexes altogether. Instead, they designed individual locations for each horse barn and its supporting structures such as mash houses, pump houses, and sheds, resulting in pastoral-looking farms with the horse barns dotting the rolling hills.

Regardless of the approach taken in organizing the layouts of their equine structures, Virginia hobby farmers preferred Colonial Revival-influenced architecture. Many owners hired well known architects such as William Lawrence Bottomley who designed and influenced a number of the horse-country estates during the 1920s and 1930s in the Middleburg area, while others used local builders and architects who applied more vernacular aesthetics. Bottomley believed that the equine buildings should be stylistically compatible with the residence, leading to the construction of stable complexes built in or containing stylistic elements of the Colonial Revival style.48 Some examples of equine structures designed in high-style Colonial Revival architecture are North Wales designed by the firm Little and Brown, and Burrland Farm designed by Bottomley. Other architects and builders who used more of a vernacular form for their equine structures incorporated stylistic elements influenced by the Colonial Revival aesthetic such as symmetry, arcades, colonnades, transoms, and louvered square, octagonal, and

47 Hopkins, Modern Farm Buildings, 18.
48 “NPS Form 030-5570_LittleRiverRHD_2013_NRHP_FINAL.pdf.”
pyramidal cupolas.\textsuperscript{49} One such example is du Pont’s 1909 pony barn. Likely designed by local architect George Ficklen, the frame stable clad with board-and-batten siding references a three-part Palladian plan and includes transoms, pyramidal ventilators, and a slate roof.

Additionally, Virginia equine buildings incorporated both local materials and new materials. Architects like Bottomley shared Hopkins’s belief that local materials such as stone, brick, stucco, and wood were the best because they were “the least expensive in cost and the most suitable in appearance.”\textsuperscript{50} In addition to local traditional materials, equine buildings also frequently made use of new twentieth century materials such as concrete, cinderblock, and structural terra cotta blocks. Farm owners used these materials to reduce construction costs and improve the hygiene of their stables. Equine veterinarians such as Mathew Horace Hayes who were influenced by scientific agriculture especially recommended concrete floors, walls, and plaster because it reduced moisture, which could cause a number of health problems, particularly in the hooves.\textsuperscript{51} Built by foxhunting enthusiast Joseph B. Thomas in collaboration with the architectural firm Peabody, Wilson and Brown, the 1913 Huntland stable in Loudoun County exemplifies the melding of the Colonial Revival style with a state-of-the-art facility. The symmetrical U-plan stables are made of stuccoed concrete and feature arcades, columns,

\textsuperscript{49} “Architectural Survey Forms,” Virginia Department of Historic Resources.
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\textsuperscript{51} Matthew Horace Hayes, \textit{Stable Management and Exercise: A Book for Horse-Owners and Students}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1900), 210-212, accessed January 17, 2016, \url{https://books.google.com/books?id=QBJDAAAAIAAJ}. Veterinary science evolved during the Industrial Revolution. Beginning in the 1860s, veterinarians published books recommending changes to horse husbandry including stable construction because they believed that the dark, damp, poorly ventilated stables constructed in both England and the United States from the eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth centuries contributed to a myriad of equine illnesses. Some of these earliest books included William Haycock, \textit{The Gentleman’s Stable Manual}. 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed (London: Routledge, Warne, and Routledge, 1861), accessed August 7, 2015, \url{https://books.google.com/books?id=MG5DAQAAAMAAJ} and William Miles, \textit{(General Remarks on Stables, and Examples of Stable Fittings}, 1864), accessed September 9, 2015, \url{https://books.google.com/books?id=hCwDDAAQBAJ}. As the veterinary knowledge progressed over the course of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, and extensive body of literature on horse care developed.
dormers, pilasters, brick chimneys, transoms, arched doorways, and a hexagonal cupola.\textsuperscript{52} However, many Virginia stables only use concrete in the foundations or in work areas like wash stalls and offices because they found concrete to be too hard for stall flooring material. The horses’ stalls often have packed clay floors, reflecting the more widely held belief that “clay is undoubtedly the best material with which to make floors for horses […] To be satisfactory, clay floors must be kept smooth, with slightly more slope for drainage,” as stated by the United States Department of Agriculture.\textsuperscript{53}

Unlike the stables of the eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth centuries, equine structures built by gentlemen farmers during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries had a greater variety of forms and functions. In contrast to the general-purpose stables frequently combined with a coach room built before the Civil War, the development of the equine industry during the American Country House movement resulted in specialized stables for stallions, broodmares, yearlings, carriage horses, sporting horses, and racehorses. Although the stables could often be used interchangeably, their original purpose was sometimes reflected by the stall sizes, as well as the presence and size of the tack rooms. Stables constructed by gentlemen farmers were usually one-to-two story buildings with gable, gambrel, shed, and occasionally hipped roofs.\textsuperscript{54} The stalls were arranged in single or double rows with linear, L-plan, or U-plan footprints to maximize light and ventilation as recommended by advances in scientific veterinary medicine beginning during the mid-to-late nineteenth century. Some stables had center aisles, while others opened directly to the exterior depending on the owners’ beliefs regarding efficient
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farm management and fire safety. Stables that opened to the exterior often had overhanging roofs or colonnades to provide additional shelter from the weather. Additionally, racing farms often had training barns, which have a central row of stalls surrounded by an indoor track for exercising the horses during inclement weather. The indoor tracks were usually about an eighth of a mile long, while outdoor tracks were about three-quarters to one mile long. Stables could also contain feed rooms, hay lofts, tack rooms, wash stalls, office spaces, and worker housing, although many farms, especially larger stud farms, had separate buildings dedicated to some of these functions. The development of Virginia’s distinctive picturesque landscapes, Colonial Revival-influenced equine architecture, advances in technology and veterinary medicine, and development of specialized horse barns influenced the designs of both the male and female owners of the case study farms.
Women and Virginia’s Early-Twentieth Century Equine Industry

While women who built thoroughbred stud farms like Eleonora Randolph Sears (1881-1968), Marion duPont Scott (1894-1983), and Isabel Dodge Sloane (1896-1962) challenged gender norms in other equine sports as young adults, their contestation of gender norms in thoroughbred racing was limited to owning and breeding racehorses because their own double standards prevented them from supporting women who sought to further challenge masculine activities in racing by becoming trainers and jockeys. In response to the perceived frailty and ill-health of white middle- and upper-class women combined with the fear of race war caused by the emancipation of slaves, the influx of millions of immigrants, and economic instability, it became increasingly acceptable for middle- and upper-class girls to engage in formerly male physical activities like swimming, tennis, and hunting. Girls were encouraged to engage in these physical activities because it was thought that their increased strength and stamina would later cause them to produce better children, keeping whites in control of American society.55 While noblewomen in Europe and elite women in America had ridden in the past, changing views on female athleticism made it acceptable for women from a broader range of classes to spend more recreational time riding and resulted in their participation in previously male-dominated social activities like horse showing and foxhunting. Women’s increased athleticism as well as the recent acceptance of riding as a proper activity for middle- and upper-class women still created anxieties about gender for those with Victorian sensibilities as exemplified by Scott’s mother. She did not want Scott to ride as a child because of “how impractical it was—bowed legs and

delicately implying that she was worried about the propriety of her daughter riding astride, as well as damage to her daughter’s physical appearance. The acceptance of female equestrians hinged on their observation of social standards for modesty by riding sidesaddle. In 1911, author of instructive farm literature George Martin offered his opinion on the issue of the health benefits and propriety of women riding by asserting “there is no exercise more healthful, delightful or lady-like than horseback riding.” However, he implied that women had to ride sidesaddle to be safe by stating that new developments in women’s sidesaddles like leaping horns, which held the rider’s thighs to the saddle enabled “the fair rider to hold on with a firmer grip than a man can secure with his knees.” The argument that riding sidesaddle was not only safer but also better than riding astride was used to discourage women from challenging traditional masculine norms by riding astride. Despite efforts to prevent women from challenging gender norms, many upper-class women born during the Gilded Age like Sears, Scott, and Sloane embraced the sporting life and used it to further contest existing gender norms.

All three women shared a childhood love of sports and horses, and assertive personalities that led them to challenge gender standards as young adults. However, each of the three women approached the contestation of gender through the equine sports differently. As a feminist, Sears was the most aggressive in her pursuit of gender equality for women. Driven by a sense of frustration with gender-divided competition in sports, Sears used her formidable athleticism, immense wealth, and elite social status to challenge gender norms by excelling at eighteen different sports. Although she turned her attention to the male-dominated world of thoroughbred
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breeding and racing late in her life, Sears broke gender barriers in other riding disciplines as a young woman. In 1899 at the age of eighteen, she confronted assumptions about propriety and safety by riding astride into the Madison Square Garden arena at the National Horse Show. While she was disqualified for her inappropriate behavior, she set precedent that ultimately led to women being allowed to ride astride in the 1915 National Horse Show. In addition to excelling at show jumping and foxhunting, Sears also broke records in timed coach driving competitions.  

As a twenty-seven-year-old, she attempted to enter the exclusively-male sport of polo by riding onto the playing field astride in trousers. After she was ordered off the field, she formed an all-women’s team that competed with distinction against an internationally-renowned men’s team in 1909, leading to her acceptance as a player on a men’s team in 1912. She also broke barriers in 1912, when she organized and won a horse race as a jockey, although her behavior and dress were widely condemned in newspapers and sermons. Sears continued to challenge norms for decades. In her seventies, she turned her attention to the still predominantly male-dominated world of thoroughbred racing with the intent to breed or own a Kentucky Derby winner during the 1950s. However, she entered the racing world too late in her life to make as significant of an impact as Scott and Sloane.

While Marion duPont Scott shared a drive to succeed with Eleonora Randolph Sears, she was less focused on mounting an overt challenge to double standards and more motivated by her competitive streak. Sears paved the way for Scott to become the first woman to win riding astride at the National Horse Show in 1915. Scott justified her choice of riding form as a matter of technique instead of an overt challenge to gender norms. She stated, “I rode hunters and
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jumpers sidesaddle. You could stay on better. But in the show ring, if you wanted to put on a real good show against the men—the top riders from Kentucky—you had a much better chance riding like they did, astride.”  

62 While Scott minimized her contestation of gender in the show ring by stating “I didn’t think it would create so much commotion. I’m not so sure it created as much comment as some people now [in the 1970s] say it did,”  

63 her recollections on gender and horse showing revealed the magnitude of her resistance to gender norms. In her 1976 memoir Scott reminisced “not many women would ride three-gaited horses to start with, in open class. […] Women in those days either rode sidesaddle or they didn’t ride. But I rode astride,”  

64 showing that she was acutely aware of the gender norms she was disregarding to improve her performance. Scott also reversed gender roles in foxhunting, forming the Montpelier Hunt in 1927 and appointing herself Master of Foxhounds, a position traditionally held by a man. As Master of Foxhounds, Scott took on the important duties of deciding the dates and locations of hunt meets, maintaining the foxhound kennels, and compensating landowners for property damaged during the hunts. Furthermore, she appointed her then-husband Thomas Somerville as the secretary of the Montpelier Hunt to manage the club’s social aspects.  

65 Hunting provided Scott with a natural transition to steeplechase racing because fast foxhunting horses were also often used for steeplechasing. Scott entered one of her hunt mares in a local race, recalling “When she won, I really got interested in racing. […] As I kept getting more and more fed up with the show ring, I would go to little race meetings and buy more horses.”  

66 By the late-1920s and early-1930s, Scott was purchasing top racing prospects like Trouble Maker who won the

---
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1932 Maryland Hunt Cup, Battleship who was the only horse to ever win both the American Grand National in 1934 and the British Grand National in 1938, and Annapolis who had a moderately successful racing career but became one of Scott’s best studs.  

Isabel Dodge Sloane’s interest in horse racing followed a similar trajectory to Scott’s. Sloane loved horses, but was “allergic to the saddle.” Instead, she enjoyed foxhunting by following the hounds “in a snorting, cavorting, high spirited fluid drive.” Although Sloane preferred driving horses to riding them, she decided to purchase a thoroughbred steeplechaser named Sky Scraper II in 1924. Similar to Scott, Sloane became hooked on racing after Sky Scraper II won a race; she began to purchase additional racehorses. She also extensively studied breeding theories, becoming an expert on pedigrees and young horses’ physical confirmation to enable her to identify prospective winners at sales. However, like Scott, it took several years after the construction of Brookmeade Stable in 1929 at Upperville, Virginia before Sloane gained national prominence when she became the fifth woman to own a Kentucky Derby winner after her horse Cavalcade won in 1934. Her reputation was further cemented after her horse High Quest beat Cavalcade to win the 1934 Preakness, resulting in Sloane becoming the first woman to lead the owner’s list in earnings for the year. 

Wealthy women increasingly became successful owners of racehorses during the early-
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twentieth century as evidenced by the Kentucky Derby wins of Lasca Durnell’s Elwood in 1904, Mrs. R. M. Hoot’s Black Gold in 1924, Mrs. John D. Hertz’s Reigh Count in 1928, and Mrs. Payne Whitney’s Twenty Grand in 1931, as well as the successes of Scott’s and Sloane’s horses during the 1930s. However, male owners continued to dominate the field, causing women like Sears to establish thoroughbred farms in hopes of owning or producing a winning racehorse into the mid-twentieth century.

In addition to challenging the male-dominated field of racing by owning accomplished horses, women also became expert breeders. Both Scott and Sloane transitioned naturally from using their knowledge of pedigrees and equine confirmation for buying prospective racehorses to applying it to develop breeding theories to produce their own winners. Scott demonstrated her independence and vast knowledge by making “her own decisions as to which mare will be sent to which stallion,” although she would occasionally ask for advice from expert breeders and trainers like Preston Burch. Indicative of her male contemporaries’ skepticism of female owners and breeders, her stallions Battleship and Annapolis received little attention from outside breeders despite their success on the race track. However, they still produced 69 winners and 23 graded stakes winners including steeplechasers Benguala, Shipboard, Sea Legs, and Hampton Roads as well as Scott’s foundation mare Accra who, in turn, produced the stakes winners Mandingo, Songai, Neji, Nahodah, Nala, and Mongo. Particularly notable was Mongo who was the 1963 Champion Male Turf Horse, with race earnings over $800,000. Similarly, Scott bred Neji who became the greatest American steeplechaser of the 1950s. Scott gained formal recognition as a breeder when she received the Thoroughbred Breeders of Kentucky Award in
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1973 and the Joe Palmer Award for her meritorious service to racing in 1981. Similarly, Sloane also challenged gender norms by becoming an expert, breeding 1951 Preakness winner Bold, 1959 Belmont Stakes winner Sword Dancer, and 1960 Champion Two-Year-Old-Filly and 1961 Champion Three-Year-Old-Filly Bowl of Flowers. Sloane’s Brookmeade Stable bred a total of twenty-one earners of $100,000 or more, being surpassed only by the famous Calumet Farm in Kentucky and Greentree Stable in New Jersey.

