



Meeting Agenda

Design Review Committee Site Visit

Wednesday, April 30, 2025

4:00 PM

318 Franklin Rd.

Notice is hereby given that a Special Called meeting of the Design Review Committee will be held on the date, time, and location listed above. The purpose of the site visit will be to conduct a design review workshop. The Design Review Committee makes recommendations to the Historic Zoning Commission.

CITIZEN COMMENTS (Open for citizens to be heard on any issue or concern, including those related to items on the agenda. Please submit a Speaker Card at the beginning of the meeting if you would like to address the Commission. If you would like to speak on an agenda item, the Chair will hold your comment until the public comment period associated with the item. As provided by law, the Commission shall make no decisions or consideration of action of citizen comments for items not on the agenda, except to refer the matter to the Planning Director/Staff for administrative consideration, or to a schedule the matter for consideration at a later date. Those addressing the Commission are requested to come to the microphone and identify themselves by name and address for the official record. The Chair may restrict the period for public comment, including the length of the public comment period, the number of individuals who can speak and the length of time each individual may speak. When time allows, the standard individual public comment time is two minutes.)

Comments on agenda items may be made in person or by emailing planningintake@franklintn.gov before noon on the day of the meeting. Emailed comments will be provided to the Commission and included in the minutes, but not read aloud in their entirety during the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Discussion Of A Preliminary Historic Zoning Commission Recommendation For A Mixed-Use Development At 318 Franklin Rd.; Greg Gamble, Applicant.

ADJOURN

Anyone needing accommodations due to disabilities please contact the ADA Coordinator at 615-791-3277 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.


FACTORY DISTRICT

USES	Vision	Arts and culture uses are highly encouraged in new or adaptively reused spaces for creative ideas and talent expression through the use of performing and creative arts. These could include galleries, studios, theaters, museums, event space, classrooms, markets, makerspaces, and other spaces that foster visual, auditory, and sensory creativity.
	Uses	<p>Uses at the Factory at Franklin should include Local Commercial and Light Industrial uses with an emphasis on arts and culture. A Hotel may be an appropriate use at this site if carefully designed to complement and support the historic Factory buildings. Secondary uses could include Townhouses, Live Work Units, Multifamily Residential, Institutional, and Recreation.</p> <p>Uses along Harpeth Industrial Court should be a mix of Local Commercial, Light Industrial, Institutional, and Multifamily on upper floors. Established light industrial uses are encouraged to remain. Uses related to arts and culture are encouraged.</p> <p>Uses to the south of Liberty Pike should be predominantly residential, including a mix of Single Family Residential, Duplexes, Multiplexes, Townhouses, and Multifamily Residential. Uses related to arts and culture are encouraged. In Multifamily buildings, first floor Local Commercial uses are encouraged where fronting Liberty Pike. Along the southern edge of the Factory District, single family residential or duplexes should be located along the periphery to appropriately transition to the adjacent historic residential neighborhoods. The historic Alpheus Truett House facing Franklin Road should remain Single Family Residential.</p> <p>The first two structures along Morningside Drive facing Franklin Road should remain and be preserved subject to the Historic District Design Guidelines. Future residential uses in the rear of the property could include duplexes, multiplexes, and townhouses.</p> <p>For the property north of Morningside Drive, future development should be located behind the hill and could include single-family residential, duplexes, townhouses, multiplexes, small-scale multifamily, and accessory dwellings.</p>
FORM	Building Placement	<p>The established setbacks of historic buildings should remain. No new buildings should be located in front of the Factory buildings. See the Historic District Design Guidelines for additional guidance.</p> <p>Any new buildings should have moderate setbacks along Franklin Road and Liberty Pike, but buildings internal to a site or along Harpeth Industrial Court should have shallow to moderate setbacks.</p> <p>Any new buildings along Morningside Drive or on the adjacent parcel to the north (hill across from Harlinsdale Park) should respect the rural character of Franklin Road. Infill should be located behind the hill to obscure visibility and maintain the rural viewshed. See Appendix D.</p>

FACTORY DISTRICT

The Factory District is anchored by the Factory at Franklin which has been a defining community landmark since its opening in 1929. It was used as a manufacturing center for four different companies over the course of 62 years and served as Franklin’s largest employer for most of that time. Several generations of Franklin families would go on to work at the Factory. In 1991, Jamison Bedding moved production to a new facility and the building was left empty. It went on to deteriorate rapidly over the next five years until the property was purchased by a local entrepreneur. Between 1996 and 2006, the property underwent a major transformation and was curated into a community hub of dining, entertainment, office, and retail uses. Major renovations began in 2022 for theater space, event spaces, a carousel, restaurants and other commercial uses, and a variety of indoor and outdoor gathering spaces.

The vision of the District is to expand the types of uses found in the Factory at Franklin to surrounding properties in order to create a memorable destination. The vibrant uses at the Factory at Franklin should extend beyond its walls and integrate into Harpeth Industrial Court. Key characteristics of the District should include high-quality architecture, plazas, outdoor dining, art, tree-lined streets, and pedestrian and bicycle amenities.



THE FACTORY - 2023



THE FACTORY - 1947



FACTORY DISTRICT

FORM	Building Character	<p>Character should be consistent with the Factory and be contextually sensitive to existing historic architecture, which should be preserved and maintained. See the Historic District Design Guidelines for additional guidance.</p> <p>New buildings should consist of traditional and industrial character so as to continue the established rhythm and scale of the street. Materials should complement the existing brick facades of Jamison Station and the Factory.</p> <p>Multifamily uses are encouraged to have ground floor commercial spaces, including retail, restaurants, leasing offices, and other amenities, individually accessible from the street. When multifamily units are located on the first floor, individual ground floor entrances, stoops or front porches, and pedestrian connections to the street or to a drive resembling a street should be provided.</p>
	Building Height	<p>The maximum building height for new development on both sides of Liberty Pike should be three stories with a recessed fourth story, but should transition in height to the lower-scale historic buildings along Franklin Road. The building height of any new structures along Franklin Road should not exceed two stories in order to maintain the low-scale character of the corridor. See the Historic District Design Guidelines for additional guidance.</p> <p>The maximum height for properties along Harpeth Industrial Court should be three stories, which will serve as a transition to the rural character extending north of the Factory District along Franklin Road.</p>
SITE DESIGN	Landscape	<p>Colorful plant beds and street trees should line Franklin Road, Liberty Pike, Harpeth Industrial Court and internal drives where applicable. Prominent entrances with signage, plantings, obelisks, archways, or masonry walls are encouraged at the gateways of redeveloped sites.</p> <p>Along Franklin Road, landscaping should be utilized to preserve and enhance the established character. Overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) should be retained.</p>

The images below represent the community’s desired architectural style and character within the Factory District, which are encouraged throughout the District.



FACTORY DISTRICT

SITE DESIGN	Art	Public art and public art programs are highly encouraged in the Factory District. They provide many benefits, including enhancing the sense of place, encouraging public gathering and pedestrian walkability, and bringing art and artists to the public realm for citizens and residents to enjoy. Sculptures, decorative benches and crosswalks, interactive art, murals, and/or other art elements should be strategically placed in prominent locations for public viewing. The Franklin Public Arts Commission and the Historic Zoning Commission, as applicable, provide guidance to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on public art.
	Amenities	This area should have high quality amenities that promote the use of outdoor spaces and activities, and activates the pedestrian connections between buildings. Active open spaces with water features, central green, public art, deciduous trees and gardens should be provided throughout the District. Development should include open spaces with open seating, outdoor dining areas, gathering areas, outdoor market space, interactive art, and/or historic design elements that are highly accessible and in prominent locations.
	Vehicular Access	Coordinated vehicular access between Harpeth Industrial Court and the Factory should be implemented according to the approved The Factory at Franklin Development Plan.

The images below represent the community’s desired architectural character, streetscape design, public art, and amenities within the Factory District. These types of character and amenities are encouraged throughout the District.



FACTORY DISTRICT

	Parking	Subterranean parking and structured parking is encouraged. Parking for all new development should be located to the rear of new buildings and screened from view. With redevelopment, existing parking areas should be screened with landscaping or low walls to minimize the visual impact. Shared parking is encouraged. Structured parking should be located internal to the site and activated ground level uses are encouraged.
MOBILITY	Streetscape	Streets should be designed per Connect Franklin. Streets and internal drives should be pedestrian friendly, tree-lined, and provide pedestrian connections throughout. Street furnishings are encouraged.
	Bicycle and Pedestrian	Pedestrian and non-vehicular mobility options should be highly emphasized to allow for safe and enjoyable walking and biking between residential, commercial, and light industrial areas and to downtown Franklin. Additional internal pedestrian connectivity is needed to better integrate the site with the existing network. Connections between uses on the site and between the site and adjacent properties and rights-of-way should be provided. Improved sidewalk connections are desired in order to provide pedestrian linkages from the neighboring properties of the Factory and throughout the Factory District. Sidewalks along Liberty Pike should be separated from the street with landscape planting strips and street trees. The layout of new sidewalks and walkways should take placement of specimen trees into consideration. Crosswalks at street intersections should be provided where feasible, as well as at least one mid-block crosswalk across Liberty Pike. Crosswalks should have unique design considerations to enhance the District’s character and promote pedestrian safety. Bicycle parking facilities should be provided. Bicycle, multi-use path, and pedestrian connections should be designed and provided per Connect Franklin and the Parks Master Plan.
	Transit	A trolley service with transit stops and/or stations between downtown and the Factory is encouraged.
	Property north and east of Morningside Drive	To preserve the rural character along the Franklin Road corridor, future development should be situated behind the hill to obscure visibility and maintain a rural viewshed. This should be defined as 500 feet from Franklin Road right-of-way. In order to maintain the low-scale character of the Franklin Road corridor, building heights should gradually increase, with structures located between 500 feet and 700 feet from Franklin Road being limited to a maximum height of two stories then transitioning to a maximum height of three stories. Additional landscape buffering should also be implemented as necessary to maintain the rural viewshed along Franklin Road. In addition to residential uses, development behind the hill could include mixed-use buildings featuring neighborhood commercial spaces on the ground floor and residential units above to support and activate businesses. The conservation area should be preserved. Information about the site’s history should be included as part of the amenities provided in the conservation area. The developable area of the site should largely correspond to the Infill Character Map (in Appendix D of Envision Franklin and as shown on Page 6 of the Applicant’s submittal package).
SPECIAL CONSIDERATION		



FACTORY DESIGN POLICY:

SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

PROPERTY NORTH OF MORNINGSIDE DRIVE

To preserve the rural character along the Franklin Road corridor, future development should be situated behind the hill to obscure visibility and maintain a rural viewshed. This shall be defined as 500 feet from Franklin Road right of way. In order to maintain the low-scale character of the Franklin Road corridor, building heights should gradually increase, with structures located between 500 feet and 700 feet from Franklin Road being limited to a maximum height of 2 stories then transitioning to a max height of 3 stories. Additional landscape buffering should also be implemented as necessary to maintain the rural view shed along Franklin Road.

In addition to residential uses, development behind the hill could include mixed-use buildings featuring neighborhood commercial spaces on the ground floor and residential units above to support and activate businesses.

CULTURAL RESOURCES DOCUMENTATION



318 FRANKLIN ROAD

Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee

PREPARED FOR:

Franklin 240, LLC
PO Box 1507
Mount Juliet, Tennessee 37121

Draft Report

February 2025

RGA Technical Report No. 2024-379TN



RICHARD
GRUBB &
ASSOCIATES

CULTURAL RESORUCES DOCUMENTATION


318 FRANKLIN ROAD

Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee



Principal Investigator:

Kate McKinney, MA, RPA



Project Manager:

Robbie D. Jones, MA

Author:

Kate McKinney

Co-author:

Robbie D. Jones

Prepared by:

Richard Grubb & Associates, Inc.
204 Rivergate Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37206

Prepared For:

Franklin 240, LLC
PO Box 1507
Mount Juliet, Tennessee 37121

Draft Report

February 26, 2025

RGA Technical Report No. 2024-379TN

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Richard Grubb & Associates, Inc. (RGA) prepared this Cultural Resources Documentation report for Franklin 240, LLC, which proposes to redevelop a 16.19-acre parcel of land at 318 Franklin Road in Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee. The proposed mixed-use commercial development will encompass approximately 10 acres of the parcel. Nick Fielder, former Tennessee State Archaeologist, provided coordination on behalf of Franklin 204, LLC for the project.

The project site encompasses approximately 10 acres in the central and eastern portions of the 16.19-acre parcel. The project site consists of undeveloped agricultural fields and forested areas in the eastern portion of the parcel. The project site is on the east side of Franklin Road (SR 6/US 31) adjacent to industrial and residential facilities on the south, a railroad corridor on the east, and a church on the north.

As part of the rezoning process, the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission required a metal detector survey of the 10-acre portion of the parcel as well as conservation of the site of a hilltop military fortification constructed during the Civil War and any additional significant Civil War-era resources that were discovered as part of the survey.

Background research identified one previously recorded archaeological site—40WM104—within the project site. Located approximately in the center of the 16.19-acre parcel, site 40WM104 is a hilltop Civil War-era earthwork, known as a lunette. The Tennessee Division of Archaeology (TDOA) recorded the site in 1989 as a heavily disturbed earthen mound that represents a portion of the hilltop lunette. No artifacts were recovered from the site during the 1989 survey, although informants indicated Civil War-era metal objects had been previously removed from the surrounding area on the 16.19-acre parcel, which also featured Civil War-era military encampments (Nance and Prouty 1989).

The fieldwork undertaken for this project consisted of a metal detector and pedestrian survey throughout the 10-acre Area of Potential Effects (APE). During the survey, archaeologists uncovered 85 artifacts, none of which could be directly related to the Civil War-era hilltop lunette or encampments. The earthwork that the TDOA previously identified in 1989 as a portion of the Civil War-era lunette was reidentified during this survey. RGA recommends that this earthwork be conserved through avoidance or that additional archaeological testing be undertaken if avoidance is not possible.

The artifacts recovered during the metal detector survey are commonly found in association with historic farmsteads and house sites and represent the continued occupation of the site by the Johnson, Cannon, and Hill families between 1840 and 1986. RGA does not recommend any additional archaeological testing within the 10-acre project site, except for the hilltop lunette, to identify possible Civil War-era features or artifacts. It is likely that any artifacts directly associated with the Civil War have already been found and removed from the site by previous landowners and others. Therefore, it is opinion of RGA that the only Civil War-era feature that remains within the project site is the hilltop lunette, which should be conserved. Fieldwork conducted by RGA indicates that the remainder of the 10-acre APE does not contain resources associated with the Civil War.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Management Summary.....	i
Table of Contents	ii
Appendices.....	iii
List of Figures.....	iv
List of Tables	v
1. Introduction	1
2. Environmental Setting.....	4
Location.....	4
Geology and Topography.....	4
Hydrology	4
Climate and Vegetation.....	4
Soils	4
3. Background Research	5
Pre-contact Context.....	5
Paleoindian Period (circa 15,000–10,000 BP)	5
Archaic Period (circa 10,000–3000 BP)	5
Woodland Period (circa 3000–1000 BP).....	6
Mississippian Period (circa 950–350 BP).....	7
Protohistoric Period.....	8
Property History.....	8
William Johnson, circa 1840–1882.....	9
Civil War Fortification.....	10
Post-Civil War.....	20
James R. Hodge, 1882–1882	23
Cannon Family, 1882–1947.....	24
Jennie B. Cannon, 1882–1931	24
Newton C. Cannon Jr., 1931–1935.....	27
William P. Cannon, 1935–1940.....	28
Henry R. Cannon, 1940–1947	28
Howard and Lillie Hill, 1947–1986	30
Gordon E. Inman, 1986–1994.....	34
Elias H. Attea Jr., 1994–1995.....	34
Heritage Covenant Church, 1995–1997	34
Elias H. Attea Jr., 1997–1997.....	34

	Dale G. and Linda B. Van Gorden, 1997–2003.....	34
	Trace Development LLC, 2003–2012	34
	R. Harvey Johnston III, 2012–2015.....	35
	Franklin 240 LLC, 2015–2025	35
	Expected Archeological Potential	35
	Previously Recorded Sites	35
	Historic Resources.....	36
	Precontact Resources.....	36
4.	Research Goals and Methods.....	37
	Laboratory Methods.....	37
5.	Survey Results.....	38
	Archaeological Fieldwork	38
	Metal Detector Survey Results	38
	Pedestrian Survey Results.....	43
	Site Interpretation.....	46
6.	Conclusions and Recommendations	47
7.	References	49

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Qualifications of Report Authors

Appendix B: Artifact Catalog

Appendix C: Additional Project Maps

Appendix D: Annotated Project Information

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Map showing project location	2
Figure 2: Map showing the 10-acre APE	3
Figure 3. Map showing the military fortifications surrounding Franklin and the fortification at Johnson’s farm, 1864.....	11
Figure 4. Map showing the military fortification on William Johnson’s farm	12
Figure 5. Map showing the military fortification on William Johnson’s farm	13
Figure 6. Map showing a detailed configuration of the military fortification on William Johnson’s farm.....	14
Figure 7. Map showing a detailed configuration of military fortification on William Johnson’s farm	15
Figure 8. Map showing the military fortification on William Johnson’s farm, 1863.....	16
Figure 9. Drawing of the spring-fed stone cistern at Johnson’s Farm.....	19
Figure 10. Map showing the unoccupied military fortification on William Johnson’s farm.....	21
Figure 11. Map of Williamson County showing Johnson’s farm, 1878.....	23
Figure 12. Map of Williamson County showing the farm, 1909.....	26
Figure 13. Photograph of the 1928 farmhouse	27
Figure 14. Advertisement for Cannon Farm stud, 1946	29
Figure 15. Map of Williamson County showing the farm, 1949.....	31
Figure 16. Map of Williamson County showing the farm, 1974.....	32
Figure 17. Aerial photograph showing the circa-1885 tenant house (center) and barns, 1949	33
Figure 18. Photograph of the circa-1955 dwelling from Franklin Pike, 2016.....	33
Figure 19. Metal detecting transect map.....	39
Figure 20. View of the project site, looking northwest towards the hilltop from the center of the site.....	40
Figure 21. View of the project site, looking north from the southern edge.	40
Figure 22. Results of the metal detector survey	41
Figure 23. Photograph of selected Type B square cut nails recovered from the site.	42
Figure 24. Photograph of the horseshoes recovered from the site.	42
Figure 25. Photograph of the stone cistern.....	43

Figure 26. Photograph of the stone cistern.....44

Figure 27. Photograph of the stone cistern discharge.....44

Figure 28. Photograph of the hilltop lunette45

Figure 29. Photograph of the hilltop lunette45

Figure 30. Existing and proposed site boundaries for 40WM104.....48

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Previously recorded archaeological sites within 1-mile of the project site.....35

1. INTRODUCTION

Under contract with Franklin 240, LLC, Richard Grubb & Associates, Inc. (RGA) prepared this Cultural Resources Documentation report for the proposed redevelopment project at 318 Franklin Road in Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee (Figure 1). As part of the rezoning process, the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission required a metal detector survey of the 10-acre portion of the parcel (Figure 2) and conservation of the site of a hilltop military fortification constructed during the Civil War and any additional significant Civil War-era resources that were discovered as part of the survey. In coordination with Nick Fielder, former Tennessee State Archaeologist, RGA determined the 10-acre project site was the Area of Potential Effects (APE).

As part of this survey, RGA also completed archival research and a comprehensive property history to better understand the evolution of the property over time and its association with the Civil War. The property history documented previous owners of the farm that owned and/or occupied the property between circa 1840 and 1986. These property owners included the Johnson, Cannon, and Hill families. The property history included a reconnaissance survey of above-ground resources within the 16.19-acre property and on adjacent parcels that were once part of the Johnson-Cannon-Hill Farm. The reconnaissance survey of above-ground resources consisted of digital photography, fieldnotes, and measured drawings.

Kate McKinney, MA, RPA, served as the Principal Investigator for archaeology and report author. Ms. McKinney exceeds the requirements of 36 CFR 61 for Archaeology. Mary Cate Mosher, MA, and McKenna Snyder, MA, served as field technicians. A resume for Ms. McKinney is in Appendix A. Robbie D. Jones, MA, Principal Senior Architectural Historian and Tennessee Branch Office Manager, completed the archival research and property history for the report. Mr. Jones also completed the reconnaissance survey of above ground resources. Sean McHugh, MA, RPA, and Mr. Jones reviewed the report. Olivier Vansassenbrouck, MA, created the graphics. Emma Durham, PhD, RPA, served as the copyeditor and assembled the report.




Figure 1. Map showing project location
(Source: Esri 2022).




Figure 2: Map showing the 10-acre APE
(Source: USGS Topo Map, Franklin, Tenn. [63 NE], 1997).

2. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Location

The approximately 10-acre project site, which doubles as the APE, at 318 Franklin Road is on a partially wooded lot along the east side of Franklin Road (SR 6/US 31) in Franklin, the county seat of Williamson County, Tennessee. The APE is north of Morningside Drive and south of the Franklin Church of Christ at 324 Franklin Road. The CSX Railroad corridor is approximately 70 feet east of the eastern boundary of the APE.

Geology and Topography

The APE is situated in the Interior Plateau region of Tennessee. Within the Interior Plateau the APE is situated in the Outer Nashville Basin which contains rolling and hilly topography with non-cherty limestone bedrock (TSLA n.d.). Higher hills and knobs contain more cherty formations and some shale (TSLA n.d.). Within the APE the topography ranges from 679 to 730 feet above mean sea level.

Hydrology

The APE is drained by the Harpeth River, located approximately 0.7 miles to the south. The Harpeth River drains into the Cumberland River. The Cumberland River flows into the Ohio River, which is part of the Mississippi River watershed. The Mississippi River watershed ultimately drains into the Golfo de México, also known as the Gulf of Mexico and, more recently, the Gulf of America.

Climate and Vegetation

The climate of Williamson County is characterized as a moderate, mixed humid climate with four seasonal changes. The mean annual high temperature is 84 degrees Fahrenheit, and the mean low temperature is 34 degrees Fahrenheit (National Weather Service [NWS] 2024). Average annual rainfall is 54 inches, and average seasonal snowfall is 1.5 inches (NWS 2024). Vegetation within the APE consists of a manicured lawn and a forested area. Native vegetation includes deciduous forests.

Soils

The APE consists of Maury silt loam and Ashwood-Mimosa-Rock outcrop complex soils. These are well-drained soils that are formed on uplands from phosphatic limestone (NRCS 2021).

3. BACKGROUND RESEARCH

RGA conducted background research to determine if previously identified archaeological resources or historic properties are within the vicinity of the APE and to develop appropriate pre-contact and historic contexts. Research was conducted using the TDOA Site File HUB on December 20, 2024. Previous historic sites surveys and regulatory survey reports on file at the TDOA were reviewed. Additional background research consisted of a review of pertinent primary and secondary sources, including aerial photographs, historic maps, atlases, photographs, and local and county histories.

Pre-contact Context

Paleoindian Period (circa 15,000–10,000 BP)

With the end of the last ice age around 15,000 years ago, people began moving into North America and subsequently, the southeastern United States. The first inhabitants of North America are known as Paleoindians. Paleoindians were mobile hunter-gatherer groups who utilized major waterways as a route into the Southeast (Anderson 1990). The Paleoindian period is subdivided into three subperiods: Early, Middle, and Late Paleoindian.

The Early Paleoindian period in the Southeast is often referred to as “pre-Clovis” and dates to before 13,250 cal BP. Early Paleoindian sites are sparse in the Southeast, with sites such as Page-Ladson (Florida), Topper (South Carolina), and Cactus Hill (Virginia) making up a large portion of the literature. Early Paleoindian diagnostic artifacts include Cumberland and Folsom points, which could have been used to hunt larger mammals such as mammoth, bison, and horse (FAUNMAP 1994). To date, no pre-Clovis sites have been positively identified in Tennessee.

The Middle Paleoindian period dates from around 13,250 to 12,850 BP and is referred to as the Clovis period, named after its type-site in Clovis, New Mexico. Clovis projectile point assemblages are widespread throughout North America; however, Clovis caches are generally rare in the Southeast (Anderson et al. 2015).

The Late Paleoindian period, also called “post-Clovis,” dates from around 12,850 to 10,000 BP. This period relates to the Younger Dryas climate episode, which was a slight cooling of the earth. Late Pleistocene fauna was mostly extinct at the onset of the Younger Dryas; thus, a shift to modern fauna for subsistence is seen. Later Paleoindian point types include Beaver Lake, Dalton, Quad, and Cumberland (Anderson and Sassaman 2012).

Archaic Period (circa 10,000–3000 BP)

The Archaic period in the southeastern United States is marked by a sharp increase in temperatures (Anderson and Sassaman 2012). The Southeast was covered in deciduous forests abundant with mammals such as deer and rabbit, and numerous varieties of nuts, including hickory (Steponaitis 1986). Throughout the Southeast, shell-bearing sites are prevalent along major waterways such as the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Duck rivers. The shell middens, which span the entire Archaic period, are interpreted as accumulations of refuse over the course of centuries by mobile hunter-gatherers (Deter-Wolf and Peres 2019). In addition to shellfish, shell middens often contained faunal remains,

pottery, lithics, and human burials. The Archaic period is subdivided into three subperiods: Early, Middle, and Late Archaic.

The Early Archaic, which dates from around 10,000 to 8000 BP, saw distinct environmental changes compared to the Paleoindian period, with the earth becoming warmer and the hardwood, deciduous forests moving further north from the coastline. Increases in human population size were complemented by generalist foraging strategies over smaller regions (Anderson and Sassaman 2012). Technological changes include a shift towards side- and corner-notched hafted bifaces better suited to killing smaller game (Anderson and Sassaman 2012). In the Southeast, these point types include Big Sandy, Kirk Corner-Notched, and bifurcate points. Among the Early Archaic sites in Tennessee are Icehouse Bottom (40MR23), the Johnson Site (40DV400), and the Puckett Site (40SW228).

The Middle Archaic, which dates from around 8000 to 5000 BP, saw the climate move towards even hotter and drier conditions in the Southeast (Anderson and Sassaman 2012). Perhaps a result of larger shoals caused by climate change, freshwater shellfish were collected and utilized at a faster rate than previously seen. Larger, seasonal sites were repeatedly utilized as evidenced through decades of refuse accumulation. It is during this period that evidence of long-distance trade networks was established, and warfare becomes evident through the archaeological record (Anderson and Sassaman 2012). Large bifaces, termed Benton points, are found in caches along major waterways such as the Tennessee and Cumberland rivers, often in association with burials. Middle Archaic sites in Tennessee include the Ervin Site (40MU174), the Anderson Site (40WM9), and the USN Site (40DV7).