While upper-class women like Sears, Scott, and Sloane challenged gender norms by becoming successful racehorse owners and breeders, they did little to contest the male-dominated professions of racehorse trainers, jockeys, and stable hands, reinforcing gender double standards in the physical activities of racing, training, and barn work. As working- and middle-class women continued to challenge gender norms in racing by pursuing these careers, even the feminist Sears hired Jimmy Rowe as her trainer. Similarly, Scott employed a number of notable male trainers, including Regg Hobbs, Preston Burch, Carroll Bassett, Billy Jones, Ray Woolfe, Mike Carr, Downie Bonsal, Peter Howe, Fred Winter, and Toby Balding. She likewise hired a number of male jockeys such as Bruce Hobbs, Carroll Bassett, Noel Laing, Joe Aitcheson, Jr., Jorge Velasquez, and Richard Pitman. Like Scott, Sloane also employed Preston Burch and his son Elliott to train her horses. Sears, Scott, and Sloane likely hired men because they needed the most experienced professionals to train their horses to be the best, while women new to the
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field were likely perceived as inexperienced. Further, men’s respected status in the racing community also gave women’s stables legitimacy by showing that upper-class women were only interested in contesting women’s ability to own and breed racehorses, as opposed to challenging women’s physical participation in racing. However, while Sears and Sloane both died before women began to gain acceptance as trainers and jockeys during the 1970s and 1980s, Scott continued to view the supervisory roles of owning and breeding racehorses as acceptable activities for women but not stable work, riding, or training because she believed that women were too erratic and emotional. In contrast, even her male trainers had begun to recognize women’s potential as exercise riders and grooms. Trainer Peter Howe’s daughter Jill Byrnes recalled that after Scott’s eyesight began to fail, Howe allowed girls to work in the barns and exercise the horses. However, he required them to wear “their hair put up under their racing helmets, and they were not allowed to speak” so Scott would not realize that girls were riding her racehorses.  

Despite Sear’s, Scott’s, and Sloane’s unwillingness to challenge women’s physical involvement in racing by hiring women to work in their stables during the second half of the twentieth century, their careers as owners and breeders gave them an alternative to traditional marriage and motherhood norms during the early-twentieth century. Furthermore, the act of building or owning stables provided them with an extra-domestic space and social relationships where they could escape from some of the constraints of their marriages and gender expectations for women. While Sears never married, both Scott and Sloane did but ultimately chose to obtain divorces and pursue careers as owners and breeders. Facilitated by changes in divorce laws that allowed women to retain their property, Scott first married Thomas Somerville in 1925 before

---

divorcing him in 1935 to marry the actor Randolph Scott in 1936.84 Although Randolph and Marion remained lifelong friends, the couple divorced in 1939 because Randolph’s career took him to Hollywood while Marion’s kept her on the East Coast racing circuit.85 Neither marriage produced any children, freeing Scott of the duties of childrearing and allowing her to focus on racing.86 Since her husbands were not heavily involved in major thoroughbred racing, Scott’s daily duties in supervising her stables appear to have provided her with a refuge from her domestic responsibilities by taking her outside of the home to her stables and racetracks, especially during her unhappy first marriage.87 Similarly, Sloane also pursued racing as an alternative to marriage and motherhood. She married New York stockbroker George Sloane in 1921, three years before she purchased her first racehorse.88 The couple divorced in 1929, after which George promptly remarried while Isabel dramatically expanded her racing stable by purchasing and constructing her horse farm.89 Sloane’s love of racing and lack of interest in remarriage appears to have served as a catalyst for her creation of her own extra-domestic space at Brookmeade Stable. While Sears, Scott, and Sloane were not interested in affirming women’s interests in becoming trainers and jockeys, their approaches to contesting gender norms in riding as young women, as well as their later challenges to the male-dominated activities owning and breeding race horses, appear to have played a role in how they designed their equine landscapes.
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Case Studies

The development of an understanding of gender and Virginia’s equine landscapes necessitated field research at five case study farms. Two of the farms, North Wales and Mount Sharon, were predominantly male-run, providing context for Marion duPont Scott’s equine landscape at Montpelier and Isabel Dodge Sloane’s Brookmeade Stable. Burrland Farm was also included to examine how Eleonora Randolph Sears purchased and took control of a farm built by a man. These farms were chosen for the large scale of the breeding and racing operations that produced a variety of equine complexes and structures on the property, as well as the owners’ willingness to have research conducted on their properties. The case study farms were also selected from Orange, Fauquier, and Loudoun counties to narrow the geographic scope.
North Wales

Background

In 1914, New York cotton broker Edward M. Weld purchased North Wales, a property that included a 1796 mansion. Soon after the purchase, he hired the architectural firm Little and Browne to design a number of equine structures for his thoroughbred breeding and steeplechase racing establishment. These structures were built between 1916 and 1920 in the Colonial Revival style. Not long after construction was completed, Weld became the president of the New York Cotton Exchange in 1921. Because his job kept him away from the farm, he sold it in 1929 to a group of wealthy men.

This group of buyers was led by adjoining property owner Robert C. Winmill who had persuaded forty men, mostly from New York, to purchase North Wales and form the North Wales Club. The exclusive club was dedicated to foxhunting and steeplechase racing. Like other clubs of the era, they held parties complete with dancing in the house. Despite the economic downturn brought by the Great Depression, the club continued to add to the property, constructing the hunt tower around 1935 to view foxhunts and steeplechase races. However, a few years later, the club began to experience financial problems and sold North Wales in 1941.

Drawn by the property’s forty stall racing barn and large breeding complex, automobile heir Walter Chrysler, Jr. purchased the property with the intent to return it to a thoroughbred breeding and racing farm. During this process, he engaged architect Washington Reed to design a Mount Vernon inspired arcade and entry arch in 1946. Chrysler also built a brick isolation barn in 1948. Despite these improvements, he sold North Wales in 1957 because
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thoroughbred breeders had been unable to get legislation passed to legalize pari-mutuel betting in Virginia. Chrysler did not want to maintain a breeding and racing stable in a state where he could not make money from betting. Over the next thirty years, the property was threatened by development and many of the agricultural and equine buildings were demolished including the race barn complex. However, community pressure and preservation-minded owners eventually succeeded in preserving much of the remaining landscape and historic buildings.92

Setting

Weld and the firm of Little and Browne largely followed the picturesque landscape aesthetics of the American Country House movement when they designed the equine complexes at North Wales in 1916. For example, the main complex was located a half mile to the northwest of the main house on top of a hill to take advantage of natural drainage and for visual appeal. Historically, the complex was accessed from the main house by a road that ran west from the house. Designed to present a dramatic and pastoral approach to the complex, the road crossed fields and a creek before paralleling a smaller stream and rising up the wooded hill to the complex. Similarly, the complex was also designed to impress visitors as it was also accessible from the main road. Visitors would have travelled past the race barn complex and through the woods before rounding a bend to see the complex standing in a clearing.

Likewise, the setting for the carriage house was also designed to impress. Accessed by the main driveway, the carriage house served as a transition between the pastoral landscape of the farm and the formal Colonial Revival landscape surrounding the main house. Taking a scenic approach to the house, the driveway crossed a stream before bending around a wooded area to
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expose the house on top of the hill across an open meadow. The driveway then turned, rising up the hill to terminate in a circle in front of the carriage house. The carriage house served as the end point of the axial design created by the tree-lined allée connecting it to the main house.

The race barn complex, on the other hand, did not follow the American Country House aesthetic as closely. Unlike the other equine structures, the race barn was highly visible to the public because it fronted the main road. The structure was also situated on a relatively flat field rather than atop a hill, possibly due to Weld’s desire for it to be seen. The race barn’s setting suggests that it was intended to be a liminal space between Weld’s horse business and his competitors’, functioning as a space to show off his affluence and fine horses. Unfortunately, it is impossible to tell if the race barn’s architecture corroborated this theory because it was demolished by 1966.

Complex Layout

Like many early-twentieth century Virginia horse farms, the structures at North Wales were designed using high-style Colonial Revival aesthetics with an eye towards efficiency. The main complex had a formal layout including a landscaped courtyard with a circular drive at the center (figure 1). The grassy areas in the courtyard appeared to have had low masonry walls separating them from the road, similar to the walls connecting the three tenant houses. The complex also used setbacks to emphasize the hay barn, stables, and veterinarian’s office over less prestigious buildings like the birthing barn, tenant housing, and herdsman’s cottage. Before the addition of Chrysler’s imposing entrance arch on the west end of the complex, the centrally-located hay barn with granary was the focal point of the complex. While creating a separate hay barn was less efficient than including a hay loft in each stable, it reduced the risk of fire. The placement of the veterinarian’s office between the two mare barns and across the complex from
the birthing barn also reflected the emphasis on efficiency common to Virginia horse farms during the American Country House movement as did the central location of the tenant houses.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to realize the full extent of the complex’s emphasis on Colonial Revival design or efficiency because two structures were demolished or substantially altered sometime between 1952 and 1966. The 1952 aerial showed a square building with an unknown use east of the hay barn, creating a symmetrical balance to the second mare barn. Similarly, another stable of similar dimensions to the birthing barn stood opposite the tack room and hunter barn. It was demolished or incorporated into a larger structure between 1952 and 1966. The larger structure was demolished by 1994.

Although extant equine complexes reflect the Colonial Revival style, the 1952 aerial (figure 2) suggests that the race barn complex did not strictly adhere to these aesthetics. The northwest side of the barn fronting the main road appears to have had paddocks or a lawn divided into the same formal pattern with a circular road as the main equine complex. However, the buildings supporting the race barn did not have a formal arrangement. Instead, three of the buildings were clustered around a circular drive. Based on other race complexes from the period, these buildings likely included a house for jockeys or exercise riders, worker housing, and possibly a mess hall. Several small structures including an extant pump house were scattered between the buildings and the training barn, suggesting the layout of the supporting buildings was motivated by functionality. Another building, likely the trainer’s house, was located to the west of the training barn in a position to supervise while granting some privacy to the occupants similar to the manager’s house located outside of the main complex. Additionally, the race track’s location behind the race barn instead of between the barn and the road suggests that Weld wanted his horses to be trained in a more private setting.
Aesthetics

The equine structures at North Wales exemplified the high-style Colonial Revival aesthetic combined with the use of local and new building materials popular among Virginia horse owners during the American Country House movement. In addition to the main complex, the Colonial Revival carriage house was also particularly notable for its high style design (figure 3). Built from stone quarried on the property with a concrete foundation, the carriage house reflected the architects’ belief in stylistic compatibility with the main house through incorporation of design elements from the house’s 1916-1920 additions. Like the additions, the two-story carriage house had a hipped slate roof. It also featured blind circular windows similar to circular windows in the additions and a pedimented gable with a two-story arch containing the doorway and a large window that references the portico added to the main house. Additionally, the carriage house incorporated other Colonial Revival stylistic elements including a large and imposing scale, segmental arches, keystones, belt courses, transoms above the stalls, Dutch doors, and a large copper-domed cupola supported by columns.

Chrysler’s additions to the main complex also reflected the continued interest in high-style Colonial Revival design. In addition to expanding the stables in 1948, Chrysler also built an arcade inspired by Mount Vernon to connect the structures. The large entrance arcade was supported by four Tuscan columns and features a wooden keystone (figure 4). An octagonal cupola with a copper roof similar to Weld’s cupolas on the hay barn and second broodmare barn sat on top of the entrance arcade. Chrysler connected the entrance arcade to the birthing stall he added to the first broodmare barn. The stall blended Weld’s and Chrysler’s designs by incorporating Weld’s use of stucco throughout the complex with a blind arcade and fanlights in
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an imitation of Chrysler’s arcade. Chrysler’s modifications also reflect Virginia hobby farmers’ investment in new building materials by using structural terra cotta clad in stucco for the additions to the main complex.

**Stable Interior Layouts**

The North Wales stables’ interior spaces reflected Weld’s and Chrysler’s goals for efficiency within the constraints created by the Colonial Revival design and the natural topography. Some of the best examples of these constraints were found in the main complex where only the second broodmare barn had a center aisle because it had to accommodate the topography. The lack of center aisles in the first broodmare barn, hunter barn, and birthing barn, as well as other equine structures on the property, indicates that Weld preferred the stalls to open directly to the exterior for ease of access and fire safety. However, the second broodmare barn has a center aisle to provide access to the second row of stalls which do not open to the exterior because the hill dropped steeply away, which led Weld to create a bank barn with space for farm vehicles and equipment below. Despite the center aisle, the first row of stalls also opens to the exterior for both aesthetics and accessibility.

Chrysler’s additions to the complex provided another example of the emphasis on aesthetics and functionality. Chrysler needed additional birthing stalls, so he added a 13.5 feet by 23.5 feet stall to the west end of the first broodmare barn. To balance the complex’s symmetry and create additional useful spaces, he added a wash stall of the same dimensions to the east end of the hunter barn and another birthing stall and a small room that may have been a closet or a space for workers attending a birth to the birthing barn. He also probably expanded the now-demolished stable on the east end of the complex to maintain the symmetry.
Figure 7 shows the main complex in 1952.
Figure 8 shows the race barn complex in 1952.
Figure 9 shows the Georgian Revival carriage house.