The Late Archaic period ranges from around 5000 to 3000 BP in the Southeast. According to Steponaitis (1986), four major trends characterize the Late Archaic: the emergence of plant cultivation; the appearance of middens associated with structures; the emergence of pottery; and the intensification of long-distance trade. Early plant cultigens in the Southeast include sunflower and maygrass, although the extent to which they were cultivated is unknown (Chapman and Crites 1987). Similar to the trends of the Middle Archaic, Late Archaic sites are often associated with shell middens along waterways. Late Archaic pottery types, which are among the earliest in the Southeast, include the Wheeler and Stallings variety. Stone tool technology comprises mostly stemmed projectile points such as Savannah River, Coosa, Pickwick, and Ledbetter (Schroder 2015). Late Archaic sites in Tennessee include the USN Site (40DV7), the Barnes Site (40DV307), and the Robinson Site (40SM4).

Woodland Period (circa 3000–1000 BP)

The Woodland period in the southeastern United States is marked by the widespread emergence of pottery, an increase in sedentism and organizational complexity, and an increased reliance on cultivated foods. Building on subsistence patterns from the Archaic Period, shellfish exploitation reached its peak in the Cumberland, Tennessee, and Tombigbee river valleys during the Woodland period (Peacock 2002). This shellfish exploitation, along with cultivated foods, allowed for population increases and semi-permanent occupations. The Woodland period is subdivided into three subperiods: Early, Middle, and Late Woodland.

The Early Woodland period dates from around 3000 to 2150 BP in the Southeast. The Early Woodland period was built on patterns seen in the Late Archaic with the widespread appearance of

pottery and distinct ceramic traditions based on geography (Anderson and Mainfort 2002). Early pottery types in Tennessee include the quartz-tempered Watts Bar series and the limestone-tempered Mulberry Creek series (Faulkner 2002; Schroder 2015). In Kentucky, Adena burial mounds appear around 2400 BP containing stratified sequences of primary and secondary burials, which lead to conical burial mounds being characteristic of this subperiod (Anderson and Mainfort 2002). The Early Woodland period also saw the continuation of agriculture practices that began in the Archaic period, although the extent to which agriculture was utilized varies greatly by region. Squash, sumpweed, sunflower, and maygrass are common cultigens found at Early Woodland sites (Wetmore 2002). Early Woodland sites in Tennessee include the Spring Creek site (40PY207), Nowlin II (40CF35), and Duncan Tract (40TR27).

The Middle Woodland period dates from around 2150 BP to 1300 BP and is characterized by increased interaction between societies. One of the major trading spheres was the Hopewell culture in the Ohio Valley. In the Southeast, the Hopewellian trading sphere appears to be limited to a few hundred years, mainly from 2050 BP to 1750 BP (Mainfort 1996). Pinson Mounds, located in West Tennessee, is a large Middle Woodland mound complex consisting of burial and ceremonial mounds. Although few Hopewellian artifacts have been recovered from Pinson Mounds, the site is one of the largest Middle Woodland sites in the Southeast, eclipsing most Hopewellian sites in size. Common Middle Woodland pottery types in Tennessee include Pickwick Stamped, Long Branch, Mulberry Creek, and Bluff Creek. Typical Middle Woodland phases are the McFarland Phase, characterized by medium-sized triangular projectile points and limestone-tempered ceramics, and the Owl Hollow Phase, characterized by large permanent villages with middens (Faulkner 1988). Other Middle Woodland sites in Tennessee include Glass Mounds (40WM3)—located in Franklin—and Old Stone Fort (40CF1).

The Late Woodland period dates from around 1300 BP to 950 BP and is characterized by the appearance of the bow and arrow (Anderson and Mainfort 2002). As a result of the bow and arrow development, projectile points became smaller, as seen in Madison and Hamilton types. Mound building continued through the Late Woodland period as evidenced by multiple mounds in East Tennessee (Schroedl 1978). Many Late Woodland mound complexes became permanent settlements rather than intermittent locales for congregation (Anderson and Mainfort 2002). Intensive maize cultivation is seen across the South, along with the increased cultivation and collection of other plants. Late Woodland pottery types include Elk River, Napier Complicated, and Swift Creek.

Mississippian Period (circa 950–350 BP)

The Mississippian period has been the subject of much research across the Southeast and the Middle Cumberland region. The Mississippian period is characterized by more centralized communities, abundant shell-tempered pottery, and intensive agriculture (Anderson and Sassaman 2012). Mississippians across the Southeast developed similar ideologies and innovations around the same time, likely because of both population increases and subsistence adaptations (Anderson and Sassaman 2012). With these similar ideologies and innovations came increased warfare between Native societies, largely seen in weapons trauma on skeletal remains and fortifications. Mississippian sites often contain conical and flattop mounds and structures surrounding a plaza, all of which was often surrounded by

some type of fortification (Anderson and Sassaman 2012). During the Mississippian period, trade was so abundant and far reaching that archaeologists named it the Mississippian Ideological Interaction Sphere (Lankford et al. 2011). Pottery, gorgets, and statues were among the many artifact types adorned with iconography.

Protohistoric Period

The first known written records of the southeastern United States come from the Spanish de Soto expeditions, which took place from 1539 to 1543. De Soto and some 600 men landed on the gulf side of Florida near present day Tampa in search of gold and silver (National Park Service 1990). Over the next four years de Soto and his men, with the help of Native American guides, traversed the Southeast, including Tennessee. Throughout his expedition de Soto raided many Native American villages, stealing food and supplies, killing inhabitants, and likely leaving behind disease and destruction. It is generally accepted that the destruction left behind by the de Soto expedition greatly impacted the already stressed and unstable Mississippian society, leading to its eventual downfall.

After the failed attempts of de Soto, Tennessee was investigated by two other Spanish explorers: Tristan de Luna in 1559 and Juan Pardo in 1566. De Luna entered Tennessee near present-day Chattanooga, whereas Pardo likely visited Chiaha, near present-day Dandridge. Neither expedition stayed long in Tennessee but nevertheless resulted in the deaths of many Native Americans.

In the late 1700s white settlers began moving into Tennessee and the Southeast region in general. The United States government desired the lands east of the Mississippi River for white settlers and began enacting policies in the 1790s aimed at obtaining those lands from Native American tribes (Nance 2001). These policies led to the Indian Removal Act of 1830, championed by President Andrew Jackson, a resident of Tennessee. Some Native American tribes, particularly the smaller tribes, did not resist the removal and agreed to move west of the Mississippi River; however, five of the larger tribes (the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Creek, Choctaw, and Seminole) resisted the removal. The Cherokee broke into two factions, one that signed the treaty and one that resisted it. In 1837, the United States Army began to round up the remaining Cherokee resisters and placed them in stockades in preparation for a forced removal westward (Nance 2001). Starting in 1838, an estimated 16,000 Cherokee traveled westward in 17 detachments using three main land routes (Nance 2001). It is estimated that some 4,000 Native Americans died along the routes, which has been commemorated as the Trail of Tears.

Property History

The 16.19-acre parcel at 318 Franklin Road was once part of a 450-acre farm established in the midnineteenth century. The farm was originally laid out on the east side of the Franklin to Nashville Turnpike, a private toll road constructed in the mid-1830s, currently known as Franklin Road. Between 1853 and 1855, the Tennessee & Alabama (T&A) Railroad constructed a railroad corridor across the farm (Gertner 2019a). The railroad connected Nashville, Tennessee, with Decatur, Alabama, and was known as the Nashville & Decatur Railroad after 1866. In 1900, the Louisville & Nashville Railroad leased the corridor. In the 1980s, the corridor was purchased by the CSX Railroad. During the

American Civil War, the U.S Army utilized the farm as a military fortification and campgrounds serving nearby Fort Granger.

The farm was owned and occupied by the Johnson family from circa 1840 to 1882, the Cannon family from 1882 to 1947, and the Hill family from 1947 to 1986. During this nearly 150-year time span, the farm featured eight dwellings, including four dwellings for enslaved Black persons, a circa-1885 tenant house, a 1928 dwelling, and a circa-1955 dwelling. The farm also featured barns, a stable, a spring-fed cistern, and other agricultural and domestic outbuildings as well as fences, farm roads, and other types of agricultural infrastructure.

In 1909, an interurban streetcar railway connecting Franklin with Nashville was constructed along the turnpike corridor. The route went around the west side of Harlinsdale Farm—on the west side of the Franklin Road—bypassing the Johnson farm. The Franklin Interurban operated until 1942. In the late 1920s, the Franklin Turnpike evolved into the Andrew Jackson Highway, which carried State Route 6 and U.S. 31, a major north–south highway connecting southern Alabama to northern Michigan.

In 1929, a member of the Cannon family sold a 27-acre section at the south end of the farm for the development of a massive stove works factory. Another member of the Cannon family constructed a farmhouse on the south side of the farm. Located at 105 Morningside Drive, this farmhouse served as the childhood home of Henry Rolffs Cannon who, in 1947, married Sarah Colley, best known under her stage name of Minnie Pearl. For a short period in the mid-1940s, the Cannon family utilized the farm as an equestrian stud for Tennessee Walking Horses.

The Cannon family sold the farm in 1947 to Howard and Lillie Hill, who improved the property with a hilltop dwelling in the mid-1950s and several outbuildings. In the 1960s, the Hill family sold off property at the southern edge of the farm containing the 1928 farmhouse. From 1968 to 1970, three duplexes were built adjacent to the 1928 farmhouse along Morningside Drive. The Hill family lived on the farm until 1986. The barns and circa-1885 tenant house were demolished in the 1970s and 1980s. The circa-1955 dwelling was demolished in 2017. Over time, the 450-acre farm was sold off so that only the 16.19-acre core remains today. The 1928 dwelling and remnants of a mid-nineteenth-century limestone spring-fed cistern are the only remaining historic structures and are located on adjacent parcels.

The following is a comprehensive historic overview of the property.

William Johnson, circa 1840–1882

Archival records indicate that William Johnson owned the property in the mid-nineteenth century. A native of Virginia, William Johnson (circa 1796–1882) married Louisa Crockett (1797–1833) on January 25, 1821. They raised three sons: Samuel C. Johnson (1823–1845), John B. Johnson (1827–1856), and Robert C. Johnson (1832–1834). Johnson’s wife Louisa died in August 1833, and his youngest son Robert died in January 1834. Louisa Johnson was buried in the Franklin City Cemetery (NRHP 2012) on North Margin Street (Ancestry.com 2008; Malone 2024).

On May 4, 1837, William Johnson married Sarah Elizabeth King (1814–1872) at Franklin (Ancestry.com 2008). A native of Virginia, Sarah grew up in the Triune community in Williamson

County. William and Sarah raised five children: Sebastian King “S. K.” Johnson (1840–1897), Lavinia Johnson (1842–1873), Laura Johnson (1846–1882), Samuella “Sammie” Johnson (b.1849), and James B. Johnson (1851–1926). Two children died in infancy (Malone 2024).

William Johnson was a mechanic and farmer. In 1850, the 230-acre farm along with farming implements, livestock, and his personal estate was valued at \$13,600. By 1860, the value of his farm had increased to \$20,000 and his personal estate had increased to \$10,000. In 1850, Johnson owned 80 swine, 15 horses, 13 cattle, 12 sheep, and 2 oxen. His farm produced wheat, Indian corn, oats, cotton, wool, Irish potatoes, sweet potatoes, and butter. He also manufactured leather boots and shoes (U.S. Census 1850a, 1850b, 1850c, 1860a, 1860b).

In 1830, Johnson enslaved two Black people; the number of people he enslaved had increased to four by 1836. By 1840, he enslaved 15 Black people—6 males and 9 females—who worked in farming and manufacturing. In 1850, Johnson enslaved 10 Black people—six males aged 2–28 and four females aged 2–7—and in 1860, he enslaved 10 Black people—four males aged 12–55 and six females aged 14–45. The enslaved lived in four dwellings on the farm (Ancestry.com 2013; U.S. Census 1830, 1840, 1850d, 1860c).

In 1860, William Johnson’s household consisted of his wife Sarah, three daughters, and his youngest son James B. Johnson. By 1860, his son Sebastian K. Johnson had moved to Nashville (Malone 2024; U.S. Census 1860a).

Johnson’s neighbors along the east side of the turnpike included Rev. Joshua Soule (1781–1867), who owned a circa-1805 Federal style dwelling to the north, currently known as Wyatt Hall (WM-68; NRHP 1980), and William Alpheus Truett Sr. (1823–1898), who owned a circa-1846 Greek Revival style dwelling (WM-65; NRHP 1988) to the south. Other prominent neighbors included William Maney (1799–1862), who lived in a circa-1850 dwelling (WM-66; NRHP 1988) on the west side of the turnpike to the south, and Thomas Shute, who lived in a circa-1845 Greek Revival style dwelling known as Creekside (WM-69; NRHP 1988) on the east side of the turnpike to the north. Directly across the turnpike on the west was Mr. Wagner, who owned a circa-1850 Greek Revival style dwelling (WM-67; NRHP 2023), which as later incorporated into the Harlinsdale Farm.

Civil War Fortification

The town of Franklin played a significant role in the American Civil War. Under the command of Major General Gordon Granger (1821–1876), the U.S. Army liberated Franklin in early 1862. A year later, the U.S. Army constructed military fortifications and signal stations surrounding the town to defend against attacks by the Confederate Army. The fortifications constructed by the U.S. Army formed an approximate semicircle around Franklin from northwest to southeast. The Harpeth River, running along the north side of Franklin, formed the other half of the circle (Figure 3). The Federal fortifications were constructed between February 12 and May 29, 1863 (Thomason 1999:2).



Figure 3. Map showing the military fortifications surrounding Franklin and the fortification at Johnson's farm, 1864 (Source: Willett and Remington, 1874).

On the north side of town, under the direction of Colonel Samuel Emerson Opdycke (1830–1884), the U.S. Army constructed Fort Granger (40WM100; NRHP 1973) over a 10-week period along Figuers Bluff at the T&A Railroad Bridge spanning the Harpeth River and a hilltop fortification and signal station at Roper’s Knob (40WM101; NRHP 2000) along Liberty Pike. Fort Granger was situated to protect the railroad and control transportation in and out of Franklin. Between these two large fortifications, in 1863, the U.S. Army constructed a series of smaller hilltop fortifications, including a lunette on the crest of the 100foot-tall hill at William Johnson’s farm. These fortifications and signal stations were surrounded by military encampments for soldiers from various regiments (Figures 4–7). Self-emancipated Black freedmen, known as contraband, assisted Federal forces with the construction of these fortifications. At Fort Granger, the U.S. Army created a Contraband Camp near the south side of Johnson’s Farm (Banks 2022; Flagel 2016:20, 30–31, 36–38, 48–49; Gertner 2019b, 2019c; Smith et al. 1990:14–15).




Figure 4. Map showing the military fortification on William Johnson’s farm with the Franklin Turnpike to the west and the T&A Railroad to the east (Source: Willett and Remington 1874).




Figure 5. Map showing the military fortification on William Johnson’s farm with Roper’s Knob to the northeast and Fort Granger to the southeast (Source: Merrill 1864).

During the construction of one of the hilltop fortifications—perhaps the one at Johnson’s farm—a soldier from Ohio noted that Lieutenant John Raidaie “sallied forth in the direction of Roper’s Knob, and he was rewarded by finding large numbers of the aforesaid ‘contraband,’ as the slave owners of

Kentucky had sent their slaves to Tennessee, to keep them as far away as possible from the Union lines...These slaves we kept in camp until the fort was completed” (Flagel 2016:37–38). During the war, dozens of self-emancipated Black freedmen were mustered into the U.S. Colored Troops at Franklin (Flagel 2016:37–38; Gertner 2019b).




Figure 6. Map showing a detailed configuration of the military fortification on William Johnson’s farm (Source: Willett 1865).




Figure 7. Map showing a detailed configuration of military fortification on William Johnson's farm (Source: Ruger 1865).

The fortification on William Johnson's farm was built at the site of Johnson's circa-1840 farmhouse, which U.S. Army soldiers burned down on April 20, 1863. The soldiers also burned Johnson's outbuildings. The hexagonal fortification faced northwest towards the Franklin Turnpike with an opening at the southeast side. A detailed map created on April 10, 1863, by Dr. Samuel Scott Boyd (1820–1888), a Federal regimental surgeon from Indiana, claimed: "House burned here—to make room for fort" (Flagel 2016:44, 84). During their occupation of Franklin, U.S. Army soldiers destroyed dwellings, barns, and outbuildings—all owned by Confederate resisters—for construction of Federal fortifications (Flagel 2016:82–83).

Dr. Boyd's map also described the fortification on William Johnson's farm as a redan atop a 100-foot-high hill with long-term encampments and a parade ground for several regiments from the Army of Illinois. (Redans are small V-shaped structures; lunettes are larger hexagonal-shaped structures.) The parade ground also featured a field hospital flanked by the encampment headquarters and Dr. Boyd's tent. The field hospital and encampment headquarters were undoubtedly housed in temporary canvas

tents. The map also shows a spring with “cool water” on the east side of the T&A Railroad and a fruit nursery on the neighboring William A. Truett Sr. farm as well as several farmhouses along the turnpike (Figure 8; Fligel 2016:44, 84; Smith et al 2003:110–116).

In a letter dated May 29, 1863, Captain William E. Merrill (1837–1891), a military engineer with the U.S. Army, provided a description of fortifications on four hilltops—including Johnson’s farm—between Fort Granger and Roper’s Knob as “irregularly shaped batteries for Artillery solely.” Merrill explained that these fortifications were “first barbette batteries, but have since been turned into embrasure batteries and surrounded by carefully constructed abattis” (Merrill 1863).




Figure 8. Map showing the military fortification on William Johnson’s farm, 1863 (Source: Fligel 2016:44).

William E. Merrill—Mapmaker

During the war, Captain William E. Merrill served as head of the Topographical Department of the Army of the Cumberland. Merrill graduated from West Point Academy in 1859 and served as an assistant professor of engineering there from 1860 to 1861. Under his direction, the Topographical

Department developed advanced mapmaking technology such as lithographic presses and a mobile photoprinting device, which allowed the cartographers to produce updated maps in real time. Merrill's team produced meticulous and detailed maps, which proved essential for tactical planning and operational maneuvering (Bigelow 2022).

Fortification Description

A series of military maps created under the direction of Captain William E. Merrill and U.S. Army regimental surgeon Dr. Samuel S. Boyd (see Figures 4–8) suggest that the fortification on the crown of the hill on Johnson's farm was a hexagonal lunette with V-shaped salient points facing north, east, and west towards the Franklin Turnpike and the T&A Railroad. The gap in the rear southeast side—facing Fort Granger—was left open for easier access by Federal troops. Lunettes were constructed from earthworks or other material such as wood or stone. A lunette fortification contained short flanks, approximately 10-feet in length, for firing into advancing troops (American Battlefield Trust 2023, 2024; Smith et al 1990:14–15, 30–31; Smith et al 2003:106, 113–116).

William E. Merrill's 1863 description suggests that the hilltop lunette on Johnson's farm was initially constructed with a barbette battery before being enhanced with an embrasure battery and external abattis. A barbette was a protective circular armor support or ground parapet for a heavy gun turret or cannon. A barbette provided better angles of fire but less protection from hostile fire. An embrasure was an opening in a battlement such as a port or merlon hollowed out of a solid wall. Featuring an opening that was flared inward, an embrasure provided more protection and mobility for Union soldiers taking aim at Confederate soldiers (American Battlefield Trust 2023, 2024). Dr. Boyd's 1863 map indicates that the lunette on Johnson's farm contained 12 cannons, making it the largest fortification north of Franklin besides Fort Granger, which had 30 cannons, including 6 large siege guns and 24 smaller field cannons (Flagel 2016:44; Gertner 2019c; Smith et al 1990:62).

Merrill's military maps also suggest that the interior of the fortification had a raised magazine or traverse for storing artillery ammunition, powder, and weapons (see Figures 6–8). The traverse could have been constructed with heavy timber and soil, making it bombproof. The traverse ran perpendicular to the parapet to protect against flanking fire and limit Confederate attackers from expanding any breach (American Battlefield Trust 2023, 2024; Smith et al 1990:30–31, 65).

Merrill's letter also suggests that the fortification featured an abattis (Merrill 1863). An abattis was a field fortification consisting of an obstacle formed of felled trees and/or branches laid in a row, with the sharpened tops directed outwards, towards the enemy. The trees were usually interlaced or tied with wire. The abattis kept the approaching enemy under fire for as long as possible (American Battlefield Trust 2023, 2024; Smith et al 1990:27, 62).

Based on Merrill's 1863 description of Fort Granger, it is possible that the fortification on Johnson's farm also exhibited a system of rifle pits, large trees with cleats and platforms used as lookouts, field ditches, and a sundial prepared on a stump. The sundial allowed regulation of time. The fields surrounding the fortification would have been cleared of all trees and shelters that could be used by Confederate forces (Merrill 1863).

Spring-fed Cistern

Merrill's 1863 description of Fort Granger and its surrounding fortifications mentions two cisterns capable of holding 4,500 gallons of water at Roper's Knob and a third cistern capable of holding 9,000 gallons of water at Fort Granger. The water was necessary to sustain the 10,600 infantrymen stationed at Fort Granger and the surrounding fortifications. Fresh water was especially necessary to ward off typhoid, scurvy, diarrhea, dysentery, tuberculosis, smallpox, pneumonia, and other communicable diseases, which resulted in the deaths of hundreds of U.S. Army soldiers during their occupation of Franklin during the war. A spring-fed cistern would also prevent contamination by human or animal excrement or blood from dead horses, mules, or cattle. Water was also needed to cool cannons that heated up during battle, sometime resulting in explosions (Chandonnet n.d.; Flagel 2016:39–68; Gertner 2019c; Merrill 1863).

Considering the construction techniques and characteristics of the spring-fed stone cistern on Johnson's farm, it is possible that it was constructed by members of the U.S. Army. The cistern was built on a nearly perfect 5-foot grid with a 10-foot by 21-foot, 9-inch pit served by a 5-foot by 10-foot staircase within a 15-foot-long sallyport-type opening. The stone steps are 12 inches wide and 6 inches tall. The pit is 6 feet deep. The pit has a 20-foot-long underground square-shaped stone box culvert with a 2-foot-wide and 5-foot-long stone discharge. Located north of the pit, the L-shaped discharge had an 8-foot-long diversion stone. The discharge fed a small watering hole alongside the T&A Railroad (Figure 9). A review of TDOA's surveys of Civil War military sites did not contain any references to cisterns; however, the survey reports are not all-inclusive.

Parade Grounds and Encampments

During the U.S. Army's occupation of William Johnson's farm, the Federal soldiers used the farmland for a variety of purposes, including long-term encampments with rows of tents and camp sites. Long-term encampments for thousands of soldiers involved making camp sites, tending to field equipment, and cooking meals. Each day, soldiers likely marched into town as a show of force. At night, troops likely implemented calls to arms and exchanged gunfire to test the strength of defensive lines. At all hours of the day, sentries demanded that townspeople stop and give countersigns at checkpoints. Infantrymen were roused from sleep with blaring bugles and rattling drums before sunrise. Drills occurred during the morning hours and afterwards work commenced on fortifications. Dress parades with battle flags and music were assembled on the parade grounds. Union infantrymen practiced their shooting skills, easily expending 2,000 rounds per day. Booming artillery could be heard for over 12 miles or more. As part of practice routines, gunnery within the fortifications was fired with live rounds at distant targets. At night, drunken revelry, brawls, and late-night howls were not uncommon. Additionally, the long-term encampments included a field hospital, regimental field headquarters, and a contraband camp for self-emancipated enslaved people. Records indicate the contraband camp was on the William Alpheus Truett farm along the south side of Johnson's farm (Flagel 2016:89–93; Gertner 2019c, 2019d; Smith et al. 1990:41–45; Smith et al. 2003:166–179).




Figure 9. Drawing of the spring-fed stone cistern at Johnson's Farm.

Battle of Franklin

On November 30, 1864, the Battle of Franklin was fought during the Franklin–Nashville Campaign, a series of battles in the Western Theater that took place from September to December 1864 in Alabama, Tennessee, and northwest Georgia. During the Battle of Franklin, Confederate Lieutenant General John Bell Hood (1831–1879) led the Army of Tennessee with some 30,000 soldiers against Major General John M. Schofield (1831–1906) and the Army of Ohio with some 27,000 soldiers.

Hood attacked from the south, and the battle resulted in the deaths of nearly 2,000 men, including 1,750 Confederate soldiers and 189 Federal soldiers. Of the over 4,800 men injured, 3,800 were Confederate soldiers and 1,033 Federal soldiers. And over 1,800 men were captured or missing in action, comprising 702 Confederate soldiers and 1,104 Federal soldiers. Among the casualties during the battle were 14 Confederate generals and 55 regimental commanders. “This signal defeat deeply depressed the enemy,” claimed Captain William E. Merrill, and “Gen. Schofield withdrew his troops to Nashville during the night without further molestation” (Merrill 1865). During the battle, Gen. Schofield observed the fighting from Fort Granger (Gertner 2019c). The subsequent Battle of Nashville resulted in a second defeat of the Confederate Army, effectively destroying the Army of Tennessee as a fighting force for the remainder of the war.

The Franklin Battlefield (NHL 1960; NRHP 1966) was centered on the Carnton plantation (NRHP 1973) and the Carter House (NHL 1960) on the south side of Franklin. During the battle, the fortification on William Johnson’s farm was left vacant (Figure 10), and U.S. Captain Giles J. Cockerill commanded four cannons at Fort Granger. Cockerill’s guns fired 163 rounds and inflicted serious losses to the Confederates as it marched towards the U.S. Army defenses (Dover 2011). After a long night of fighting, the Union troops withdrew from Franklin along the Franklin Turnpike and headed north to Nashville. Along with Fort Granger, the fortifications on the northern outskirts of Franklin—including the fortification on William Johnson’s farm—were soon abandoned. Following the Union victory during the Battle of Nashville in mid-December, the U.S. Army reoccupied some of the fortifications at Franklin until the end of the war (Thomason 1999:4). It is unknown if Union troops reoccupied the fortification on William Johnson’s farm; however, the fortification continued to be shown on military maps (see Figures 4–6).

Post-Civil War

Upon the end of the Civil War in 1865, the Federal soldiers garrisoned at Fort Granger for several months. They may have disassembled the hilltop fortification on Johnson’s farm, as they did with other fortifications throughout the South; however, the soldiers most likely abandoned it, like they did the nearby Fort Granger. In 1909, an aging U.S. Army soldier from Illinois returned to Fort Granger where he found the “old fort stands neglected, a labyrinth of brush vines and timber growing on the parapet and from the sides of the trenches” (Flagel 2016: 167–168) The main embankments, some 30 embrasures, and the magazine were still visible. Records indicate that the Union army eventually returned Johnson’s farm to his ownership although it was undoubtedly decimated with trees having been cut down, the farmhouse and outbuildings destroyed, and farm animals stolen. Johnson’s enslaved farm workers had been emancipated, and their dwellings were likely destroyed. The

encampments and parade grounds were littered with beds, tents, chairs, stools, boxes, and lumber (Flagel 2016:146, 160, 167–168).