Figure 10 depicts the entrance to the main complex including Chrysler’s arcades and birthing stall attached to the broodmare barn.
Mount Sharon

Background

Elizabeth G. Augustus purchased the Mount Sharon property in 1936 as a country estate for herself and her husband Ellsworth H. Augustus. Ellsworth Augustus was a banker, industrialist, philanthropist, and amateur athlete from Cleveland, Ohio. Both Elizabeth and Ellsworth Augustus were heavily involved in the racing industry. When the Augustus family purchased the property, it consisted of a number of dependencies as well as a house constructed by the Taliaferro family between 1888 and 1890. After the Augustus family bought the property, they hired architect Louis Bancel LaFarge to design a Georgian Revival manor home to replace the earlier residence. They also hired contractor Reid A. Dunn, who built the house using reinforced concrete, and landscape architect Ellen Biddle Shipman to design the gardens, no longer extant. In addition to construction of a new manor house, the Augustus family increased the acreage and constructed a number of agricultural buildings further transforming the Mount Sharon property into a typical early twentieth century country estate.

In their main farm complex, they built a series of prefabricated Sears and Roebuck structures including a granary, two dairy barns, and a broodmare barn. They also constructed a Sears race barn across the road.

The Augustus family sold Mount Sharon in 1951 to syndicated columnist Nancy Sasser Eldridge who ceased the equine operations and concentrated solely on cattle. During the 1970s, the Eldridge family subdivided the property into a 77.5 acre house tract and a farm tract. A

---

94 Orange County Virginia Courthouse, Deed Book 108, page 426.
95 Although Elizabeth Augustus was involved in racing and likely participated in the construction of the stables, the farm is interpreted as masculine because her husband dominated the construction of the house and likely exerted considerable control over the construction of the stables and other farm structures.
development was planned for the farmland but never came to fruition due to local opposition. The farmland, now known as Meadowfarm, is owned by Egyptian Arabian horse breeder Helen Marie Taylor.

**Setting**

Consistent with the practices of the American Country House movement, the Augustus family located their equine structures in a picturesque setting. This included locating both the main farm complex and the race barn on hilltops. Despite this elevated location, the main farm complex’s site line from Route 20, a major road, was obscured by neighboring hills. The complex, however, is visible from Mount Sharon Road which provides access to the farm from Route 20. The siting of the complex, nestled into the hillside, suggests that the Augustus family took efforts to blend the barns into the landscape to maintain the picturesque aesthetic (figure 1). In contrast, they chose a prominent knoll as the site for their race barn, enabling it to be viewed from Route 20, as well as during the approach to the house on Mount Sharon Road. The barn’s visual prominence reflected the importance of horse racing to the Augustus family and served as a public statement of their wealth and power.

**Complex Layout**

Unlike many Virginia horse farms that featured more formal, Colonial Revival-styled plans, the Augustus family’s complexes reflected their preference for the picturesque design and functionality as demonstrated by their main complex’s linear arrangement and relationship to the topography. The structures were laid out along a farm road to increase ease of access except for

---
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one dairy barn to the southeast and the manager’s house (figure 2). The granary, tenant housing, and sheds were interspersed among the barns for efficiency. While the linear organization opposed the picturesque aesthetic, the Augustus family used the changing elevation of the ridge to give the structures a rambling appearance. Additionally, they may have located the southeast dairy barn and manager’s house out of line to enhance the picturesque design.

**Aesthetics**

The aesthetics of the Augustus family’s horse barns also differed from many Virginia country house stables. This can be explained in some part due to the use of pre-fabricated Sears barns, which incorporated a variety of elements from different styles to fit into different settings across the country. Instead, the aesthetics of the Sears barns were predominantly influenced by the use of modern building materials and scientific innovations in conjunction with cost efficiency. Such innovations included the use of gothic roofs constructed with gang-planked timbers and roofed with metal shingles to create a durable structure that maximized hay storage (figure 3). The barns also had large metal ventilators to facilitate air circulation, contributing to their industrial-agricultural appearance.

The race barn, which incorporated stylistic elements of Colonial Revival, Queen Anne, and Arts and Crafts design, was also impacted by scientific innovations of the time. The symmetrical barn contained four Colonial Revival-influenced louvered hexagonal ventilators, imitating cupolas such as those on Mount Vernon, Queen Anne-style pressed metal shingles, and Arts and Crafts exposed rafter tails (figures 4 and 5). However, the barn’s long form, 25 light windows, and sleek metal roof also reflected the influence of a modernist industrial aesthetic. The Augustus family’s decision to build such an eclectic race barn showed that they were
predominantly interested in technological innovations but wanted a barn that acknowledged Virginia’s architectural heritage.

**Stable Interior Layouts**

Consistent with both the Augustus family’s and the Sears and Roebuck Company’s focus on scientific farm management, the horse barns at Mount Sharon were organized for efficiency and convenience as exemplified by the broodmare and race barns. The 8-stall broodmare barn featured concrete floors with an additional birthing stall, office, and an area to work. The birthing stall had a removable stall partition to convert it into a normal stall in addition to two doors for easy access (figure 6). The office was located next to the birthing stall and contained shelves and cupboards for medical supplies, as well as a window to view the birthing stall (figure 7). The Sears broodmare barn combined the latest scientific and construction advancements in birthing like the observation area in the office with the convenience and standardization of prefabricated building kits.

Similarly, the Sears race barn was also designed to provide modern conveniences and an efficient space to house and train race horses. The 16 stalls were circumscribed by an indoor sand track and arranged in a double row with eight stalls located on either side of the center pass-through. The double row of stalls widened the barn, allowing for horses and riders to make smoother turns when exercising on the indoor track as did the barn’s half-hexagonal ends (figure 8). The wide center pass-through (figure 9) facilitated circulation through the barn and provided a large workspace. The combined feed and tack room, office, and bathroom were centrally located on either side of the pass-through for efficiency and contained built-in features to provide

---

99 The barn originally contained 17 stalls, but one has been converted into a wash stall and tack room. The present feed room was originally a combined feed and tack room.
additional conveniences, such as the bookcases in the office (figure 10). Similarly, the granary was situated above the feed room and hay was stored above the stalls to utilize gravity (figure 9).

The Augustus family’s decision to build a prefabricated Sears race barn showed that some wealthy owners preferred to showcase their interest in modern conveniences, technology, and scientific stable management over Colonial Revival aesthetics.
Mount Sharon Illustrations

Figure 11 shows the Sears barns of the main complex nestled into the ridge. Mount Sharon Road runs in front of them.

Figure 12 shows a contemporary aerial of the Mount Sharon property.
Figure 13 shows the broodmare barn.

Figure 14 depicts the race barn.
Figure 15 shows the race barn.

Figure 16 shows the birthing stall in the broodmare barn. Note the removable stall partition to the left and the window into the office.
Figure 17 shows the office in the broodmare barn.

Figure 18 depicts the half-hexagonal south end of the race barn.
Figure 19 shows the center pass-through. The converted wash stall and tack room are on the left, as is the feed room. The office is on the right. Note the granary above the feed room.

Figure 20 shows the office. The office has direct access to the bathroom, although it is also accessible from the outside.
**Burrland Farm**

*Background*

Heir of the Royal Baking Powder fortune and New York real estate mogul William Zeigler, Jr. purchased Burrland Farm located near Middleburg, Virginia in 1926 with the intent of establishing a successful thoroughbred stud farm. Working with notable architect William Lawrence Bottomley, Zeigler had built a Colonial Revival, state-of-the-art stud farm by 1930. He also purchased a number of American-bred and imported bloodstock and hired notable trainers, breeders, and managers from Kentucky. He raced the colts under his name while the fillies raced under Mrs. Ziegler’s Middleburg Stable. Despite his success in the horse industry, Zeigler decided to sell Burrland and his breeding stock in 1938. However, he ultimately continued to breed and train thoroughbreds at Burrland until he sold his breeding stock in 1950 and the property in 1955.\(^{100}\)

The purchaser of the property was Boston socialite and pioneering female athlete, Eleonora Randolph Sears. The acquisition of the farm helped consolidate her thoroughbred breeding and training operations. She intentionally burned the 1879 main house in 1961 to reduce her taxes but made no significant alterations to the equine structures. She continued to breed and train thoroughbreds at Burrland until 1966. James Mills, Sr. and Alice duPont Mills purchased the property that year and renamed it Hickory Tree Farm. Hickory Tree Farm continues to be a prominent thoroughbred breeding and training farm.\(^{101}\)

---


\(^{101}\) Ibid.
Setting

Architect William Lawrence Bottomley followed the picturesque landscape tenants of the American Country House movement such as using the property’s natural topographic features when laying out the equine structures at Burrland Farm. He situated the stables at or near the tops of the property’s open and gently rolling hills. The use of the natural landscape in this manner provided the observer with varied perspectives of the structures. At times, the buildings appeared nestled into the landscape while at other times they appeared dramatically distinct. One example (figure 1) features the polo barn tucked into the side of a hill with the yearling barn on a low rise in the background (figure 2). When viewed from the yearling barn, the polo barn almost appears to be a part of the landscape (figure 3). However, when approached from the farm road, the polo barn stands looming impressively on the hillside (figure 4). The lone variance to following the picturesque landscape tenants of the American Country House movement was Bottomley’s and Ziegler’s visual exposure of the equine complexes to the main house and public roads. Ziegler made the equine complexes visible because he intended for his stud farm to be a statement of power and competition.

Likewise, Bottomley also took advantage of vistas created by the property’s location between the Bull Run Mountains and the Blue Ridge Mountains to provide a scenic backdrop and accentuate Zeigler’s power. The race complex exemplified this design technique, with the racetrack framed by the Bull Run Mountains to the east (figure 5) and the imposing Georgian Revival race barn atop the hill to the west (figure 6). The large ca. 1870 Colonial Revival residence located on a knoll to the northwest of the track also contributed to this vista, but the overall effect was diminished after Sears burned it in 1961.
**Complex Layout**

The layouts of the equine complexes at Burrland were predominantly driven by the picturesque landscape design and functionality instead of elements of formal Colonial Revival design embraced by some Virginia horse farm owners. For example, the broodmare barn was located on top of a hill with its supporting structures including a mash house for cooking feed and a pump house located down the hill, reflecting an overarching concern for efficiency while maintaining the picturesque landscape design. Similarly, the complexes appear to have been laid out in relation to one another to maximize efficiency. The stallion barn (demolished by 2008) stood on the next rise over from the broodmare barn with the breeding shed (demolished by 2008) located in a wooded valley nearly equidistant from the two (figure 7).\(^{102}\) The placement of the breeding structures reflected Zeigler’s desire to manage an effective breeding program by observing the widespread practice of limiting daily contact between breeding stock of different sexes while saving time by having the stables and breeding shed in close proximity.

Of the equine complexes, the formally designed race complex showed the strongest Colonial Revival influence like symmetry, axial design, and terminal vistas. The race barn and track were connected by an axial road (figure 8); the barn acting as a terminal vista to the west and the track, backed by the mountains, serving a similar function to the east. However, the space presently appears more formal than it was because the symmetrical horse paddocks lining the road replaced asymmetrical paddocks in 2008.\(^ {103}\)

---


\(^{103}\) Ibid.
Aesthetics

The equine structures reflected the high-style Colonial Revival designs popular among American Country House architects like Bottomley. The high-style race barn, stallion barn (demolished 2008), and polo barn (partially demolished 1969-1974) were built using Colonial Revival aesthetics, while the broodmare and yearling barns were more influenced by functionality. The race barn exemplified Bottomley’s high-style Colonial Revival designs for equine architecture because it incorporated features used in domestic and public architecture like columns. The one-story, gable structure was clad in weatherboard with a slate roof. The central east entrance projected from the building, featuring three bays with a hipped roof and a gabled portico supported by four Tuscan columns (figure 9). The north and south wings also had projecting entrances on the east façade with gabled porticos supported by two Tuscan columns (figure 10). The north and south elevations contained large Venetian windows in the gable ends. In contrast, the relative lack of stylistic treatments on the west elevation including a gable instead of hipped roof over the entrance designated it as the working side of the building. Crowning the ridge of the roof were six square, louvered cupolas. The center of the barn was topped with an octagonal, arcaded cupola with a balustrade and domed metal roof and flanked by decorative urns.

The yearling and broodmare barns were designed in a more-subdued Colonial Revival aesthetic because they were not intended to be statements of power like the race barn. As shown in figure 10, the yearling and broodmare barns featured overhanging forebays covering the walkways in front of the stalls. The frame structures had slate gable roofs with three square louvered cupolas with pyramidal roofs.
Stable Interior Layouts

The stables’ interior arrangements and widespread use of concrete reflected Zeigler’s desire to operate an efficient, state-of-the-art breeding and training facility within the symmetrical constraints of the Georgian and Colonial Revival styles as exemplified by the race barn. The race barn contained a single row of 28 concrete-floored box stalls fronted by a concrete walkway surrounded by an indoor 1/8th mile sand track used for exercise during inclement weather (figure 11). The concrete-floored feed and tack rooms were located at the center of the row of stalls, the feed room containing a pass-through to the rear of the barn for convenience (figure 12). The loft space above the stalls (figure 13) was used for hay storage with a granary directly above the feed room to utilize gravity to move the food. The barn’s centrally-located, projecting entrance contained two rooms. Now used for storage, they were originally used as a bedroom for a groom to monitor the horses at night and a medicine room.\textsuperscript{104} The barn’s rear projecting entrance contained two wash stalls, a bathroom, and a storage closet (figure 14). Combined with the farrier’s forge located behind the race barn, the barn contained all of the amenities needed to support the health, dietary, and training needs of the racehorses. The central location of the supporting spaces made labor more efficient because the workers did not have to walk as far.

\textsuperscript{104} \textit{“NPS Form 030-1017_Burrland_Farm_Historic_District_1997_Final_Nomination.pdf.”}
Figure 21 shows the polo barn. The yearling barn stands to the left in the distance.

Figure 22 depicts the yearling barn.
Figure 23 shows a picture of the polo barn taken from the yearling barn.

Figure 24 depicts the polo barn.
Figure 25 shows the race track with the Bull Run Mountains to the east.

Figure 26 depicts the training barn in a photograph taken from the race track.
Figure 27 shows the 1952 aerial of the breeding barns.

Figure 28 depicts the east central entrance to the race barn.
Figure 29 shows the south facade and the projecting entrance to the south wing.