Figure 10. Map showing the unoccupied military fortification on William Johnson's farm (Source: Comstock 1890:50).

After the Union soldiers burned their farmhouse down on April 20, 1863, the Johnson family moved to Franklin. The 1870 census listed the family as living in a house at the intersection of South Margin Street and 3rd Avenue in Franklin. Johnson's neighbors included John Spry Park (1819–1907), a prominent physician, and Francis Ann Crockett Marshall (1821–1893), the widow of Judge John Marshall (1803–1863), a wealthy attorney who died during the Civil War. In 1870, Johnson's household included his wife Sarah E. Johnson; their youngest daughter Samuella "Sammie" Johnson; Anna McGrew (b.1853), a 17-year-old female from Texas; and Petry Dempsey (b.1816), a Black domestic servant. That year, Johnson's property was valued at \$15,000 and the value of Johnson's personal estate was \$3,000 (U.S. Census 1870b).

The 1870 census lists a 480-acre farm in this vicinity owned or managed by "Johnson & Son." Containing 250 improved acres and 230 wooded acres, this farm was valued at \$19,000 with farming implements valued at \$2,000. On the farm there were 6 cattle, 6 oxen, 4 milk cows, 80 sheep, and 40 swine. The farm produced 600 bushels of wheat, 1,000 bushels of Indian corn, 3 bales of cotton, 50 bushels of Irish potatoes, \$300 worth of orchard products, 250 lbs. of butter, and 6 tons of hay. That year, the value of the farm products sold was \$2,630. Records indicate that both of Johnson's sons had moved to Richmond, Georgia, by 1870, where they worked for the railroad, so it is unknown who the "son" referred to in the census (U.S. Census 1870a, 1870b).

Between 1865 and 1867, two of Johnson's daughters married and left home. On October 19, 1865, Laura Johnson married Theodore Lockett Lanier (b.1846), an attorney, and moved to Waverly in Humphreys County, Tennessee. Two years later, on October 16, 1867, Lavinia Johnson married James Robert Hodge (1843–1907), a farmer in Franklin. She died on May 20, 1873, two weeks after the birth of their third child, and was buried at Rest Haven Cemetery (NRHP 2012) in Franklin (Malone 2024; U.S. Census 1880).

Johnson's wife Sarah E. Johnson died on April 15, 1872. She was buried at Rest Haven Cemetery in Franklin (Find a Grave 2004). After his wife died, William Johnson and his daughter Sammie Johnson moved to Waverly to live with his daughter Laura Lanier and her family. At Waverly, Sammie Johnson was employed as a music teacher. In January 1881, she married J. C. Young (Ancestry.com 2008; U.S. Census 1880).

The farm is shown on an 1878 map of Williamson County as owned by "W. Johnson" with "Mrs. M. Reynolds" to the north, "A. Truett" to the south," and "J. Hodge" to the east. To the west, the map shows "D. Youngman," "W. Farmer" and "E. Winston." The map does not identify an associated dwelling with Johnson's farm, indicating that Johnson continued to live in Franklin and did not return to the farm after the Civil War (Figure 11; Beers 1878).




Figure 11. Map of Williamson County showing Johnson’s farm, 1878
(Source: Beers 1878)

James R. Hodge, 1882–1882

After William Johnson and his daughter Sammie Johnson moved to Waverly, he most likely leased the farm to tenants. On August 4, 1882, four of his children and their spouses sold the 256-acre farm to James Robert Hodge, the widower of Lavina *Johnson* Hodge, their sibling who had died in 1873. Hodge paid the group of eight people \$3,600 for the farm (WCDB 1882a:233–235). The sellers comprised:

- T. L. Lanier and his wife Laura Lanier of Humphreys County, Tennessee
- J. C. Young and his wife Samuella Young of Humphreys County, Tennessee
- S. K. Johnson and his wife Sophie L. Johnson of New York City
- James B. Johnson and his wife Mary Johnson of Fulton County, Georgia

The deed was filed as “S. K. Johnson Et Al,” since Sebastian King Johnson, the oldest son, filed the paperwork with the Williamson County register of deeds in Franklin. Laura *Johnson* Lanier and her

husband Theodore L. Lanier and Samuella *Johnson* Young and her husband J. C. Young signed affidavits at the county clerk's office in Humphreys County, Tennessee. James B. and Mary Johnson signed affidavits at the county clerk's office in Fulton County, Georgia (WCDB 1882a:233–235).

James R. Hodge was the former son-in-law of William Johnson and a Confederate veteran. Hodge grew up at a nearby farm known as Rebel's Rest (WM-138) and had married Lavinia Johnson on October 16, 1867. Lavinia gave birth to three daughters: Sarah Jane Hodge (1868–1897), Irene Johnson Hodge (1870–1923), and Lavinia May Hodge (1873–1958). Lavinia Johnson died two weeks after giving birth to Lavinia May on May 13, 1873. On January 21, 1875, James R. Hodge married Mary Frances “Fannie” McEwen (1851–1928). They raised three children—James Dalton Hodge (1876–1926), John Wesley Hodge (1878–1897), and Ethel Hodge (1881–1965) (Bright 2024; Find a Grave 2012a).

A wealthy landowner, James R. Hodge sold the property about a month after purchasing it (WCDB 1882b:238-240).

Cannon Family, 1882–1947

The Cannon family owned the property from 1882 to 1947. The following is an overview of their ownership.

Jennie B. Cannon, 1882–1931

On September 9, 1882, James R. Hodge sold the 258-acre farm to Virginia “Jennie” Brown *McEwen* Cannon (1853–1935) for \$5,000. Jennie Cannon was the wife of Newton C. Cannon Sr. (1847–1925), a grocery merchant in Franklin and a grandson of Newton Cannon (1781–1841), a famous politician who served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1814 to 1817 and 1819 to 1823 and as the governor of Tennessee from 1835 to 1893. (Cannon County is named in his honor.) James R. Hodge and Jeannie Cannon were neighbors on Liberty Pike just east of the property (U.S. Census 1880, 1900; WCDB 1882b:238–240).

To obtain a clear title to the property, Hodge was required to file a lawsuit against his three young daughters—Sarah Jane, Irene, and Lavinia May—with the Williamson County Chancery Court on November 28, 1882. Legally, his daughters retained ownership of the 109-acre life estate granted by William Johnson to his wife Sarah E. Johnson, who died in 1872. The life estate then passed to Sarah E. Johnson's daughter Lavinia Johnson, who died in 1873, and then to Lavinia Johnson's three daughters. In effect, the three young girls—Sarah Jane, Irene, and Lavinia May Johnson—owned a 109-acre section of the farm that their father sold to Jennie Cannon. Jennie Cannon and her husband Newton Cannon joined Hodge in the complaint. On December 9, 1882, James R. Hodge, then 89 years of age, filed a deposition regarding the land sale. Hodge stated that the farm had “no improvements on it” and that the \$5,000 sale price was fair (Ancestry.com 2007:1882, Roll B-88).

On December 16, 1882, William Alpheus Truett, a longtime neighbor to the south, filed a deposition, which provided a description of the farm. Truett described the farm as featuring “not much fences on

it” and “one Spring that runs through” and “a cistern of the tract, that furnishes water the year around.” Truett also stated that that farm did not have “a house on the place, but one little old spring.” Truett described the farm as “in very good repair having been leased out for several years.” In conclusion, Truett agreed that the \$5,000 sale price was a “good & fair price” for the farm and that a 109-acre section could not be naturally partitioned out (Ancestry.com 2007:1882, Roll B-88).

On December 23, 1882, Abner William Moss (1820–1908), a 62-year-old neighbor to the southeast, filed a deposition regarding the sale of the farm. Moss indicated that renters of the farm were productive on an annual basis. He stated that “most of the fences inclosing said lands are either inferior stone fences, or decayed post & plank fences” and that there were “no cross fences or timbered land on the place.” Moss also described the farm as being incumbered with the railroad that ran through it and “there is but one lasting Spring on the place, and it is situated in the back or N. E. corner of the farm.” He claimed that “several winter springs on the place cannot be relied upon for water supply, the whole year for man or beast.” In conclusion, Moss supported James R. Hodge’s desire to sell the property as a whole, without carving out a 109-acre section (Ancestry.com 2007:1882, Roll B-88).

On January 8, 1883, the judge decided in favor of James R. Hodge and Jennie Cannon that the 109-acre life estate could not be naturally partitioned out and the entire 258-acre farm should be sold to Jennie Cannon with Newton Cannon paying all legal costs incurred (Ancestry.com 2007:1882, Roll B-88).

In 1880, Jeannie Cannon lived on a farm adjacent to James R. Hodge on Liberty Pike. That year, her household included her husband and four children—John Brown Cannon (1874–1917), Leah America Cannon (1875–1915), Cynthia Graham Cannon (1877–1969), and Newton C. Cannon Jr. (1879–1942). Her household also included an African American family consisting of Mart DeGraffenried (b.1850), Bill DeGraffenried (b.1875), and an infant Foster DeGraffenried (b.1878). Likely a formerly enslaved person, Mart DeGraffenried was the family a cook and Bill DeGraffenried was a farm laborer (U.S. Census 1880).

By 1900, Jeannie Cannon and her family had moved to Maple Street in Franklin. Her family had grown to include three more children—Saul P. Cannon (1882), William Perkins Cannon (1885–1940), and Newton Brashear Cannon (1891–1947). By 1910, Jeannie and Newton Cannon lived in a large brick Italianate-style house at 612 Fair Street in the Hincheyville Historic District (NRHP 1982; Pierson 2024; U.S. Census 1880, 1900, 1910, 1920).

Records indicate that Jennie B. Cannon used the land as a tenant farm. The occupants of the farm during her ownership from 1882 to 1931 are unknown. Historic maps and aerial imagery indicate Cannon improved the farm with a dwelling and support outbuildings (Figure 12).




Figure 12. Map of Williamson County showing the farm, 1909
 (Source: USGS Quad Franklin, TN, 1909).

In 1925, Jeannie Cannon's husband Newton C. Cannon Sr. died. Around that time, Jeannie Cannon's son William Perkins Cannon, a graduate of Battle Ground Academy and wholesale grocer, moved to the farm in 1928, after marrying his second wife in 1925. His first wife Katie Elizabeth *Rolffs* Cannon (1887–1922) had died in 1922. William Perkins Cannon lived in a farmhouse facing Franklin Pike at the southern side of the farm (Figure 13) with his second wife Susie McDonald *Beavans* Cannon (1872–1959)—a widow from Clarksville, Tennessee—and three children: Henry Rolffs Cannon (1917–1997), Alice McEwen *Cannon* Patterson (1917–2002), and Virginia “Jennie” M. *Cannon* West (1918–1977). In 1930, the farmhouse's address was 1001 Nashville Pike (Ancestry.com 2008; Find a Grave 2012b, 2013; Nashville Banner, 23 February 1940:4; U.S. Census 1920, 1930).



Figure 13. Photograph of the 1928 farmhouse constructed by William Perkins Cannon, looking northeast with the hilltop fortification to the left, February 2025.

In January 1926, Jennie Cannon hired the J. M. Burke Company to prepare a survey of the farm. On February 25, 1927, Jennie Cannon temporarily transferred ownership of the 258-acre farm to her son Newton C. Cannon Jr. (1879–1942), two years after the death of her husband Newton C. Cannon Sr. (WCDB 1927a:269). Newton C. Cannon Jr. lived at the Cannon family home at 612 Fair Street in Franklin with his wife Nancy Jane Cannon (1890–1966) and son Newton C. “Newt” Cannon III (1921–1981). Newton C. Cannon Jr. was a banker with the Harpeth National Bank in Franklin and a community leader (Tennessean, 3 December 1942; U.S. Census 1920, 1930). For unknown reasons, three days later, on February 28, 1927, Newton C. Cannon Jr., along with his wife Jane Henderson Cannon, transferred the property back to his mother. The land transfer was most likely associated with the transfer of a portion of the farm to her son William Perkins Cannon for construction of a farmhouse in 1928 at the southern end of the farm (Griffith 2024; WCDB 1927b:270).

In 1929, Jennie B. Cannon sold a 27-acre portion of the farm along the south side, adjoining the Truett farm, to the Nashville-based Allen Manufacturing Company for construction of a stove works manufacturing factory. The factory was served by the L&N Railroad. The large factory opened in September 1929. Three years later, in December 1932, O. L. Dortch purchased the factory, where he operated the Dortch Stove Works Company. Employing some 300 residents, the stove factory operated until 1962 when it was converted into a bedding factory (Johnson et al, 1997:7–10).

Newton C. Cannon Jr., 1931–1935

On April 11, 1931, Jennie B. Cannon once again transferred ownership of the farm back to her son Newton C. Cannon Jr. and his wife Jane Henderson Cannon. At the time, the farm contained

231.72 acres since she had sold the southern 27 acres in 1929 for construction of the Allen Manufacturing Company's stove works factory (WCDB 1931:474–475).

Records indicate that Newton C. Cannon Jr. used the land as a tenant farm. The 1930 census indicates that the occupant of the tenant house on the farm was James Edward “Ed” Fentress (1873–1943), a general farmer originally from Cheatham County. He lived here with his second wife Mary Etta Fentress (1894–1984), whom he married in 1921, and three daughters: Thelma Fentress (b.1918), Rose Virginia Fentress (1923–2012), and Sarah Leona Fentress (1929–2000). By 1940, he had moved to a farm on Johnson Hollow Road in Williamson County (Lane 2024; U.S. Census 1930, 1940).

William P. Cannon, 1935–1940

On February 13, 1935, Newton C. Cannon Jr. and his wife Jane Henderson Cannon sold the 231.72-acre farm to William Perkins Cannon for \$12,240.34, the amount owed on the farm's mortgage. The land transfer was made a few months before their mother Jennie B. Cannon died on May 13, 1935, and was buried in the family plot at the Mount Hope Cemetery in Franklin. William Perkins Cannon lived in the 1928 farmhouse at the south side of the farm (Griffith 2024; U.S. Census 1930, 1940; WCDB 1935:332–333).


Henry R. Cannon, 1940–1947

William Perkins Cannon died on February 20, 1940, and was buried in the family plot at Mount Hope Cemetery in Franklin. Upon his death, the farm was legally inherited by his children: Henry Rolffs Cannon, Alice McEwen Cannon, and Jennie Cannon. After Cannon's death, his widow Susie M. Cannon continued to live in the 1928 farmhouse with her three stepchildren. In 1940, the farm was valued at \$6,000 (Find a Grave 2012b; Nashville Banner, 23 February 1940:4; U.S. Census 1940).

Susie M. Cannon leased the farm out. In 1946, the leased farm was managed by James Terrell Tanner (1897–1958), who used the farm as an equestrian stud for Tennessee Walking Horses. Tanner was a notable Tennessee Walking Horse equestrian leader in Franklin. During the 1946 stud season, the farm featured Red Silver Allen (Figure 14), a four-year-old roan stallion sired by stallion Merry Boy (1925–1958) and a grandsire of stallion Roan Allen (1904–1930), one of the founding sires of the Tennessee Walking Horse industry. The stud fee for Red Silver Allen was \$25. The use of the Cannon Farm as an equestrian stud was undoubtedly due to its proximity to the Harlinsdale Farm (WM-67, NRHP 2006, 2023), one of the region's premier Tennessee Walking Horse studs in the 1930s and 1940s. Harlin Hayes (1911–1980), a neighbor of the Cannon family in the 1930s and 1940s, was the lead horse trainer and stable manager at the Harlinsdale Farm, which was home to stallion Midnight Sun (1940–1965), a grandsire of Roan Allen and a two-time World Grand Champion from 1945 to 1946 (Hudgins 1946:6; Jones 1997:10–12; Tennessean, 12 May 1946:46; West and Lynch 2005:12–15; U.S. Census 1930, 1940).

AT STUD

RED SILVER ALLEN 421739



This 4-year-old red roan stallion, a son of the famous sire, Merry Boy, is a horse of splendid conformation, with true type flat foot and running walk and perfect canter.

SIRE: Merry Boy, No. 350189, by Roan Allen F-38.

DAM: Jacob's Maud Allen, No. 410140, by Brantley's Roan Allen, Jr., No. 350066, by Roan Allen F-38.

This young stallion will make the 1946 season at the Cannon farm one-half mile North of Franklin on the Nashville Highway and will serve a limited number of selected mares. All care taken in handling but not responsible for accidents. Make your bookings now. Fee \$25.00.

J. T. TANNER

Phone 407 or 357-M

Franklin, Tennessee

Figure 14. Advertisement for Cannon Farm stud, 1946
(Source: Tennessean, 12 May 1946:46)

Henry R. Cannon was an office clerk who attended Battleground Military Academy and Vanderbilt University. During World War II, he served as a pilot in the U.S. Army Air Corps. After the war, he worked as a commercial pilot at Capitol Airways, Inc. On February 23, 1947, he married Sarah Ophelia Colley (1912–1996), a graduate of Ward-Belmont College in Nashville and a musical theater comedian better known by her stage name: Minnie Pearl. Henry R. Cannon served as her business manager. Minnie Pearl was best known for her performances on the Grand Ole Opry and the television show *Hee Haw*. After marriage, they lived in Nashville at 2308 West End Avenue (Colladay 2018; Find a Grave 2012b; Griffith 2024; Nashville Banner, 24 February 1947:3; Tennessean, 16 February 1947:27, 24 February 1947:3).

In 1957, Alice McEwen Cannon married Ray Coolidge Patterson (1923–2000) and raised a daughter, Katherine Elizabeth Stutts (1957–2019), in Franklin. Alice *Cannon* Patterson was employed by the Williamson County Health Department and later as a statistician for the State of Tennessee (Ancestry.com 2008; Tennessean, 18 September 2002:82).

In 1950, Jennie McEwen Cannon married Thomas Cardwell West (1906–1986). She attended George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville (Ancestry.com 2008; Tennessean, 19 May 1977:66).

Presumably, Susie M. Cannon and her daughters—Alice and Jennie—continued to live in the 1928 farmhouse until the siblings sold the property in 1947.

Howard and Lillie Hill, 1947–1986

On May 30, 1947, Henry R. Cannon and his two sisters—Alice Cannon and Jennie Cannon—sold the 231.72-acre farm for \$40,000 to Howard Hill and his wife Lillie E. Hill. Their stepmother, Susie M. Cannon, moved to the Harris Nursing Home on Columbia Avenue in Franklin, where she died on February 2, 1959. Susie M. Cannon was buried at the Cave Hill Cemetery (NRHP 1979) in Louisville, Kentucky (Ancestry.com 2011a; Find a Grave 2013; Nashville Banner, 3 February 1959:21; WCDB 1947:174–175).

A farmer originally from Maury County, Tennessee, Howard Homer Hill (1899–1972) married Lillie Ester Anglin (1901–1995) in January 1922. They raised five children: Hazel Beatrice *Hill* Groom (1922–2012), Dorothy Hester *Hill* Gardner (1924–1977), Helen Irene *Hill* Powers (1926–2015), Homer Roger Hill Sr. (1928–2020), and Hubert Marion Hill (1930–1995). Howard Hill served in the military during World War II and had previously owned a farm along Hillsboro Road in Williamson County (Ancestry.com 2008, 2011b; Find a Grave 2011; U.S. Census 1940).

In the late 1940s, the farm featured two dwellings—the 1928 farmhouse and circa-1885 tenant house—connected by a curvilinear driveway at the south side (Figure 15). Presumably, the Hill family initially lived in the 1928 farmhouse and continued to rent out the circa-1885 tenant house. In the 1950s, Hill constructed a one-story Ranch-style dwelling atop the hill where the fortification had been built during the Civil War. The red brick dwelling featured a front porch with columns, hipped roof, and a side wing on the south side. Facing west towards Franklin Road, the dwelling was accessed by a curvilinear paved driveway with a curvilinear concrete block retaining wall. Hill constructed

agricultural barns and outbuildings along a farm service road along the south and eastern edges of the farm. Howard and Lillie Hill sold a 3.43-acre section of the farm along the south edge, including the 1928 farmhouse, where three Ranch-style duplexes were built from 1968 to 1970 along Morningside Drive (Figures 16–18). In 2021, the 1928 farmhouse at 105 Morningside Drive and adjacent duplexes were renovated into vacation rental houses.

In 1950, Hill’s household included his wife Lillie E. Hill and his youngest son Hubert M. Hill. Howard H. Hill farmed the property until his death in 1972. After Hill died, his family demolished the barns, agricultural outbuildings, and the circa-1885 tenant house. His widow Lillie E. Hill continued to reside on the farm until 1986. She died in 1995. Both Howard and Lillie were buried at Williamson Memorial Gardens in Franklin (Tennessean, 7 October 1972:27, 15 August 1995:15; U.S. Census 1950).

The 1950 census indicates that the circa-1885 tenant house may have been occupied Riley J. Harper (1903–1976), a house carpenter. His household included his wife Mandy Elizabeth “Lizzie” *Barners* Harper (1902–1985), and two sons: Thomas R. Harper (b.1940) and Roger D. Harper (1942–1975). Harper had previously lived at 206 Margin Street in Franklin (Ancestry.com 2011a; Find a Grave 2015; U.S. Census 1940, 1950).




Figure 15. Map of Williamson County showing the farm, 1949 with the 1928 farmhouse to the southwest and the circa-1885 tenant house to the northeast (Source: USGS Quad Franklin, Tenn. [63-NE], 1949).




Figure 16. Map of Williamson County showing the farm, 1974
(Source: USGS Quad Franklin, Tenn. [63-NE], 1974).




Figure 17. Aerial photograph showing the circa-1885 tenant house (center) and barns, 1949 (Source: Tennessee Department of Agriculture 1949).



Figure 18. Photograph of the circa-1955 dwelling from Franklin Pike, 2016 (Source: Google Street View 2016).

Gordon E. Inman, 1986–1994

On December 15, 1986, Lillie E. Hill sold the remaining 21.16-acre portion of the farm for \$423,200 to Gordon E. Inman of Inman Realtors of Franklin, Tennessee (WCDB 1986:707–709). Aerial imagery indicates that the barns, agricultural outbuildings, and the circa-1885 tenant house had been demolished in the 1970s and 1980s, leaving only the circa-1955 hilltop dwelling (Nationwide Environmental Title Research [NETR] 1958, 1980, 1981, 1987). Records indicate that Ronnie Deason leased the farm during this period. During the TDOA survey in 1989, archaeologists interviewed Deason, who was inadvertently listed as the property owner on the TDOA survey site form (Nance and Prouty 1989:3).

Elias H. Attea Jr., 1994–1995

On November 29, 1994, Gordon E. Inman divided the property and sold the 16.19-acre section on the south side to Elias H. Attea Jr. of Franklin, Tennessee (WCDB 1994:498–500). Inman sold a 5-acre section on the north side to the congregation of the Franklin Church of Christ, founded in 1983 as the Chestnut Lane Church of Christ. In 1996, the congregation filed a permit for the construction of a Contemporary-style sanctuary building costing nearly \$900,000. The church had an address of 324 Franklin Road. The 5-acre parcel contained the mid-nineteenth-century stone spring-fed cistern constructed during the ownership of William Johnson as well as the former site of a barn constructed during the Cannon family ownership (Spanjian 1998:84–85; Tennessean, 1 May 1996:98).

Heritage Covenant Church, 1995–1997

On August 25, 1995, Elias H. Attea sold the 16.19-acre parcel to the congregation of the Heritage Covenant Church of Franklin, Tennessee, for the construction of a “Christian School and facility.” The deed contained a covenant that a Christian school must be in operation by December 31, 1997, or the property would revert to Attea (WCDB 1995a:761–763; 1995b:764–767).

Elias H. Attea Jr., 1997–1997

On February 25, 1997, the congregation of the Heritage Covenant Church defaulted on the mortgage and transferred ownership of the 16.19-acre parcel back to Elias H. Attea Jr. of Franklin, Tennessee (WCDB 1997:615–618).

Dale G. and Linda B. Van Gorden, 1997–2003

On April 1, 1997, Elias H. Attea Jr. sold the 16.19-acre property to Dale G. and Linda B. Van Gorden of Franklin, Tennessee. The covenant requiring a Christian school to operate on the property was revoked (WCDB 1997b:768–770).

Trace Development LLC, 2003–2012

On September 2, 2003, Dale G. and Linda B. Van Gorden sold the 16.19-acre property to Trace Development, LLC of Franklin, Tennessee (WCDB 2003:652–654).

R. Harvey Johnston III, 2012–2015

On October 24, 2012, Trace Development LLC sold the 16.19-acre property to R. Harvey Johnston III of Bowling Green, Kentucky (WCDB 2012:756–759). Johnston demolished the house and barns in 2017.

Franklin 240 LLC, 2015–2025

On December 1, 2015, R. Harvey Johnston III sold the 16.19-acre property to Franklin 240, LLC of Bowling Green, Kentucky (WCDB 2015:304–307).

Expected Archeological Potential

Previously Recorded Sites

A review of the TDOA Site File Hub indicates that there is one previously recorded archaeological site located within the project site: 40WM104. In addition to the site located within the project area, there are also 23 previously recorded archaeological sites located within 1 mile of the project area. Those sites are summarized in Table 1. These sites include several Civil War-era military fortifications and encampments, such as Fort Granger (40WM100), which was initially documented in the 1970s and listed on the NRHP in 1973 (Smith et al 1990:50–51).

40WM104

Site 40WM104 is a Civil War-era military fortification that the TDOA surveyed in 1989. When it was recorded, the approximately 2-acre site consisted of a remnant earthwork on top of the hill behind the circa-1955 dwelling. TDOA noted that the site type consisted of military, earthwork, encampment, and lunette. The site was recorded as heavily disturbed, and no subsurface testing was completed. At the time of the survey, Ronnie Deason indicated that “relic hunters” had previously removed Civil War-era artifacts such as bullets and belt buckles from the site (Nance and Prouty 1989:3). In 1990, the site was included in the TDOA’s survey report on 143 Civil War period military sites in Middle Tennessee within a group of archaeological sites determined “Probably Not eligible for Listing on the National Register” (Smith et al 1990:25, 49–50). In 2003, the site was also included in the TDOA’s survey report on 443 Civil War period military sites throughout Tennessee (Smith et al 2003:89, 116).

Table 1. Previously recorded archaeological sites within 1-mile of the project site.