Figure 30 shows the yearling barn.
Figure 31 shows the interior of the training barn.

Figure 32 shows the granary and passage to the rear of the barn on the left. The tack room is on the right.
Figure 33 depicts the hay loft and granary above the stalls.

Figure 34 shows the wash stalls located in the work area at the rear of the training barn.
Montpelier

Background

William du Pont, Sr.’s secretary William King Lennig bought James Madison’s Montpelier on behalf of du Pont in 1900. The property was not formally transferred to du Pont until 1901. The family did not move in until the renovations to the main house were completed in 1902. In addition to more than doubling the size of the main house during the renovations, du Pont was an avid horseman and built a number of equine structures on the property. Some of the earliest equine structures built, ca. 1901-1902, included the brick carriage house and stables adjacent to the main house. After the family moved to Montpelier, du Pont undertook the construction of numerous equine structures to further transform Montpelier into a hobby farm where he bred and raised draft, carriage, and riding horses. He enlarged the farm barn and completed new construction including a schooling barn, a yearling barn, a stud barn, and a three stall barn. Due to the barns’ close proximities to the house, he may have initially used the yearling barn and the three stall barn to house riding horses including his children’s ponies. The ponies may have lived in the three stall barn due to the unusually low height of the hay racks. As his children’s interest in riding continued to grow, du Pont built a twelve stall pony barn behind the main house for his children’s horses in 1909.

Marion duPont Scott, daughter of William du Pont, Sr. and Annie Rogers, inherited Montpelier in 1928 after her father died in 1927. Between 1928 and 1931, Scott transformed Montpelier into a thoroughbred breeding and training farm. Some of the first changes she

106 Montpelier Master Plan March 2006 Draft Document Building Inventory, James Madison’s Montpelier.
108 DuPont Scrapbook 15, Courtesy of Montpelier, a National Trust Historic Site.
made included the erection of four prefabricated Sears and Roebuck barns, with supporting structures, to house her broodmares and yearlings.¹⁰⁹ With the help of her brother William du Pont, Jr., she also developed a flat race track and a steeplechase course in front of the main house. Together they founded the Montpelier Races in 1929.¹¹⁰ Likely collaborating with her brother, who allegedly built the first race barn with an indoor track in the United States at Liseter Hall Farm in Delaware, she also constructed a race complex complete with two race barns, a jockey bunkhouse, a Montgomery Ward trainer’s cottage, an isolation barn, a pump house, and a garage.¹¹¹ Scott’s success as a breeder and owner also led her to increase the number of horses at Montpelier, requiring her to add a granary to her father’s main equine complex and construct a U-plan stable to house additional racehorses between 1946 and 1959.¹¹² After Scott died in 1983, her heirs transferred Montpelier to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.¹¹³

Setting

Both William du Pont Sr. and Marion duPont Scott observed the picturesque landscape techniques in designing the equine structures and complexes at Montpelier, although du Pont followed a stricter adherence to the aesthetics than did Scott. The carriage house exemplified du Pont’s application of picturesque landscape techniques because it was located next to the

¹¹² Date range derived from the 1946 Land Use Map and a 1959 aerial.
¹¹³ “The duPonts,” James Madison’s Montpelier. Although the mansion has been restored to the Madison era, many of the du Pont family’s horse barns remain. A number of run-in sheds, fence lines, and general-purpose agricultural buildings have been demolished because of neglect and disuse.
manmade pond at the base of the hill on which the Montpelier mansion stands. The carriage house was accessed from the main house by a scenic walk or drive through the woods down the meandering road on the east side of the hill. Similarly, du Pont situated his main farm complex midway up the hill to the east of main house, taking advantage of the scenic rolling topography. Du Pont’s intent to create a picturesque landscape was particularly reflected by his enhancement of the landscape by damming the stream between the hills to create the pond (figure 1). As his children became avid competitors, he worked with them to create the Montpelier Horse Show and constructed a show ring and grandstand between the farm complex and the pond in 1921.\textsuperscript{114} Although du Pont did not completely hide the equine structures from the view of visitors, he consciously placed them in more private settings adjacent to or behind the main house to avoid marring the mansion’s aesthetics while still showing that he had a leisure farm.

In contrast, Scott did not follow the picturesque landscape aesthetics as closely as her father when choosing the settings for her equine structures. With the exception of the barren broodmare barn located in a secluded hollow behind the main house, Scott situated her Sears barns along a low ridge situated next to a primary farm road to the east front and side of the mansion. This setting provided pastoral views even though it did not command the grander views of her father’s main farm complex. Scott’s placement of the barns on such a primary farm road indicated that she wanted her broodmares, yearlings, and equine landscape to be seen by visitors to Montpelier (figure 2). She also located her race barn complex on a farm road to the west front and side of the mansion, although it was not as visible as the Sears barns because it was located on a small, wooded knoll. She inserted the upper race barn in the tree line, making it visible to visitors (figure 3). Scott’s setting for the race complex suggests that although seemingly

\textsuperscript{114} Strine, \textit{Montpelier}, 55.
contradictory, she wanted to appear modest by only making one barn visible, while still drawing attention to her race horses and facility.

Although Scott did not create settings for her barns with grand views, she used picturesque landscape techniques in the creation of her racetracks. Scott’s racetracks were framed by fields and woodland pasture with the majestic Blue Ridge serving as a dramatic backdrop. Scott located her live hedge steeplechase course on the undulating fields directly in front of Montpelier. The steeplechase extended around the perimeter of the field, wrapping around a hill, the entrance road, and the flat track. Despite the topography causing the location to be a poor site for a flat track, Scott had large amounts of earth moved to create a level, mile-long track encircled by the steeplechase course (figure 4). She also planted a clump of trees inside the flat track to increase its picturesque appearance. Instead of locating the tracks on an axis with the mansion as was common with other Virginia horse farms influenced by Colonial Revival design, Scott followed picturesque design practices by locating the tracks off-center to appear naturalistic (figure 5). The space appeared even more impressive when viewed from the race tracks because the Montpelier mansion stood on the hill overlooking the tracks, invoking the power and prestige of both the Madisons and the du Ponts (figure 6).

Complex Layout

As a compromise between the naturalistic picturesque landscape settings, the formality of Colonial-Revival influenced architecture, and the need for an efficient layout, du Pont and Scott chose a loose quad arrangement where the structures were roughly arranged in a rectangle with little-to-no symmetry. Du Pont appears to have chosen it as another form of picturesque layout intended to be a romanticized imitation of a vernacular farm complex, while Scott used it
because of its efficiency. Du Pont and Scott also had a number of isolated equine structures, some of which were laid out to fit into the picturesque setting like the carriage house, and others that were arranged for practical reasons like du Pont’s yearling barn.

Du Pont constructed his main complex in a loose quad pattern on the side of a hill, directly following Alfred Hopkins’s literature recommending farm complexes ramble to follow the topography to create aesthetically-pleasing and functional spaces mimicking vernacular farms. Reflecting the widespread interest in efficient farm management among hobby farmers, du Pont concentrated most of his equine structures at the east side of the complex to reduce the amount of travel between the structures (figure 7). He later expanded the complex to the west by adding the show ring and grandstand.

Similarly, Scott also constructed her race complex in a loose quad. However, the layout was likely driven by a goal for efficiency more than picturesque aesthetics because the secluded complex lacked the visual prominence of du Pont’s farm complex. The race barns formed the southwest and northeast sides of the complex, while the trainer’s cottage was located on the northwest side and the jockey bunkhouse on the southeast side (figure 8). The isolation barn stood slightly outside the quad to the southeast. The central location of the trainer’s cottage and bunkhouse between the two stables reflected Scott’s intention to operate an efficient racing stable.

Scott also arranged her isolated equine structures for efficiency as exemplified by her Sears barns. She located them along the road to increase their accessibility, following an east-west orientation to maximize sunlight and airflow. She also spaced them apart to reduce the risk of fire and disease. Additionally, she built a separate structure containing a wash room next to the middle Sears barn to provide a centrally-located space to bathe her broodmares and yearlings.
Aesthetics

While many Virginia hobby farmers hired notable architects to design their stables in the Georgian or Colonial Revival styles, du Pont and Scott did not. In keeping with his picturesque settings and loose quad layout inspired by local working farms, most of du Pont’s equine structures were designed in a vernacular agricultural form with elements of Colonial Revival-stylings using local building materials. Du Pont hired local contractor George Ficklen to design and build many of his agricultural buildings including the riding school, which was an early form of an indoor riding arena. Mitchell Jackson succeeded Ficklen as du Pont’s contractor after Ficklen died in 1917. Du Pont’s and Ficklen’s Colonial Revival-influenced vernacular equine structures could have either symmetrical or asymmetrical forms with asymmetrical fenestration. The equine structures influenced by vernacular forms often had concrete or brick foundations, frame structural systems, board-and-batten or weatherboard siding, and slate gable roofs with Colonial Revival-influenced elements like square louvered ventilators with pyramidal roofs. The pony barn exemplified du Pont’s and Ficklen’s melding of vernacular design and the Colonial Revival style. The pony barn’s symmetrical two-story main block flanked by one-story wings referenced a three-part Palladian plan (figure 9). The pony barn also incorporated other Colonial Revival-influenced features common among early-twentieth century equine hobby farms including transoms and square louvered ventilators with pyramidal roofs. However, the pony barn’s otherwise lack of stylistic treatments, use of local materials, and assortment of windows reflected du Pont’s desire for the stable to appear to be vernacular.

Conversely, Scott’s preferences for the Art Moderne style as evidenced by her

redecoration of the Red Room in the mansion, convenience, and functionality led her to build prefabricated Sears barns, as well as race barns where the aesthetic was dictated by function as illustrated by her lower race barn. The lower race barn reflected interests in streamlining and modernizing agriculture that were popular during the late-1920s and 1930s through its use of horizontal lines created by the structure’s long, low profile; sliding doors; and horizontal windows, paneling on the doors, and siding (figure 10). Additionally, the large metal ventilators and exposed rafter tails gave the race barn more of an industrial agricultural aesthetic that would have been further enhanced by its original metal roof.

Du Pont and Scott also used paint colors to create a hierarchy of buildings and structures at Montpelier. Du Pont painted buildings he considered to be important like the farm manager’s house pale yellow, while he painted the majority of his buildings, including the equine structures, green. Scott continued to use the color hierarchy, painting the Sears barns green. However, she used the pale yellow color to elevate the race barn complex to the highest level of importance beneath the main house, which was clad in pink stucco.

**Stable Interior Layouts**

Unfortunately, it is not possible to fully compare the interior layouts of du Pont’s and Scott’s stables because du Pont’s most important stables have been demolished or adaptively reused. However, the layouts of Scott’s stables reflected her interest in scientific thinking and efficiency. She chose to use Sears barns not only because their prefabricated designs made them quick and convenient to build, but they also followed the latest scientific thought advocated by
professors of agriculture, engineers, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Sears barns featured roomy box stalls that opened to a center aisle as well as the exterior for ease of access. The overhanging eaves sheltered the stall doors and windows (figure 11). The stalls also had one or two windows in addition to Dutch doors to increase light and air circulation. Additionally, the gambrel roof design maximized the amount of storage space in the hay mow.

Scott’s race barns also illustrated her interest in efficiency. Despite their different floor plans, the barns both had hay storage above the stalls and sand tracks for indoor exercise during inclement weather. Scott oriented the single row of 12 stalls in the lower race barn to face the southwest to maximize afternoon sunlight, while keeping the barn dark during the horses’ late morning resting hours (figure 12). However, she used the same orientation with the 16 stall upper race barn, which had a double row of stalls (figure 13), likely figuring that each row of stalls received sunlight for part of the day except for midday when it was dark for the horses. In the lower race barn, she located a combined tack, equipment, and feed room, as well as a combined office and equipment room with a sink and two stoves at the south end of the barn (figures 14 and 15). A work area with a farrier’s forge and a room with two wash stalls were at the north end (figure 16), while she left the north end of the upper race barn open and located two wash stall, a feed room, and a combined tack room and office with a sink and a stove on the south end of the barn (figures 17 and 18). While many race barns created centrally-located separate spaces for different uses to increase efficiency, Scott’s mixed-use work spaces located at the ends of the structures were, in many respects, more efficient because the integrated uses resulted in the workers having to travel less. Similarly, the workers could also walk directly down the row of stalls to deliver grain, water, or tack to each horse instead of having to double

back to the centrally-located feed or tack room. The location of the work area and wash stalls at
the north end of the lower race barn also made logical sense because these spaces were situated
away from the bustle of the south end, providing a quieter and calmer area to work with the
horses.
Figure 35 shows William du Pont Sr.'s equine complex viewed from the east side of the main house.

Figure 36 shows an aerial taken in 1937.
Figure 3 shows the small race barn inserted in the tree line.

Figure 4 shows part of the fill used to create the flat track.
Figure 5 shows the flat track on the left and the steeplechase course on the right backed by the Blue Ridge Mountains as seen from Montpelier’s portico. Note how the peak creates a focal point, drawing the eye out across the tracks.

Figure 6 shows Montpelier as seen from the finish wire of the flat track. Part of the steeplechase course separated from the flat track by the entrance road stands in front of the house. Note that Montpelier was even larger before its restoration.
Figure 7 shows a close-up of du Pont's farm complex from the 1937 aerial. His original complex is located to the east (right) side. The south side of the complex was comprised of a blacksmith’s shop, sheds, and other structures hidden in the trees.
Figure 8 depicts the race barn complex from the 1937 aerial.

Figure 9 shows the pony barn.
Figure 10 depicts the lower race barn.

Figure 11 shows one of Scott's eight-stall Sears barns.
Figure 12 shows the lower race barn looking towards the office at the south end.

Figure 13 depicts the upper race barn looking north.
Figure 14 shows the combined tack room, equipment storage, and feed room in the lower race barn.

Figure 15 shows the tack room and office in the lower race barn. The room to the left had hooks for tack in addition to the built-in cabinet. The room on the right contained a sink and two stoves.
Figure 16 shows the work area with farrier's forge on the left and the wash room on the right in the lower race barn.

Figure 17 depicts the wash stall (left), feed room (center), and tack room (right) in the upper race barn.
Figure 18 shows the tack room and office in the upper race barn.
Brookmeade Stable

Background

Automobile heiress Isabel Dodge Sloane established a racing stable in 1924 using part of the $7 million she inherited after her father John F. Dodge’s death in 1920. She received an additional $146 million after the Dodge Brothers Motors Company was sold in 1925. After divorcing her husband, New York stockbroker George Sloan in 1929, she purchased 261.5 acres west of Upperville, Virginia to create Brookmeade Stable, her thoroughbred breeding and training farm. By 1931, she had made $42,500 worth of improvements to the land, constructing a Colonial Revival style house, outbuildings, worker housing, race barn, stallion barn, mare barn, yearling barn, and breeding shed in addition to renovating a preexisting mule barn for use as a stable for work horses, mules, and carriage horses. The high-style design of both her house and equine structures indicates that she hired an architect familiar with the Colonial Revival style and equine architecture, possibly William Lawrence Bottomley. After her farm’s rise to national prominence when her horses Calvacade and High Quest won the 1934 Kentucky Derby and Preakness respectively, Sloane expanded Brookmeade by purchasing an additional 174.5 acres in 1936. She continued to successfully breed and train horses until her death in 1962. The farm, now known as Lazy Lane Farms, remains in use as a thoroughbred breeding facility and is owned by the Allbritton family. While many of the structures are still extant, the land containing the breeding complex was sold. The mare barn is now located on the adjacent property, and the yearling barn has been demolished.

---

118 1931 Loudoun County Land Book.
119 1936 Loudoun County Land Book.
120 Isabel Dodge Sloane, “Isabel Dodge Sloane’s Will,” Will Book 686, Page 247 from the Loudoun County Circuit Court.
Setting

Like many horse farms developed during the American Country House movement, the equine structures at Brookmeade Stable were laid out in a picturesque landscape setting. However, the farm’s landscape differed somewhat from many of these designs in that greater visual emphasis was placed on the house and its dependencies compared to the equine structures, which were almost hidden from view. Sloane located the house and its outbuildings on a commanding hill surrounded by horse fields above Route 50, a major road in the area (figure 1). To make the farm appear older, she situated her equine complex behind the house, with only the roofs and chimneys visible, evoking a setting reminiscent of a historic plantation house surrounded by dependencies.

Despite the equine complex’s low public visibility, its location on top of the hill allowed it to take advantage of the dramatic scenic vistas created by the Blue Ridge Mountains to the west and north (figure 2). Sloane’s minimization of the equine structures to the public combined with her use of scenic vistas within the farm, suggests that she did not want her equine structures to be a public statement of wealth and power like many of her male contemporaries. Instead, her equine complex was a private space in which she could selectively allow visitors to enter and admire her horses, structures, and landscapes privately.

Complex Layout

The grouping of Sloane’s equine structures and their supporting buildings fell in line with her picturesque landscape aesthetic and desire to imitate a historic farm complex. The broodmare and yearling barns were located east of the house to give the mares and their foals seclusion from the activities associated with the training and breeding of horses, while her main complex stood
behind the house. The core of the main equine complex formed a loose quad comprised of the jockey house, general-purpose stable, combined mess hall and bunkhouse, trainer’s house, and training barn. The scale house, breeding shed, and stallion barn stood to the outside of the quad (figure 3). This layout helped create an efficient space because it located worker housing at either end of the barns with the mess hall at the center, minimizing the time the workers spent travelling between their residence, the stables, and the mess hall. Similarly, the breeding structures were situated just outside the quad, signifying that they had a different use from the training structures and breaking from the more formal layout to contribute to the complex’s historic appearance. The quad had some elements of formal design, such as the symmetry created by the jockey house and the trainer’s house. However, in keeping with her romanticized replication of a historic farm, Sloane disrupted the formality created by the symmetry by constructing the mess hall and bunkhouse perpendicular to the general-purpose stable.

Aesthetic

Like many contemporary stables, the Colonial Revival aesthetic of Sloane’s equine structures further reflected her romanticized interest in Virginia’s architectural heritage. However, unlike many farms that featured statement-making Georgian Revival structures, Sloane used a subdued Colonial Revival aesthetic, in keeping with her desire to imitate a more vernacular historic Virginia farm complex. This aesthetic is exemplified by her training barn (figure 4). The one-story frame barn with a monitor roof was clad with weatherboard siding and consisted of minimal stylistic treatment beyond its projecting arched entrances with imitative keystones. Paired casement windows with six lights were positioned on the north elevation complete with louvered shutters. Crowning the ridge of the monitor roof were three, square
cupolas with louvers topped with concave roofs and spires. The center cupola also featured arched louvers with imitative keystones.

Similarly, Sloane’s stylistic treatment of the buildings for her workers also contributed to the equine complex’s appearance as an historic Virginia farm. Such aesthetic treatment is most clearly seen when examining the mess hall and bunkhouse, which were both added to the general-purpose stable (figure 5). These structures were relatively simple but included the addition of shutters, a porch, and a cupola to increase contextual compatibility with the rest of the complex. The mess hall and bunkhouse featured Colonial Revival elements such as the six-over-six windows with louvered shutters and decorative lintels. It also had a four column portico with a louvered lunette vent within the tympanum. However, the building also had asymmetrical fenestration and chimneys to diminish its formality, giving it a more vernacular, historic appearance.

Likewise, Sloane also built the equine complex’s supporting structures such as the scale house and breeding shed using local stone and subtle stylistic elements, contributing to the farm’s historic appearance by resembling dependencies. The scale house had subtle jack and segmental arches, a chimney, and an arched louvered vent (figure 6). It also featured six-over-six windows with louvered shutters to aesthetically connect it to the frame structures within the complex.

*Stable Interior Layouts*

The race barn at Brookmeade was similar to other race barns built at the time in Virginia. Sloane’s race barn reflected her interest in creating an efficient space to support her horses through her layout of the stalls and supporting spaces. The 25 stall race barn had a central
passage with a single row of 11 stalls and a centrally-located feed room to the west and another 12 stalls to the east (figure 7). Two large box stalls stood at the east end of the barn, separated from the other stalls by the 1/8th mile indoor track (figure 8). To increase efficiency, the barn had tack rooms at either end. The east tack room was located between the two box stalls, and the west tack room was located adjacent to a bathroom and a workspace. The workspace featured exterior and interior Dutch doors to allow horses into the area as well as a heating stove and bay window to increase the amount of natural light (figure 9). Additionally, each stall had a cabinet next to it to store medications and grooming supplies for its occupant, reflecting Sloane’s desire to have an organized and efficient stable. Similarly, recesses in the concrete floor located throughout the barn used for soaking or poulticing the horses’ hooves and lower legs also showed her use of built-in features to facilitate horse care (figure 10).
Brookmeade Stable Illustrations

Figure 37 shows Sloane's twentieth century recreation of a plantation house and curtilage. The race barn’s roof is visible to the right of the house and the chimney of the jockey house to the left.

Figure 38 depicts the stallion barn viewed from near the scale house.
Figure 39 shows a 1937 aerial of the farm.

Figure 40 depicts the north and west elevations of the race barn.
Figure 41 shows the general-purpose stable to the left and the combined mess hall and bunkhouse to the right.

Figure 42 shows the scale house.
Figure 43 depicts the west block of stalls, feed room, and center pass-through in the race barn.

Figure 44 shows the two stalls and tack room at the east end of the race barn. Note the cabinets.
Figure 45 shows the exterior Dutch door, bay window, and chimney in the work room at the west end of the barn.

Figure 46 shows a recess in the floor for soaking or poulticing hooves.
Gender and Virginia’s Early-Twentieth Century Equine Landscape

Virginia’s early-twentieth century equine landscapes reflected the influence of the Picturesque and Colonial Revival aesthetics espoused by the American Country House movement. These landscapes, and their contributing structures, also showcased the various trends and technologies associated with the industry at that time. The equine landscapes reflected the owners’ personal preferences while also serving as statements of power and wealth. While not as apparent, there were subtle differences incorporated into the designs of women’s equine landscapes when compared with their contemporary male counterparts. The case studies suggest that men used the placement of their stables within the public view and stylistic treatments to convey their self conceptions of masculinity, competiveness, and power. While men located their race barns to be visible, women’s siting of the race barn in front or in back of the main house suggested that some were not as comfortable about publicly acknowledging their contestation of gender norms. Women likely located their stables out of the public’s view because notions of upper-class female propriety kept them from erecting stables as a public contestation of gender. However, within their properties, the women may have placed their broodmare barns in prominent locations to serve as an assertion of their abilities as breeders and statements of pride, contesting gender norms to a select group of visitors. The differing locations of women’s race barns also reflected their perceptions of gender and horse racing. Although the research suggests that women’s designs were influenced by their differing senses of self due to gender and their perceptions of gender and horse racing, additional research at a national level is required to increase data and sample sizes.

Like their male counterparts in Virginia, women followed one of the fundamentals of the American Country House movement by choosing picturesque settings when siting their equine
structures. This is clearly illustrated by farms such as Brookmeade, designed by Isabel Dodge Sloane, which stood atop the rolling hills at the base of the Blue Ridge Mountains. This farm is not the only one to exhibit such characteristics. All five farms studied located their equine structures on or near the tops of hills to maximize their picturesque appeal as recommended by leading Country House architect Alfred Hopkins.\textsuperscript{121} All the farms also followed Hopkins’s suggestions to take advantage of the pastoral settings created by the open fields, wooded areas, and scenic vistas created by the Blue Ridge and Bull Run mountains.

While the Picturesque movement was a primary influence on landscape design, practical reasons and agricultural “best practices” also played a significant role in the siting of equine structures for both male and female owners. This included locating their structures near or on the tops of hills, ridges, and knolls for the practical reason of facilitating drainage and ventilation in addition to the aesthetic appeal. In his book on breeding, training, and managing thoroughbreds, William Fawcett espoused a commonly held view: “Above all, the ground must be dry, for any moist soil that holds water, such as clay, must be avoided like the plague. Your boxes [stalls] will always be damp and your mares always coughing.”\textsuperscript{122} Since clay soils were hard to avoid, particularly in the Virginia piedmont, professor of animal husbandry Carl Gay advised that horse barns “should be built on high, well-drained ground.”\textsuperscript{123} The siting of the equine complexes was studied using sightlines to determine their visibility from public roads, main driveways and farm


roads, the main house, and the scenic vistas viewed from the complexes. The sightline analysis was a viable method because historic aerials showed that the tree lines and topography remain virtually unchanged at North Wales, Mount Sharon, and Montpelier. The woods behind the mare barn at Burrland and the woods near the facilities maintenance at Brookmeade Stable were cut down, but did not impact the use of sightline analysis from the main road, farm roads, or the main house. Of the 24 equine complexes constructed on the five farms, 75% were sited for both scientific best practices and aesthetics, while only 17% were located for scientific best practices, 4% for aesthetic reasons, and 4% for other reasons. Of the eight complexes exclusively built by women, 63% were sited for scientific best practices and aesthetics, 25% for scientific best practices, 0% for exclusively aesthetic reasons, and 13% for neither reason. On the other hand, of the 16 complexes built by men, 81% of the locations were chosen for both practical and aesthetic reasons, 13% for scientific best practices, 6% for solely aesthetics, and 0% for neither reason, showing that while owners of both genders predominantly chose locations for both scientific best practices and aesthetics, women were more likely than men to choose a site to follow best practices rather than for aesthetic appeal. Similarly, men were slightly more likely to select a site that did not follow scientific best practices because they liked the aesthetic.

Despite these overarching similarities in setting, analysis of the five horse farms from the period suggests that male owners chose publicly-visible locations for their race barns, while female owners did not. All three male owners who built race barns constructed them in clear view of the public right of way as illustrated by Ellsworth and Elizabeth Augustus’s race barn at Mount Sharon. William Zeigler, Jr., owner of Burrland Farm, and Edward Weld, owner of North Wales likewise positioned their race barns in clear view of the public. This emphasis on public visibility was taken further by Zeigler who also took pains to locate other equine structures

124 See the Appendix for a detailed explanation of the analysis process.
within the public viewshed, although these structures received a diminished aesthetic emphasis compared to his race barn. The evidence of men’s construction of their race barns in the public’s view suggests that the barns were meant to be statements of power and wealth tied to their understandings of masculinity and competition. However, this interpretation is complicated by William du Pont’s lack of equine structures visible to the public at Montpelier. He did not build publicly-visible equine structures because he did not seem to feel the same need to publicly display his stables like Weld, Chrysler, Ziegler, and the Augustus’s. In all likelihood, du Pont showcased his ownership of President James Madison’s house instead, trumping the other men’s expressions of personal wealth and masculinity through their public construction of stables.

Conversely, the equine structures including the three race barns built by Marion duPont Scott at Montpelier and Isabel Dodge Sloane at Brookmeade Stable were not easily visible from public roads, suggesting that notions of female propriety kept women from building equine structures as public contestations of gender. Women may have also built less visible equine complexes to emphasize privacy and an inward sense of family as a challenge to male norms of publicly expressing wealth and power. Victorian-era concepts of separate spheres held that upper-class women were supposed to remain within the home where gender norms dictated that they serve as pure, asexual, submissive, moral examples to their husbands and children and minimize their involvement in public activities. ¹²⁵ Although the Victorian period ended in 1901 and gender norms changed, women like Scott and Sloane may have retained some aspects of Victorian views on gender and sexuality when they constructed their farms in the late 1920s since horse breeding was taboo for women. Because decency laws required that horses be bred inside of breeding sheds to protect women’s sensibilities, Scott and Sloane may have felt

---

uncomfortable placing their equine structures in public view because they felt like they were mounting a serious challenge to gender norms just by becoming breeders.\textsuperscript{126} They may have avoided constructing their barns in public view as an assertion of their challenge to gender norms for a variety of reasons including fearing ostracism because they could be perceived as perverted or failing to attract clients interested in breeding. The naming conventions women owners observed support the interpretation that they were reluctant to publicly challenge gender norms. Although both men and women often used nom de courses, or pseudonyms, for their breeding and racing stables, men were more likely to breed or race horses under their own names, especially if they did not have business partners.\textsuperscript{127} For example, Weld partnered with his neighbor J. Temple Gwathmey, and they named their breeding and racing stable Mr. Cotton.\textsuperscript{128} Zeigler bred and raced under his own name, while his wife used the nom de course Middleburg Stables.\textsuperscript{129} Similarly, Scott conducted all of her breeding and racing operations under the name Montpelier, and Sloane used the name Brookmeade Stable.\textsuperscript{130} The women owners’ use of their stables’ name instead of their own suggests the importance of their stables to their identities. The use of the stable’s name also disassociated the horses and their owners from the gendered connotations created by using a feminine name, giving the women greater privacy in publications. The women sited their stables out of view from public right-of-ways, likely

\textsuperscript{126} Horse breeding sessions were such a masculine domain that women continue to be discouraged from working in stallion barns or attending coverages to the present. Discomfort with women in breeding spaces is so deeply rooted that I was not allowed to enter breeding sheds during my field studies, although they were not in use and there are no longer legal restrictions banning women from these spaces in Virginia.