Site Number	Cultural Affiliation	Temporal Period	Site Type
40WM6	Prehistoric; Historic	Mississippian; 1901–1932	Prehistoric; cemetery
40WM17	Prehistoric	Archaic	Open habitation
40WM18	Undetermined	Undetermined	Open habitation
40WM19	Prehistoric	Archaic	Open habitation
40WM20	Undetermined; Historic	Undetermined; 1820–1860	Open habitation; Stone quarry
40WM44	Prehistoric	Archaic	Open habitation
40WM96	Prehistoric	Undetermined	Open habitation

Site Number	Cultural Affiliation	Temporal Period	Site Type
40WM99	Prehistoric	Archaic and Woodland	Open habitation
40WM100	Historic	1861–1865	Military fort
40WM101	Historic	1861–1865	Military
40WM102	Historic	1861–1865	Military earthwork
40WM103	Historic	1861–1865	Military earthwork
40WM104	Historic	1861–1865	Military earthwork
40WM120	Historic	1820–present	Military short-term hospital
40WM121	Historic	1820–present	Military short-term hospital
40WM237	Prehistoric	Woodland	Open habitation
40WM325	Prehistoric; Historic	Archaic and Woodland; 1861–1865	Open habitation; Military
40WM326	Historic	1866–1900	Cemetery
40WM411	Prehistoric; Historic	Undetermined; 1820–present	Open habitation; Rural domestic farmstead
40WM412	Prehistoric	Undetermined	Open habitation
40WM415	Historic	1760–present	Site
40WM451	Historic	1866–present	Rural domestic farmstead
40WM452	Historic	1866–present	Rural domestic farmstead
40WM509	Historic	1901–present	Rural domestic scatter

Historic Resources

Based on a review of historic maps and archival research, the APE has been intermittently occupied between circa 1840 and 1986 by the Johnson, Cannon, and Hill families. During this nearly 150-year time span, the farm featured eight dwellings, including four dwellings for enslaved Black persons and a circa-1885 tenant house. Two additional houses were built in association with the property in 1928 and circa 1955. Only the 1928 house remains; however, it is located outside the APE. The APE is also the location of a Civil War-era military fortification and encampment, recorded as TDOA archaeological site 40WM104. Very little above-ground evidence of the Civil War-era military site remains; however, no systematic subsurface testing has been undertaken to explore any possible remnants of the fortification. Based on the known historic use of the project site, there is a high probability for subsurface historic archaeological resources to be identified.

Precontact Resources

There are multiple previously recorded pre-contact archaeological sites within a 1-mile radius of the project site. The proximity of the APE to the Harpeth River, approximately 0.7 miles to the south, and known resources indicate that the area could have been inhabited prior to European contact; however, as this survey is focused on identifying historic metal artifacts using a metal detector, the likelihood of identifying pre-contact materials is low.

4. RESEARCH GOALS AND METHODS

The cultural resources documentation was completed to satisfy rezoning requirements of the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission. The goals of the survey were to identify resources associated with the Civil War within the approximately 10-acre APE. As part of this effort, RGA archaeologists performed background research, a pedestrian survey, and a metal detecting survey to fulfill these goals. RGA architectural historians also conducted archival research, a comprehensive property history, and a reconnaissance survey of above-ground resources on the 16.19-acre parcel and adjacent parcels.

The metal detecting survey consisted of detecting along transects spaced at 5-meter intervals throughout the project site. In areas where dense vegetation impeded formal transects, the area was surveyed based on accessibility. All metal detector finds that were determined to predate 1950 were collected and the location was recorded with a Trimble Geo7x GPS unit with sub-meter accuracy. Metal detector finds that dated to 1950 or later were disposed of in the field. Barbed fence wire, which was abundant throughout the project site, was also disposed of in the field.

The reconnaissance survey of above-ground resources included digital photography and field notes of remnants of the hilltop military fortification and infrastructure associated with the circa 1955 dwelling. The survey included digital photography, field notes, and measured drawings of the spring-fed stone cistern on an adjacent parcel to the north. Digital photographs were also taken of the 1928 dwelling on an adjacent parcel to the south.

Laboratory Methods

The project artifacts, documents, field notes, and photographs were processed at RGA's Tennessee Branch Office in Nashville. Artifacts were cleaned with water and soft brushes, dried overnight, and placed in 4-mil plastic bags with project information on the outside of the bag, as well as on a bag tag. At the close of the project, all project materials will be returned to the client.

5. SURVEY RESULTS

Archaeological Fieldwork

The archaeological fieldwork consisted of a metal detector survey which spanned four days on January 16–17, 2025, and January 28–29, 2025. The site conditions allowed metal detecting along a 5-meter grid throughout most of the site; however, the northeastern portion of the site is wooded and was surveyed only where vegetation density allowed (Figure 19). The ground cover in the open fields consisted of grass and various weeds and thistle, therefore surface visibility was low (Figures 20–21). In addition to the metal detector survey, the entirety of the project site was walked over by the project archaeologist to document any above ground resources.

Metal Detector Survey Results

The metal detector survey resulted in the recovery of 85 artifacts from 65 metal detector locations (Figure 22; Appendices B and C). Of the 85 recovered artifacts, 67 are metal, 11 are glass, and 7 are ceramic. The non-metal artifacts were all recovered in association with metal artifacts. The artifacts were recovered throughout the site with light concentrations in the vicinity of previous structures. The presence of artifacts further away from the location of buildings and structures that are no longer extant is likely the result of erosion, plowing, and other human activities over a long span of time.

One probable refuse pile was identified at metal detector locations 52–54, where most of the broken glass and ceramics were recovered. The date range for these artifacts varied from 1820 to present and they were fragmented and some exhibited evidence of burning. Due to the presence of recent materials, such as a 1960's Pyrex bowl shard, this collection of artifacts is interpreted as a refuse pile rather than an encampment. Further archaeological testing within this area could help confirm if it does indeed represent a refuse pile.

The most common artifact type from the project site is a Type B square cut nail, which dates from approximately 1820 to 1900 (Figure 23). The square cut nails were found throughout the project site and do not appear to be concentrated around any previous structures. Square cut nails are the earliest machine-made nails and evolved from earlier wrought iron nails. Type A square cut nails, which were patented in the 1790s, were sheared from iron bars by a machine and then the nail head was attached by hand (Nelson 1968). Advancements in machinery allowed for Type B nails, which were entirely machine made and allowed for the mass production of nails. Type B nails were used throughout most of the nineteenth century and were replaced by wire cut nails by the early twentieth century.

Other artifacts that were found in multiples and have specific date ranges include horseshoes (n=4; date range late nineteenth century–present; Figure 24), metal water pumps (n=2; date range 1900–present), milk glass shards (n=2; date range 1890–1960); and whiteware sherds (n=4; date range 1820–present).




Figure 19. Metal detecting transect map (Source: Esri 2022).



Figure 20. View of the project site, looking northwest towards the hilltop from the center of the site.



Figure 21. View of the project site, looking north from the southern edge.




Figure 22. Results of the metal detector survey (Source: Esri 2022).



Figure 23. Photograph of selected Type B square cut nails recovered from the site.



Figure 24. Photograph of the horseshoes recovered from the site.

Pedestrian Survey Results

Four above-ground structures were identified during the pedestrian survey including a spring-fed stone cistern, concrete block retaining walls, a concrete drainage feature, and remnants of a dry stacked stone structure. The mid-nineteenth century cistern is located outside the APE, but within the original farm boundary and was documented to help understand the timeline of the property (Figures 25–27). The remaining three structures are located within the APE on top of the hill. The curvilinear concrete block retaining wall and concrete drainage feature are attributed to the circa-1955 dwelling, which was demolished in 2017. The dry stacked stone structure is attributed to the Civil War-era lunette and is described in greater detail in Chapter 3 (Figures 28–29).



Figure 25. Photograph of the stone cistern looking northwest, February 2025.



Figure 26. Photograph of the stone cistern looking northeast, February 2025.



Figure 27. Photograph of the stone cistern discharge looking northwest, February 2025.



Figure 28. Photograph of the hilltop lunette looking west, February 2025.



Figure 29. Photograph of the hilltop lunette looking southwest, February 2025.

Site Interpretation

The artifacts and above-ground structures identified during the survey represent a continued occupation by the Johnson, Cannon, and Hill families since at least 1840. None of the artifacts can be definitively attributed to the Civil War fortification or encampments that took place within the 10-acre APE and surrounding project area. While some artifacts date to the period of the Civil War, these are primarily architectural artifacts mostly found in association with farmsteads and domestic spaces.

The fact that metal artifacts were recovered from the entirety of the project site while definitive Civil War era artifacts were not recovered suggests that the area has been heavily looted over the years and any artifacts that may be perceived as valuable have already been collected. This is further underscored by the findings in the 1989 TDOA survey for site 40WM104, which noted that Civil War-era bullets and belt buckles had previously been taken from the site (Nance and Prouty 1989:3).

The conclusion that most Civil War-era military sites have been looted over the years by a “veritable army of specialized relic collectors” using metal detectors is further elaborated on in the 1990 TDOA survey report on Civil War military sites in Middle Tennessee (Smith et al 1990:50). This report concluded that all 143 military sites that TDOA surveyed in Middle Tennessee from 1988–1989 had experienced “at least some relic collecting activity” (Smith et al 1990:50). The 2003 TDOA survey report on Civil War military sites throughout Tennessee concluded that sites had been “torn to shreds by random holes dug for the sole purpose of obtaining collectible artifacts” (Smith et al 2003:212).

The 1990 TDOA survey report also determined that the reliance of metal detectors by relic hunters resulted in non-metal military artifacts, such as broken glass and ceramic containers, being left behind (Smith et al 1990:51). In 1994, Smith interpreted the findings of the survey report in *Look to the Earth: Historical Archaeology and the American Civil War* (Smith 1994:60–75). Smith focused on the distribution of 786 Civil War artifacts excavated at the Carter House, a centerpiece of the Battle of Franklin.

Currently, site 40WM104 is recorded only as a Civil War military site that contained a lunette and various encampments. Based on the results of the current survey, the Civil War elements represent less than 5 years of over 185 years of continuous occupation. Of the 85 recovered artifacts, 56 can be dated to one or more of the occupations. The square cut nails recovered from the site date from approximately 1820 to 1900, which aligns with both the Johnson and Cannon occupations, although the Johnson family lived on the property during the period of highest production of square cut nails.

Archival research presented in Chapter 3 indicates that the Johnson family built a farmhouse, outbuildings, and four dwellings for enslaved persons on the property prior to the Civil War. In early 1862, the U.S. Army destroyed the farmhouse and some outbuildings prior to construction of the hilltop fortification. Court documents prepared as part of the 1882 land sale indicate that the property featured stone and rail fences and a stone cistern, but no dwellings or outbuildings. Records indicated that the Cannon family constructed a tenant house and outbuildings between 1882 and 1909 and a dwelling in 1928. These buildings were most likely constructed with readily available wire nails.

The horseshoes and agricultural artifacts recovered from the site date from the late nineteenth century to the present and represent the occupation of the farm by tenants and members of the Cannon family. The use of the farm as a stud farm in the mid-twentieth century aligns with the dates of the recovered horseshoes and fence wire.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Under contract with Franklin 240, LLC, RGA prepared this Cultural Resources Documentation report for a proposed redevelopment project at 318 Franklin Road in Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee. As part of the rezoning process, the Franklin Municipal Planning Commission required a metal detector survey of the 10-acre portion of the parcel as well as conservation of the site of a hilltop military fortification constructed during the Civil War and any additional significant Civil War-era resources that were discovered as part of the survey.

Background research identified one previously recorded archaeological site—40WM104—within the APE. Archaeological site 40WM104 is a hilltop fortification constructed by the U.S. Army in the spring of 1863. Federal troops manned the lunette until the Battle of Franklin in November 1864. The U.S. Army also occupied long-term encampments on or adjacent to the APE from the spring of 1863 through the winter of 1864. The TDOA recorded the site in 1989 as a heavily disturbed fortification that contains remnants of a hilltop lunette. At the time of the 1989 survey, no artifacts were recovered from the site, although informants indicated Civil War-era metal artifacts had been removed from the surrounding area.

The current fieldwork consisted of a metal detector and pedestrian survey throughout the APE. The metal detector survey resulted in the recovery of 85 artifacts, none of which are thought to be directly associated with the lunette or encampments during the Civil War. The fortification identified by the TDOA in 1989 as a portion of the Civil War lunette was reidentified during this survey. RGA recommends that this fortification be conserved through avoidance or that additional archaeological testing be undertaken if avoidance is not possible.

The artifacts recovered during the metal detector survey are commonly found in association with historic farmsteads and dwelling sites and represent the continued occupation of the site by the Johnson, Cannon, and Hill families from circa 1840 to 1986. RGA does not recommend any additional archaeological testing within the 10-acre project site, except for the lunette, to identify possible Civil War-era features or artifacts. It is likely that any artifacts directly associated with the Civil War have already been found and removed from the site by previous landowners and others. Therefore, it is RGA's opinion that the only Civil War-era feature that remains within the project site is the hilltop lunette, which should be conserved. The remainder of the project site does not appear to retain archaeological resources related to the Civil War based on the metal detector survey.

Based on the artifacts recovered from the project site, RGA recommends preparation of an update of the TDOA site file for 40WM104 to reflect what is known about the site both prior to and after the Civil War (Figure 30). Doing so will not impede the project as it is currently designed but will allow for the full 185-year history of the site to be recorded.



Figure 30. Existing and proposed site boundaries for 40WM104 (Source: Esri 2022).