\textsuperscript{130} Editors of the Daily Racing Form, \textit{Champions}. 
paralleling their reluctance to mount a strong, public contestation of gender.

Evidence suggests that the male and female owners had differing perceptions of gender and identity that were further reinforced by their placement the structures to house their breeding stock within their farms. Of the three stallion barns constructed on the farms, two were built by men and one by a woman. Sightline analysis of the stallion barns’ visibility from public roads, main driveways or farm roads, and the main house revealed that all three were moderately visible within the farm’s landscape, showing that owners of both genders took pride in their stallions and acknowledged the importance of stallions to breeding.\(^{131}\) However, of the nine broodmare barns built, 44% had high visibility, 33% had moderate visibility, and 22% were hidden. The male owners built four of the broodmare barns, 75% of which had moderate visibility, 25% were hidden, and 0% had high visibility. In contrast to the stallion barns, male owners deemphasized the broodmare barns by using the landscape to partially conceal them as exemplified by the Augustus family minimizing their broodmare barn by locating it over the crest of a hill and Weld hiding his breeding complex in a forested area. Similarly, du Pont did not build a broodmare barn, presumably housing his mares within the general-purpose farm barn. The male owners’ de-emphasis of their broodmare barns suggests that they felt these spaces should be private due to holdovers of Victorian discomforts about openly acknowledging the role of their female horses in sex and reproduction, as well as their perceptions of breeding and breeding spaces as masculine. Ziegler differed slightly because he was proud of his state-of-the-art breeding and training facilities and comfortable with his broodmare barn being seen. However, the breeding facilities were located farther away from the house than the race barn and the polo barn, showing that the placement was likely influenced by ideas of modesty for the barn’s female occupants.

On the other hand, the female owners appear to have placed a much greater emphasis on

\(^{131}\) See the Appendix for a detailed explanation of the analysis process.
their broodmare barns, suggesting that they were willing to challenge gender norms to a select audience. Of the five broodmare barns built by women, 80% had high visibility, 20% were hidden, and 0% had moderate visibility, suggesting that they had an alternative understanding of breeding in which they had a greater appreciation and empathy for their broodmares than their male contemporaries. Scott’s broodmare barns had the highest visibility because they were located on farm roads parallel to the driveway to the front and sides of Montpelier like her race barns. In many ways, Scott’s location of her stables paralleled her approach to challenging gender norms under the pretext of improving her performance at horse shows as a young woman and her reversal of gender roles in foxhunting because she only contested gender norms in front of a limited audience. Although her stables were not visible to the public, they served as a symbol of her challenge of the male-dominated thoroughbred industry because they could be seen by visitors to Montpelier, especially people who were there to compete against her in the Montpelier Races held a short distance away from her barns. In contrast to Scott’s equine structures, Sloane’s main equine complex was nearly invisible to visitors unless they passed the main house, which, in many ways, acted as a gate to the stables. The concealed nature of Sloane’s stables may have been a reflection of her intensely private personality, her ambition to create a prestigious and exclusive stable, or a discomfort with expressing her contestation of gendered equine spaces to guests who did not have any business with the stables. However, her location of the broodmare barn adjacent to the main house where it could be seen from her main driveway serves as evidence that she, like Scott, valued her broodmares and wanted to contest gender norms by showing that she was an expert breeder to visitors.

Additional research into primary sources written by the women is needed to better determine how their understandings of racing and breeding differed from men. The contrast between the women’s stables’ lack of public visibility and visibility to visitors who were able to gain access to the farms raises questions about how the women chose to draw lines in
Unlike the locations of the equine structures within the landscape, the layouts of the equine complexes appear to have been influenced more directly by the interrelationship of the architectural treatment to the picturesque landscape aesthetic and the owner’s desire to achieve efficiency than by gender. Analyses of historic aerials to study the geometry of the complexes showed that of the 24 complexes constructed on the farms, only 8% featured formal, Colonial Revival-influenced layouts, 13% had loose quad layouts, 8% had half-quad layouts, and 71% had picturesque layouts. Of the 16 male-built complexes, 13% used formal layouts, 6% had loose quad arrangements, 6% had half-quad layouts, and 75% used picturesque layouts. The eight complexes built by women had 0% formal layouts, 25% loose quad layouts, 13% half-quad arrangements, and 63% picturesque layouts, showing that women had slightly more of a preference for loose quad and half-quad arrangements and slightly less of a inclination to build picturesque layouts than men. The women in the study did not adopt the highly formal layout used by Weld. The prevalence of different types of four-sided arrangements exemplified through Scott’s race complex, Sloane’s race barn and broodmare complexes, du Pont’s main complex and Weld’s breeding complex indicate that both women and men used four-sided arrangements to increase efficiency by decreasing the distance between structures to avoid “loss of time” while varying the level of the quad’s formality to fit in with their landscape and architectural aesthetics. Similarly, the diffused, picturesque layout used by Scott for her broodmare and selecting who saw their farms. They became well-known in the thoroughbred racing and breeding community, in many ways negating their efforts to decrease their public visibility. Did they initially construct their farms out of public view in case they never achieved the success they sought, or was it more deeply tied to gender and identity? Additionally, the women’s highly-visible broodmare barns may have also initially served as motivators, later becoming symbols of pride as the women achieved success as breeders.

See the Appendix for a detailed explanation of the analysis process.

yearling barns, the Augustus family’s race barn and main complex, and Ziegler’s entire farm reflected the prevalence of plans intended to reduce the spread of fires and diseases and provide additional pasture space surrounding the barns for the breeding stock while retaining accessibility by farm road.

Similarly, the inclusion of supporting structures within the equine complexes also seems to have been primarily influenced by the owner’s aesthetics and fear of fire. Of the 34 horse barns constructed, all but three barns either had the basic functions to support the horses such as hay storage, granaries, wash stalls, tack rooms, work areas, worker housing, and offices located in the barn or in a nearby supporting structure regardless of the owner’s gender. Instead, the decision to have supporting structures located near the barn as opposed to within the barn appears to correlate to aesthetics. Owners who were trying to achieve a formal Colonial Revival aesthetic either incorporated the supporting structures into their design, such as Weld’s hay barn, tack room, and veterinarian’s office at his breeding complex at North Wales, or they created a stand-alone equine structure containing all the supporting functions like Weld’s carriage house and yearling barns, du Pont’s carriage house, the Augustus family’s race barn, Sloane’s breeding complex, and Zeigler’s stallion and race barns (although the race barn had a blacksmith’s shop hidden from view). Conversely, owners including those with Colonial Revival-style structures, who desired a more “vernacular” or picturesque appearance, built small supporting structures within the complex such as du Pont’s main complex, the Augustus’s main complex, Zeigler’s polo, broodmare, and yearling barns, Scott’s breeding and race complexes, and Sloane’s main complex. Fire prevention also may have played a role in complex layout, with Weld locating hay storage and stoves in separate structures from the stables. Similarly, Zeigler built separate structures for mash preparation and blacksmithing at Burrland, while Scott located the stove in
her breeding complex in a detached office. However, most owners decided to store hay in the barn lofts despite the risk of spontaneous combustion, and both Scott and Sears counted on workers to prevent fires from stoves in their race barns.

Paralleling the visibility of their equine structures to the public, the creation of a hierarchy using the horse barns’ aesthetics also appears to reflect the owners’ understandings of gender in horse racing and breeding in addition to their personal tastes. Consistent with the high visibility of their stables and indicative of their intent to express their wealth through their equine structures, Weld and Ziegler constructed the most high-style Colonial Revival barns. Both used stylistic treatments to create a hierarchy of equine structures mirrored by the barns’ visibility. Weld’s carriage house had greater visibility to visitors than his breeding complex. It likewise was more visually-imposing because of its huge scale, use of stone, and Colonial Revival detailing like belt courses, blind windows, and a cupola, while the breeding complex had a slightly smaller scale, was stuccoed, and had fewer Colonial Revival details. Similarly, Zeigler incorporated elements of Colonial Revival design to create a hierarchy, using columns and an octagonal cupola on his race barn to show that it had the highest status of all the equine structures at Burrland. The stallion and polo barns had octagonal cupolas to differentiate them from the relatively plain broodmare and yearling barns. Ziegler’s hierarchy provides evidence that his valuation of his sporting horses and studs over his mares and their offspring was connected to understandings of equine competitions and breeding as fundamentally masculine activities. The Augustus family also emphasized their sporting horses over their broodmares. Although the Augustus family used prefabricated buildings, they placed their Colonial Revival-influenced, bright white racing barn in public view, while trying to make their broodmare barn

136 Weld’s race barn and stallion barn have been demolished, but they may have had greater stylistic treatments than the broodmare barns.
blend into the landscape by painting it green and locating it behind a hill.

While du Pont strove for more of a vernacular aesthetic, like Weld, Zeigler, and the Augustus’, he also created a hierarchy by using Colonial Revival elements on the equine structures he valued the most. Because he loved driving and he strongly supported his children’s love of riding, he built both the carriage house and the pony barn in three-part plans influenced by Palladianism while his other horse barns were linear. He also differentiated them from other equine structures by constructing the carriage house in brick with a hipped roof and cladding the pony barn with weatherboard instead of board-and-batten like his other agricultural buildings. Du Pont’s gendering of horse barns is more difficult to discern because he did not have a documented broodmare barn, indicating that they were probably kept in the large general farm barn. However, he had a stallion barn treated with Colonial Revival-influenced pyramidal cupolas, suggesting that he privileged the stallions over the mares like the other male case studies.

In contrast, Sloane and Scott used stylistic treatments combined with the barns’ visibility, showing a more equal interest in their different types of horses as a part of their alternative understandings of gender and thoroughbred racing and breeding. Although Sloane’s equine structures had the most private setting likely due to her reluctance to publicly challenge gender norms, she used subdued Colonial Revival features to reflect her status and imitate a historic Virginia farm complex. Her restrained architecture also distanced her equine structures from what she may have perceived as the extravagance or hypermasculinity of the high-style Colonial Revival aesthetics used on her male contemporaries’ barns. While she prioritized her race barn the most by giving it the most decorative treatment like her male peers, she arguably placed her broodmare barn slightly higher in her hierarchy than the stallion barn because she gave it greater
visibility by locating it in a field adjacent to the main house and used more stylistic features from the race barn, including the monitor roof and ornate center cupola. In keeping with her more egalitarian treatment of her breeding horses’ barns, she included the stallion barn in her main complex and used the same smaller Colonial Revival-influenced cupolas as the race barn.

Similarly, Scott also distanced her farm from those of her male contemporaries by constructing prefabricated Sears barns and race barns with a plain aesthetic, emphasizing functionality and performance. Her emphasis on functionality paralleled her personal interests in challenging upper-class assumptions about the value of beauty and femininity, likely stemming in part from her mother’s lack of interest in or affection for her physically plain, competitive, tomboyish daughter. Like Sloane, Scott’s equine structures’ locations and aesthetics privileged her race horses and broodmares over her stallions. Scott’s location of the race and broodmare barns to the front and sides of Montpelier suggests that they served as physical representations of the importance of both racing and breeding to her. It also might indicate that she ultimately viewed the mares as more important to producing foals than the stallions. Like Sloane, Scott still placed greater emphasis on her racing barns because she painted them the yellow color used to denote important buildings at Montpelier in the color hierarchy developed by her father, while her broodmare barns were green like the farm’s other agricultural structures and worker housing. Scott’s race barns and broodmare barns retained greater visibility than her father’s stallion barn, which she continued to use. Scott also treated barren broodmares differently than the other case studies through her construction of a barren broodmare barn. While the other owners presumably kept their broodmares together, regardless of whether or not they were pregnant that year, or more likely turned their barren mares out to pasture, Scott isolated her barren broodmares by

locating their barn out-of-sight behind the Montpelier mansion. She built a separate barren broodmare barn because she held the belief that barren mares living with pregnant mares could cause them to have abortions.\textsuperscript{138} Locating the barren broodmare barn behind the mansion may have indicated that Scott saw them as having diminished status because they had failed to conceive and were a threat to her other mares.

Similar to the complex layouts, the interior layouts and supporting spaces inside the barns appear to have been influenced by the exterior aesthetic the owner was trying to achieve, functionality, and, to a lesser extent, fire hazards. Since both male and female owners had a shared understanding of the supporting spaces required to support their horses, all of the stables had hay storage, granaries, feed rooms, and tack rooms in or near the stable. Many horse barns also had offices and wash stalls. Because all of the case studies except for Mount Sharon had at least one mare, yearling, or stallion barn demolished, inaccessible, or significantly altered, it is difficult to draw conclusions about how women may have organized or perceived the interior spaces of these stables differently than men without examining additional case studies. Although additional research is needed, the surviving race barns suggest that men and women may have had different understandings of how to best achieve efficiency. The male-owned race barns at Burrland and Mount Sharon had their supporting spaces located at the center of the barn, while Scott’s race barns at Montpelier had the supporting spaces at the ends of the barns. Sloane also located her supporting spaces at the ends of her race barn, except for the feed room which was next to the center pass-through. Scott may have arranged her barns with the supporting spaces at the ends to streamline chores so her workers could move in straight lines down the row of stalls. Her spatial arrangement could have also stemmed from a belief that concentrating the majority of the activity at the south ends of the barns was less disruptive to the horses. Likewise, Sloane may

\textsuperscript{138} Day, \textit{The Horse}, 115-116.
have shared this idea because most of her supporting spaces were located at the west end of her race barn. Sloane’s race barn also reflected an interest in improving organization and efficiency by having a tack room at each end of the barn instead of a single large tack room. Unlike Scott, Sloane shared her male contemporaries’ belief that a centrally-located feed room was most efficient.

Ziegler’s and Scott’s landscapes of equine competition also served as manifestations of their owner’s personal preferences, status, and gender. Both Ziegler and Scott built flat tracks for training, although they both hosted notable races on the tracks. Scott also built a steeplechase course to host the annual Montpelier Hunt Races and to physically assert her place in the masculine world of racing, although it was only visible to visitors much like her barns. Like the equine structures at Burrland, Ziegler appears to have constructed his race track to show off his wealth, power, and competitive masculinity by siting it in the public’s view and using a formal, rational race complex layout with his imposing Colonial Revival race barn providing a backdrop for the track. In contrast, Scott created a picturesque landscape of competition by locating her flat track off center from the front of the Montpelier mansion, building hillocks, and planting clumps of trees. She also constructed one of the few known live hedge steeplechase courses to be safer for the horses and riders. Scott’s picturesque landscape design built on the rolling hills of Montpelier’s front grounds expressed a grace and femininity when viewed in comparison to the formal rigidity of Ziegler’s race complex. As a woman, her use of a picturesque setting and trimmed hedges may have given her landscape of competition legitimacy to her male competitors by anchoring it within the picturesque landscape aesthetics and Colonial Revival formal gardens of the American Country House movement. However, the location of the tracks in front of the Montpelier mansion paralleled Scott’s contestation of gender norms in horse
showing as a young adult by simultaneously mounting a challenge to notions of competitiveness being exclusive to masculinity by evoking the power and prestige of both the Madisons and the du Ponts.

Finally, Sears’s decision to establish her thoroughbred breeding and racing farm at Burrland is also significant. Instead of constructing her own farm, she chose to appropriate a comparatively masculine thoroughbred horse farm, paralleling her aggressive challenges to gender norms by riding astride in breeches and forcing her way into male-only polo games as a young adult. The equine structures’ high visibility, Colonial Revival architecture, and formal race complex layout contrasted the farms built by Sloane and Scott. Sears’s choice to purchase such a visually-prominent farm where her racing and breeding activities could be seen by the public, as well as her lack of substantial alterations was similar to the ways in which she fearlessly and publicly challenged gender norms.¹³⁹ Sears’s purchase of Burrland poses additional research questions because it suggests that unlike Scott and Sloane, other women could have adopted elements of masculine equine landscapes when they built their own thoroughbred farms to publicly contest gender. It also highlights the need for additional research on the reuse of equine landscapes built by men and later controlled by women because it presents the possibility that women accepted and made very few changes to male-built stables even though they may have designed a completely different equine landscape had they been building the farm.¹⁴⁰

In conclusion, the public visibility and stylistic treatments of stables owned by men likely

¹³⁹ Her only major change to the property was burning the main house to reduce her property taxes. However, this action can also be interpreted as a refutation of domesticity and an assertion of women’s agency.
¹⁴⁰ Even though Scott built upon her father’s farm, her landscape better fits into the construction of a new farm because of the extensive amount of construction she undertook to transform Montpelier from a breeding farm for riding horses to a breeding and training farm for racehorses.
served as statements of wealth and competitiveness, manifesting ideas of masculinity, while women’s perceptions of gender and the thoroughbred industry prevented them from constructing stables as public contestations of gender. However, women’s stables were statements of their identities, and their placements of their stables within their equine landscapes suggest that they were willing to challenge gender norms to a more exclusive group of visitors. Women placed their broodmare barns in locations of prominence, likely serving as physical manifestations of their assertions that they could become expert breeders and showing that they had an alternative understanding of gender, sexuality, and horse breeding. The women’s identities also appear to have played an important role in the ways in which they shaped their landscapes, as Sloane’s location of her race barn behind her main house was a reflection of her intense privacy and her unwillingness publicly contest gender, while Scott’s placement of her broodmare barns, race barns, and racetracks in front of the Montpelier mansion seem to have paralleled her contestation of gender norms in front of a select audience at horse shows. Finally, Sears’s appropriation of a highly masculine equine landscape demonstrates that some women, particularly feminists, may have viewed the takeover of male spaces as the best way of asserting their equality and competitive natures.
Analysis Charts

**Siting of Men's Stables**

- Aesthetic: 0%
- Scientific: 6%
- Both: 13%
- Neither: 81%

**Siting of Women's Stables**

- Aesthetic: 13%
- Scientific: 25%
- Both: 63%
- Neither: 0%
Visibility of Broodmare Barns Built by Men

- High: 75%
- Moderate: 25%
- Low: 0%

Visibility of Broodmare Barns Built by Women

- High: 80%
- Moderate: 20%
- Low: 0%
Complex Layouts Built by Men

- 75% Formal
- 14% Loose Quad
- 6% Half Quad
- 6% Picturesque

Complex Layouts Built by Women

- 63% Formal
- 25% Loose Quad
- 13% Half Quad
- 0% Picturesque
Conclusion

The National Register of Historic Places rural historic district nominations in Virginia for areas that include structures and landscapes built during the American Country House movement argue that the wealthy residents’ longstanding interests in historic preservation and environmental conservation have resulted in relatively pristine, intact landscapes of leisure. While this might be true of the general landscapes, many of the structures associated with the equine industry that continue in use have seen substantial modifications and repairs. Many others have been demolished primarily due to obsolescence within a highly developed industry. Preservationists can study the properties’ late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century histories including considering gender and the built environment when writing National Register nominations. A Virginia Department of Historic Resource contextual study could also give better guidance to preservationists who seek to identify historic equine landscapes and structures. The contextual study would help surveyors collect enough information to assist in the identification, research, and preservation of equine landscapes.

Additionally, Montpelier’s status as an historic house museum presents an excellent opportunity to interpret and raise public awareness of Virginia’s important role in the American Country House movement. Although both Montpelier, Maymont, and Morven Park present some aspects of the American Country House movement, they do not provide an extensive discussion of the importance of hobby farms as leisure activities undertaken by the upper-class or as important factors in Virginia’s early-twentieth century economy. Montpelier also has a unique opportunity to interpret women’s history to the public through Marion duPont Scott’s equine structures.

The inconclusiveness of the case studies shows that further research would benefit the
scholarly understanding of gender and the equine landscape. Areas of additional research include a comparative study of the breeding and racing stables built by women across the United States because a number of women operated stables in Kentucky, Maryland, and New York in particular. Additionally, a number of stables owned by women who bred and raced a few racehorses and owned only one or two barns should be compared to see if the manifestation of gender differed for smaller operations. Likewise, stables built by elite women during the American Country House movement who pursued foxhunting and showing, as well as the stables of early female trainers from the 1950s and 1960s, have not been studied.

The dynamics of the relationships between women who bred and raced thoroughbreds could also be another significant area of research because it would add to the understandings of how women viewed their roles in racing. The Middleburg area of Virginia attracted a number of women besides those included in this study. While many of them like Liz Tippet and Theodora Randolph may not have built their own farms, they were powerful forces in the racing world and studying those landscapes may reveal more about the modifications women made to previously masculine space. The Middleburg area also attracted African American breeder and owner Marie Moore and trainer Dorothy Lee, suggesting that these women may have formed a support group or spurred each other on through friendly competition.

While additional research needs to be conducted on additional equine landscapes built by the Gilded Age elite, there is evidence of women constructing different equine landscapes than their male contemporaries related to their unwillingness to publicly contest gender norms. The Gilded Age hobby farmers wanted to preserve the aristocratic heritage and sporting lifestyle of Virginia’s eighteenth through mid-nineteenth century planter class. The hobby farmers tangibly demonstrated their wealth and aristocratic sensibilities by building horse barns that were
influenced by the picturesque landscape tenets of the American Country House movement and the popularity of Colonial Revival aesthetics inspired by Virginia’s eighteenth through mid-nineteenth century architectural heritage. Women like Sears, Scott, and Sloane emerged from this wealth and aristocracy to challenge gender norms in the equine sports both in riding as young adults and later through their construction of equine landscapes supporting their involvement in the previously male-dominated field of thoroughbred racehorse ownership and breeding.
Appendix

Glossary

**American Country House movement:** During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, Gilded Age elites built or renovated mansions in rural areas to escape the immorality and unsanitary conditions of the industrial cities. The movement also characterizes the elite’s sporting lifestyle consisting of activities like hobby farming, playing golf and tennis, flying, sailing, car racing, playing polo, and horse riding and racing.

**Barren Broodmare:** A mare who does not become pregnant or becomes pregnant but aborts or absorbs the foal.

**Birthing Barn:** A barn dedicated to broodmares giving birth. The stalls are often larger than 16 feet by 16 feet, have at least two doors to increase accessibility, and there are sometimes windows used to observe the mares.

**Blooded Horse:** A well-bred horse, typically with Arabian or thoroughbred ancestry.

**Box Stall:** A stall that is typically a minimum of 12 feet by 12 feet. Also known as an open stall.

**Equine Landscape:** The association of buildings included but not limited to barns, stables, sheds, indoor riding arenas, and carriage houses used for horses, along with landscape features such as riding arenas, racetracks, cross country courses, paddocks, pastures, fences, water troughs, and plantings.

**Flat track:** An oval-shaped racetrack with no obstacles. Typically has sand footing and is ¾ mile to 1 mile long.

**Gender:** Socially-constructed assumptions about the differences between men and women.

**Historic Context:** According to the Department of the Interior, historic context is “the information about historic trends and properties grouped by an important theme in the prehistory or history of a community, State, or the nation during a particular period of time.”

**Integrity:** According to the Secretary’s standards, integrity is “the authenticity of a property’s historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s prehistoric or historic period.” Integrity is comprised of “location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.”

**Mare barn:** A barn for broodmare barns. These barns can sometimes be distinguished through their incorporation of birthing stalls and offices with observation windows into the birthing stalls, as well as abundant storage for veterinary supplies. Some broodmare barns lack birthing stalls, but can still be identified through their lack of storage areas for tack.
**Nouveau riche:** In this context, families who became wealthy from business or industry in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.

**Race barn:** Barn where racehorses live during their training and racing careers. Also known as a training barn. Race barns often feature an indoor track encircling the row of stalls.

**Schooling barn:** An indoor riding arena. Also known as a riding school.

**Sears barn:** A prefabricated barn made by the Sears Company from 1918 to 1930.

**Significance:** According to the Secretary’s Standards, significance is “the importance of a property to the history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture of a community, State, or the nation.” It is achieved through association with events, activities, patterns, important people, distinctive physical characteristics of design, construction, or form, or has the potential to yield important information.

**Standing Stall:** A stall that is typically five to six feet wide, which allows the horse to lie down but not to roll over. Also known as a straight stall or an open stall.

**Steeplechase course:** A racecourse across turf with naturalistic obstacles for the horses to jump.

**Stud barn:** Barn where the stallions live. Stallion barns can often be identified by their large stalls which often exceed 16 feet square.

**Yearling barn:** Barn for young horses while they are being trained. Yearling barns are harder to identify, but they can have smaller stalls. They can also lack tack rooms.

**Virginia horse belt:** The area stretching from Albemarle County north to Loudoun County in the foothills of the Blue Ridge. This nomenclature developed out of the economic and social importance of the horse industry in the area. It is also referred to as Virginia Hunt Country due to the relocation to or formation of gentleman’s hunt clubs in the area during the late-nineteenth century, as well as the continued prominence of foxhunting in the area through the present day.
Analysis Criteria

The data for the Mutual Assurance Policies came from a sample of 28 policies dating from 1797 to 1816. They came from plantations located in Michlenburg, Chesterfield, Albemarle, Culpeper, Berkeley, Westmoreland, Botetourt, Middlesex, Caroline, Richmond, James City, Chesterfield, Augusta, Spotsylvania, and Lancaster counties in Virginia. A broad range of counties were used to the scarcity of insured policies outside of cities and towns.

Due to the widely varying acreages of the farms and the gentleman farmers’ interest in presenting their wealth, sightlines as opposed to distance were used to develop the analysis of the equine structures’ siting. Analyzing sightlines was viable because the tree lines and topography remain virtually unchanged at North Wales, Mount Sharon, and Montpelier based on historic aerials. The woods behind the mare barn at Burrland and the woods near the facilities maintenance at Brookmeade Stable were cut down, but do not impact the use of sightline analysis from the main road, farm roads, or the main house. The following process was used to determine if the siting was chosen for scientific best practices, aesthetics, both, or neither:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A) Scientific Best Practices</th>
<th>B) Aesthetics</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On top of hill to facilitate drainage</td>
<td>Prominent when viewed from main road</td>
<td>Satisfies A) and at least one criteria from B)</td>
<td>Does not satisfy criteria from A) or B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prominent when viewed from main driveway or major farm road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arranged to appear aesthetically pleasing from the main house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the view scenic from the complex/structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar process was used to determine if the stallion and mare barns had high, moderate, or low visibility within the farm’s landscape. If the barn was a combination of high and moderate visibilities, it was considered high visibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Visibility</th>
<th>Moderate Visibility</th>
<th>Low Visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire barn visible from main road</td>
<td>Entire barn visible from the main road but is in the far distance (overall form visible, but not architectural details)</td>
<td>Not visible from the main road, the main driveway or farm road, and the main house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire barn visible from the main driveway or farm road</td>
<td>Part of the barn (more than the roofline) visible from the main road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire barn visible from the main house</td>
<td>Part of the barn (more than the roofline) visible from the main driveway or farm road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire barn visible from the race track (if present)</td>
<td>Entire barn visible from the main house but is in the far distance (overall form visible, but not architectural details)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of the barn (more than the roofline) visible from the main house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of the barn (more than the roofline) visible from the race track (if present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The types of complex layouts were determined through the examination of historic aerials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colonial Revival Influence</th>
<th>Loose Quad Arrangement</th>
<th>Half-Quad Arrangement</th>
<th>Picturesque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complex has bilateral symmetry</td>
<td>A Rectangle can be drawn around perimeters of the main structures in the complex</td>
<td>An L-shape can be drawn over the main equine structures</td>
<td>Impossible to impose a regular geometric shape over the main equine structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex has near-bilateral symmetry</td>
<td>A square can be drawn around perimeters of the main structures in the complex</td>
<td>Main equine structures scattered across the farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charts

The following charts contain the data collected at the case study farms.
**North Wales Charts**

**Setting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Visibility from Main House</th>
<th>Visibility from Main Road</th>
<th>Scenic Vista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Wooded with pasture to the south</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barns</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Wooded with pasture to the east</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation Barn</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Wooded with pasture to the east</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Complex Layout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Formal/Symmetrical</th>
<th>Inclusion of Supporting Buildings</th>
<th>Types of Supporting Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Yes, high</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hay barn, veterinarians’ office, worker housing, tack room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Yes, high</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pump house, others unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>Yes, high</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barns</td>
<td>Yes, moderate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation Barn</td>
<td>Yes, moderate</td>
<td>No, but close to main complex</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aesthetic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Structural System</th>
<th>Cladding</th>
<th>Roof Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn #1</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete block</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn #2</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete block</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Hipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Barn</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete block</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthing Barn</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete block</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>Georgian Revival</td>
<td>Poured concrete</td>
<td>Stone Masonry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Hipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn #1</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete block</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Weather-board</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn #2</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete block</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Weather-board</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation Barn</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Poured concrete</td>
<td>Brick Masonry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Roof Material</td>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Windows or Transoms</td>
<td>Interior Wall Treatment</td>
<td>Other Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn #1</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Cross Batten Dutch</td>
<td>12 light transoms, lunette windows on gable ends and in birthing stall</td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Oak brick flooring, blind arcade on birthing stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn #2</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Cross Batten Dutch</td>
<td>Windows on north elevation, 12 light transoms on south elevation</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>Oak brick flooring; 2 square louvered cupolas with elongated copper spires; 1 stuccoed interior end chimney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Barn</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Cross Batten Dutch</td>
<td>Lunette windows in west gable end and in wash stall</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthing Barn</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Cross Batten Dutch</td>
<td>12 light transoms</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>Blind arcade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Cross Batten Dutch</td>
<td>8 light transoms</td>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>Pediments; blind circular windows; segmental arches; keystones; belt course; domed copper cupola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn #1</td>
<td>Asphalt Shingle</td>
<td>Cross Batten Dutch</td>
<td>6 light windows</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>Round louvered ventilators at the gable ends; five square, louvered cupolas with gable roofs; colonnade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn #2</td>
<td>Asphalt Shingle</td>
<td>Cross Batten Dutch</td>
<td>6 light windows</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>Round louvered ventilators at the gable ends; five square, louvered cupolas with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Number of Stalls</td>
<td>Stall Size</td>
<td>Additional Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation Barn</td>
<td>Slate, Cross Batten Dutch</td>
<td>2 windows per stall</td>
<td>Vertical wainscoting, horizontal wainscoting, and brick</td>
<td>Colonnades; corbelled interior end brick chimneys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stable Interior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of Stalls</th>
<th>Stall Size</th>
<th>Additional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn #1</td>
<td>Double pile (2 rows of stalls), opens to exterior</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14’5.5” x 11’7.25”</td>
<td>1 birthing stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn #2</td>
<td>Center aisle (2 rows of stalls)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12’11” x 12’10”</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Barn</td>
<td>Double pile (2 rows of stalls), opens to exterior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14’5” x 11’5”</td>
<td>1 wash stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthing Barn</td>
<td>Shed row</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21’4” x 15’9.25”</td>
<td>1 Closet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Carriage and harness storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn #1</td>
<td>U-plan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15’6” x 15’6”</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn #2</td>
<td>U-plan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15’6” x 15’6”</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation Barn</td>
<td>Single pile, opens to exterior</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14’7” x 14’11”</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mount Sharon Charts

#### Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Visibility from Main House</th>
<th>Visibility from Main Roads</th>
<th>Scenic Vista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Farm Complex</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>Moderate/High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Complex Layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Formality/Symmetry</th>
<th>Inclusion of Supporting Structures</th>
<th>Types of Supporting Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Farm Complex</td>
<td>Linear, picturesque</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Granary and worker housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Yes, picturesque</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Run-in sheds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aesthetic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Structural System</th>
<th>Cladding</th>
<th>Roof Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Influenced by technological innovation</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Vertical siding</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Influenced by the Colonial Revival, Queen Anne, and Craftsman styles</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Vertical siding</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aesthetic Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Roof Material</th>
<th>Doors</th>
<th>Windows or Transoms</th>
<th>Interior Wall Treatment</th>
<th>Other Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Metal tile</td>
<td>Sliding cross batten and Dutch doors</td>
<td>1 light and 4 light windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Wainscoting</td>
<td>Large metal ventilators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Metal tile</td>
<td>Sliding and sliding cross batten</td>
<td>25 light windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Wainscoting</td>
<td>Half-hexagonal ends, exposed rafter tails, hexagonal louvered ventilators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Stable Interior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of Stalls</th>
<th>Stall Size</th>
<th>Additional Uses</th>
<th>Location of Race Barn Support Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Center aisle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11’ x 11’ Birthing stall</td>
<td>Hay loft, office, work area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Double row of stalls with center-pass through surrounded by indoor track</td>
<td>17, now 16</td>
<td>12’ x 12’</td>
<td>Combination feed and tack room, office, bathroom, granary, hay loft, 14’6” wide indoor track</td>
<td>Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14’4” x 11’3”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Burrland Charts

#### Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Visibility from Main House</th>
<th>Visibility from Main Road</th>
<th>Scenic Vista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polo Barn</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>Medium from house</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallion Barn</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>Medium from house</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Complex Layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Formal/Symmetrical</th>
<th>Inclusion of Supporting Structures</th>
<th>Types of Supporting Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polo Barn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Groom’s quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mash house, pump house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallion Barn</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mash house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Blacksmith shop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aesthetic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Structural System</th>
<th>Cladding</th>
<th>Roof Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polo Barn</td>
<td>Georgian Revival</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Historically Weather-board</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Historically Weather-board</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Historically Weather-board</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Georgian Revival</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Historically Weather-board</td>
<td>Gable with hipped projecting entrances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aesthetic Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Roof Material</th>
<th>Doors</th>
<th>Windows or Transoms</th>
<th>Interior Wall Treatment</th>
<th>Other Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polo Barn</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Vertical board and diagonal batten Dutch</td>
<td>Four light windows</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>Had 4 square, louvered cupolas with pyramidal roofs and 1 octagonal cupola matching the race barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Slate, now asphalt shingle</td>
<td>Sliding doors</td>
<td>Six-over-six windows in hay loft</td>
<td>Vertical wainscoting</td>
<td>3 square, louvered ventilators with pyramidal roofs and over-hanging forebays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Vertical board and diagonal batten Dutch</td>
<td>Six-over-six windows in hay loft</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>3 square, louvered ventilators with pyramidal roofs and over-hanging forebays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Metal mesh stall doors, Chippendale-patterned main doors</td>
<td>1 light transoms in stalls, 6 light windows in east entrance, replacement sliding windows around track, Venetian windows at gable ends, 6 light windows in west entrance</td>
<td>Vertical wainscoting</td>
<td>Main east entrance has portico supported by 4 Tuscan columns and entrances in the wings have porticos supported by 2 Tuscan columns. Has 6 square, louvered ventilators with pyramidal roofs a central, arcaded octagonal cupola with a domed metal roof</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stable Interior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of Stalls</th>
<th>Stall Size</th>
<th>Additional Uses</th>
<th>Location of Race Barn Supporting Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polo Barn</td>
<td>U-plan</td>
<td>Historically 17, now 9</td>
<td>12’ x 14’ and 15’ x 18’</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Double pile (2 rows of stalls, opens to exterior)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12’ x 16’</td>
<td>Feed room, hay loft (Wash stall adaptive reuse of stall)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn</td>
<td>Double pile (2 rows of stalls, opens to exterior)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12’ x 14’</td>
<td>Feed room, hay loft</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Shedrow enclosed by track</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10’ x 16’</td>
<td>Hay loft, granary, feed room, tack room, medicine room,</td>
<td>Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedroom, wash stalls, bathroom, closet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Montpelier Charts

#### Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Visibility from Main House</th>
<th>Visibility from Major Farm Roads</th>
<th>Scenic Vista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pony Barn</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Forested</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barren Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mixed forested and open fields</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears Barns</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barns</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mixed forested and open fields</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Farm Complex</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Forested</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Plan Barn</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Mixed forested and open fields</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Tracks</td>
<td>Rolling</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Complex Layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Formality/Symmetry</th>
<th>Inclusion of Supporting Structures</th>
<th>Types of Supporting Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pony Barn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barren Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears Barns</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Three stall barn, wash stalls, office, run-in sheds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barns</td>
<td>Loose quad</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Isolation barn, trainer’s cottage, jockey bunk house, pump house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Farm Complex</td>
<td>Loose quad</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Granary, blacksmith shop, schooling barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Plan Barn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Tracks</td>
<td>Yes, Picturesque</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sheds, privy, jockey house, flat track finish line observatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aesthetic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Structural System</th>
<th>Cladding</th>
<th>Roof Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pony Barn</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Weather-board</td>
<td>Gable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barren Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Dutch Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Weather-board</td>
<td>Gambrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Roof Material</td>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Windows or Transoms</td>
<td>Interior Wall Treatment</td>
<td>Other Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pony Barn</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Sliding 12 light</td>
<td>6 over 6 sliding sash windows, 5 and 9 light transoms</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 square louvered ventilators with pyramidal roofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barren Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Standing seam metal</td>
<td>Dutch cross batten</td>
<td>9 light windows</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>Hay hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears Barns</td>
<td>Standing seam metal</td>
<td>Dutch cross batten</td>
<td>9 light windows</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>Hay hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Race Barn</td>
<td>Standing seam metal</td>
<td>Sliding, horizontal paneled, wire mesh, and Dutch vertical batten</td>
<td>6 over 6 sliding sash windows, 1 over 1 sliding sash windows, unglazed transoms</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>4 metal ventilators, 1 interior end chimney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Race Barn</td>
<td>Asphalt shingle (formerly Standing seam metal)</td>
<td>Sliding, horizontal paneled, wire mesh</td>
<td>6 over 6 sliding sash windows, 1 over 1 sliding sash windows, 12 light windows</td>
<td>Vertical and horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>5 metal ventilators, 2 interior end chimneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation Barn</td>
<td>Asphalt shingle Sliding cross batten and wire mesh</td>
<td>6 light windows</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>Interior end chimney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallion Barn</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Dutch cross</td>
<td>6 light</td>
<td>Vertical and</td>
<td>2 square,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Number of Stalls</td>
<td>Stall Size</td>
<td>Additional Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barren Broodmare Barn</td>
<td>Center aisle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12’ x 13’11</td>
<td>Hayloft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Sears Barn (southmost)</td>
<td>Center aisle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12’ x 13’11</td>
<td>Hayloft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Sears Barn</td>
<td>Center aisle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12’ x 13’11</td>
<td>Hayloft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Sears Barn (northmost)</td>
<td>Center aisle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12’ x 13’11</td>
<td>Hayloft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Race Barn</td>
<td>Double row enclosed by track</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13’ 2” x 13’10”</td>
<td>Wash stalls, feed room, office/tack room, indoor track (11’ wide), hayloft</td>
<td>South end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Race Barn</td>
<td>Single row enclosed by track</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11’7” x 11’10”</td>
<td>Wash stalls, work area/farrier’s forge, office/tack room, feed room/tack room/equipment storage, indoor track (13’ wide), hayloft</td>
<td>North and south ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation Barn</td>
<td>Center aisle</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Hayloft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Type</td>
<td>Plan Type</td>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallion Barn</td>
<td>Single row</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Single row opening to exterior (NOT a shedrow)</td>
<td>Two 14’ x 22’6” and one 15’6” x 22’6” Feed room/office, hayloft</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-plan Barn</td>
<td>U-plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13’ x 13’</td>
<td>Unknown use</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearling Barn</td>
<td>L-plan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Board and batten section: 10’10” x 14’7” Weatherboard section: 9’10” x 14’6” Feed room/office, hayloft</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple Stable</td>
<td>Shedrow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11’5.5” x 13’</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Isolation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11’ x 10’6”</td>
<td>Quarters, work area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Brookmeade Stable Charts

#### Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Visibility from Main House</th>
<th>Visibility from Main Roads</th>
<th>Scenic Vista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Complex</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Complex</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Open fields</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Complex Layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Inclusion of Supporting Structures</th>
<th>Types of Supporting Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Complex</td>
<td>Loose quad</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jockey house, bunkhouse/mess hall, trainer’s house, breeding shed, scale house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broodmare Complex</td>
<td>L-shaped</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aesthetic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Structural System</th>
<th>Cladding</th>
<th>Roof Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Weather-board</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallion Barn</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Weather-board</td>
<td>Hipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General-Purpose Stable</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>Stone and Concrete</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Weather-board</td>
<td>Gambrel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aesthetic Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Roof Materials</th>
<th>Doors</th>
<th>Windows or Transoms</th>
<th>Interior Wall Treatment</th>
<th>Other details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Asphalt Shingle (Modern)</td>
<td>Dutch cross batten with glazed top doors, sliding cross batten, Dutch horizontal batten stall doors</td>
<td>Large unglazed windows on the south, 6 light on the north, 6-over-6 on east and west, bay window in work room, and two 2 light transoms in stalls</td>
<td>Horizontal wainscoting</td>
<td>Projecting entrances, arched doorways with imitation keystones, louvered shutters, square louvered cupolas with 3 concave roofs and spires, center cupola has arched louvers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Form</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of Stalls</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stall Size</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Barn</td>
<td>Single row of stalls with center passage surrounded by indoor track</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9’6” x 13’ and two 15’ x 15’</td>
<td>Bathroom, two tack rooms, work space, feed room, and 12’6” wide track</td>
<td>Both ends and center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallion Barn</td>
<td>Single row of stalls with enclosed front passage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16’ x 16’</td>
<td>Feed room, enclosed front passage</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General-Purpose Stable</td>
<td>Center aisle with cross aisle (interior redone)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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