7. REFERENCES

American Battlefield Trust

- 2023 A Glossary of Fortification Terms. Website, <https://www.battlefields.org/learn/articles/glossary-fortification-terms>, accessed February 12, 2025.
- 2024 'Something New in the Art of War': Civil War Earthworks and Trenches. Website, <https://www.battlefields.org/learn/articles/something-new-art-war-civil-war-earthworks-and-trenches>, accessed February 12, 2025.

Ancestry.com

- 2007 Tennessee, U.S., Divorce and Other Records, 1800–1965. Database Online.
- 2008 Tennessee, U.S., Marriage Records, 1780–2002. Database Online.
- 2011a Tennessee, U.S., Death Records, 1908–1965. Database Online.
- 2011b U.S., World War II Draft Cards Young Men, 1940–1947. Database Online.
- 2013 Tennessee, U.S., Early Tax List Records, 1783–1895. Database Online.

Anderson, David G.

- 1990 The Paleoindian Colonization of Eastern North America: A View from the Southeastern United States. In *Early Paleoindian Economies of Eastern North America*, edited by K. B. Tankersley and B. L. Isaac, pp. 163–216. Research in Economic Anthropology, Supplement 5. JAI Press, Greenwich, Connecticut.

Anderson, David G., and Robert C. Mainfort Jr.

- 2002 An Introduction to Woodland Archaeology in the Southeast. In *The Woodland Southeast*, edited by David G. Anderson and Robert C. Mainfort Jr., pp. 1–19. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Anderson, David G., and Kenneth E. Sassaman

- 2012 *Recent Developments in Southeastern Archaeology: From Colonization to Complexity*. The Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

Anderson, David G., Ashley M. Smallwood, and D. Shane Miller

- 2015 Pleistocene Human Settlement in the Southeastern United States: Current Evidence and Future Discussions. *PaleoAmerica* 1:1–45.

Banks, John

- 2022 'Hidden' in plain sight: Fort location on Franklin (Tenn.) Pike. John Banks' Civil War Blog. Website, <https://john-banks.blogspot.com/2022/01/hidden-in-plain-site-fort-location-on.html>, accessed January 31, 2025.

Beers, D. G.

- 1878 *Map of Williamson County, Tenn.* D. G. Beers & Company, Philadelphia. Map. Tennessee State Library and Archives. Electronic Document, <https://teva.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15138coll23/id/343>, accessed February 4, 2025.

Bigelow, Michael E.

2022 Major Merrill Elevates Mapmaking to Professional Process. Defense Visual Information Distribution Center. Website, <https://www.dvidshub.net/news/427293/major-merrill-elevates-mapmaking-professional-process>, accessed February 12, 2025.

Bright, Tom

2024 James Robert Hodges [sic] Family Tree. Ancestry.com. Online Database, <https://www.ancestry.com/family-tree/person/tree/81371773/person/250045055210/facts>, accessed February 4, 2025.

Chandonnet, Ann

n.d. 'Nor Any Drop To Drink': The Problem of Drinking Water in the Civil War." Museums of the Bethel Historical Society. Website, https://www.bethelhistorical.org/legacy-site/Drinking_Water_in_the_Civil_War.html, accessed February 12, 2025.

Chapman, Jefferson, and Gary D. Crites

1987 Evidence for Early Maize (*Zea Mays*) from the Icehouse Bottom Site, Tennessee. *American Antiquity*. 52(2):352–354.

Colladay, Brenda

2018 Minnie Pearl. *Tennessee Encyclopedia*. Tennessee Historical Society, Nashville. Website, <https://tennesseencyclopedia.net/entries/minnie-pearl/>, accessed February 4, 2025.

Comstock, Daniel Webster

1890 *Ninth Cavalry: One Hundred and Twenty-First Regiment, Indiana Volunteers*. Richmond, Ind.: J. M. Coe. Internet Archive. Electronic document, <https://archive.org/details/ninthcavalryoneh00comst/page/n49/mode/2up>, accessed January 31, 2025.

Deter-Wolf, Aaron, and Tanya M. Peres

2019 Introduction. In *The Cumberland River Archaic of Middle Tennessee*, edited by Tanya M. Peres and Aaron Deter-Wolf, pp. 1–14. The University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

Dover, Michael

2011 Fort Granger: Franklin Stronghold. *The Historical Marker Database*. Website, <https://www.hmdb.org/m.asp?m=41119>, accessed February 12, 2025.

Environmental Services Rendering Imaging (Esri)

2022 World Imagery Map. Web Map Service, <http://www.esri.com/data/free-data/index.html>, accessed November 7, 2024.

Faulkner, Charles H.

1988 Middle Woodland Community and Settlement Patterns on the Eastern Highland Rim, Tennessee. In *Middle Woodland Settlement and Ceremonialism in the Mid-South and Lower Mississippi River Valley*, edited by Robert C. Mainfort Jr., pp. 77–98. Proceedings of the 1984 Mid-South Archaeological Conference, Archaeological Report No. 20. Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson.

- 2002 Woodland Cultures of the Elk and Duck River Valleys, Tennessee: Continuity and Change. In *The Woodland Southeast*, edited by David G. Anderson and Robert C. Mainfort Jr., pp. 185–203. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

FAUNMAP Working Group [FAUNMAP]

- 1994 FAUNMAP: A Database Documenting Late Quaternary Distributions of Mammal Species in The United States. *Illinois State Museum Scientific Papers* 25(1–2):1–690.

Find a Grave

- 2004 Sarah E. King Johnson (1814–1872). Memorial ID 8997903, citing Rest Haven Cemetery, Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee. Website, https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/8997903/sarah_e-johnson, accessed January 31, 2025.
- 2011 Howard Homer Hill (1899–1972). Memorial ID 64967441, citing Williamson Memorial Gardens, Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee. Website, https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/64967441/howard_homer-hill, accessed February 4, 2025.
- 2012a James Robert Hodge (1843–1907). Memorial ID 92570903, citing Mount Hope Cemetery, Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee. Website, https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/92570903/james_robert-hodge, accessed February 4, 2025.
- 2012b William Perkins Cannon (1886–1940). Memorial ID 101949097, citing Mount Hope Cemetery, Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee. Website, https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/101949097/william_perkins-cannon, accessed February 4, 2025.
- 2013 Susie McDaniel Beavans Cannon (1827–1959). Memorial ID 106783436, citing Cave Hill Cemetery, Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky. Website, https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/106783436/susie_mcdaniel-cannon, accessed February 10, 2025.
- 2015 Riley J. Harper (1903–1976). Memorial ID 152376958, citing Mount Hope Cemetery, Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee. Website, https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/152376958/riley_j-harper, accessed February 10, 2025.

Flagel, Thomas R.

- 2016 *The Fortress War: Effect of Union Fortifications in the Western Theater of the American Civil War*. PhD dissertation, Department of Public History, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro.

Franklin 240, LLC

- 2024 ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey. H&H Land Surveying, Inc., Smyrna, Tennessee.

Gertner, Larry

- 2019a Franklin Railroad Depot. *The Historical Marker Database*. Website, <https://www.hmdb.org/m.asp?m=142176>, accessed February 12, 2025.
- 2019b Fort Granger: From Slaves to Soldiers. *The Historical Marker Database*. Website, <https://www.hmdb.org/m.asp?m=189735>, accessed February 12, 2025.

2019c Fort Granger: Manning the Fort. The Historical Marker Database. Website, <https://www.hmdb.org/m.asp?m=193145>, accessed February 12, 2025.

2019d Fort Granger: "Tried in Fire." The Historical Marker Database. Website, <https://www.hmdb.org/m.asp?m=142697>, accessed February 12, 2025.

Griffith, Robert M.

2024 Newton C. Cannon Jr. Family Tree. Ancestry.com. Database online, <https://www.ancestry.com/family-tree/person/tree/484977/person/6154884571/facts>, accessed February 4, 2025.

Google Street View

2016 318 US-31 Bus., Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee. Google.com. Data online, <https://maps.app.goo.gl/GPTz8GvBeFQ1nPaUA>, accessed February 12, 2025.

Hudgins, Helen

1946 Williamson Noted for Progressive Agriculture and its Many Beautiful Historical Homes. *Nashville Banner*. February 28:6.

Johnson, Wanda, Lynn Hulan, and Rod Pewitt

1997 *Dortch Stove Works*. National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form. US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, DC.

Jones, Robbie D.

1997 *Architectural and Historical Assessment: Proposed Extension of SR 386 (Vietnam Veterans Boulevard) from SR 386 (Hendersonville Bypass) at the Intersection with SR 6 (US 31E) to SR 109 (Gallatin Bypass), Sumner County, Tennessee*. Technical Report. Tennessee Department of Transportation, Nashville. On file with Richard Grubb & Associates, Inc.

Lane, Kelly

2024 James Edward "Ed" Fentress Family Tree. Ancestry.com. Database online, <https://www.ancestry.com/family-tree/person/tree/155166268/person/362051085220/facts>, accessed February 10, 2025.

Lankford, George E., F. Kent Reilly III, and James F. Garber (editors)

2011 *Visualizing the Sacred: Cosmic Visions, Regionalism, and the Art of the Mississippian World*. The University of Texas Press, Austin.

Mainfort, Robert C. Jr.

1996 Pinson Mounds and the Middle Woodland Period in the Midsouth and Lower Mississippi Valley. In *A View from the Core: A Conference Synthesizing Ohio Hopewell Archaeology*, edited by P. J. Pacheco, pp. 370–391. Ohio Archaeological Council, Columbus.

Malone, Randolph

2024 William L. Johnson Family Tree. Ancestry.com. Database online, <https://www.ancestry.com/family-tree/person/tree/1580550/person/6912015649/facts>, accessed January 31, 2025.

Merrill, William E.

1863 "Engineer Report." Letter. 29 May.

1864 *Battlefield in front of Franklin, Tenn., November 30th.* [?, 1864]. Map. Library of Congress. Electronic document, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2003630453/>, accessed January 31, 2025.

Nance, Benjamin

2001 *The Trail of Tears in Tennessee: A Study of the Routes Used During the Cherokee Removal of 1838.* Tennessee Division of Archaeology, Nashville.

Nance, Ben, and Fred Prouty

1989 State Site No. 40WM104. Tennessee Survey Site Form. Tennessee Division of Archaeology, Nashville. Unpublished document on file at the TDOA.

Nashville Banner

1940 W. P. Cannon Rites Tomorrow. February 23:4.

1947 Miss Colley Is Married to H. R. Cannon. February 24:3.

1959 Susie McDaniel Cannon Obituary. February 3:21.

Nationwide Environmental Title Research (NETR)

1958 Historic Aerial Photographs. Williamson County, Tennessee. Electronic document, historicaerials.com, accessed November 7, 2024.

1980 Historic Aerial Photographs. Williamson County, Tennessee. Electronic document, historicaerials.com, accessed November 7, 2024.

1981 Historic Aerial Photographs. Williamson County, Tennessee. Electronic document, historicaerials.com, accessed November 7, 2024.

1987 Historic Aerial Photographs. Williamson County, Tennessee. Electronic document, historicaerials.com, accessed November 7, 2024.

National Park Service

1990 *De Soto Trail: De Soto National Historic Trail Study.* Southeast Regional Office, National Park Service, Atlanta, Georgia.

National Weather Service (NWS)

2024 Franklin, Tennessee Average Weather. Electronic document, <https://weather.gov/weather>, accessed January 2025.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

2021 Web Soil Survey. <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>, accessed January 2025.

Nelson, Lee H.

1968 Nail Chronology as an Aid to Dating Old Buildings. American Association of State and Local History Technical Leaflet 48, *History News* 24(11), November 1968.

Peacock, Evan

2002 Shellfish Use during the Woodland Period in the Middle South. In *The Woodland Southeast*, edited by David G. Anderson and Robert C. Mainfort Jr., pp. 444–460. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Pierson, George Wesley

2024 Newton C. Cannon Sr. Family Tree. Ancestry.com. Database online, <https://www.ancestry.com/family-tree/person/tree/115176298/person/162112796864/facts>, accessed February 4, 2025.

Ruger, Edward

1865 *Battlefield in front of Franklin Tennessee*. Map. National Archives. RG 77, Civil Works Map File, Z 77. Electronic document, <https://unwritten-record.blogs.archives.gov/2019/11/26/mapping-the-battle-of-franklin-tennessee/>, accessed January 31, 2025. Note: This is another map showing the Union positions (in blue) and Confederate positions (in red) before and during the Battle of Franklin. This manuscript map also includes an attached summary of the battle.

Schroedl, Gerald F.

1978 *The Patrick Site (40MR40) Tellico Reservoir, Tennessee: a report submitted to the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service in accordance with the provisions of TVA contracts TV-38339A and TV-48117A and HCRS contracts CX 5000-3-0864, CX 5000-4-1028, and CX 5880-8-0180*. Tennessee Valley Authority, Chattanooga.

Spanjian, Marilee

1998 Church of the Week: Franklin Church of Christ. *Tennessean*. January 23:84–85.

Schroder, Lloyd

2015 *A Field Guide to Southeastern Indian Pottery*. Rev. ed. LuLu Press, United States.

Smith, Sam D.

1998 Excavation Data for Civil War Era Military Sites in Middle Tennessee. In *Look To the Earth: Historical Archaeology and the American Civil War*, edited by Clarence R. Geier Jr. and Susan E. Winter, pp. 60–75. The University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Smith, Samuel D., Fred M. Prouty, and Benjamin C. Nance

1990 *A Survey of Civil War Period Military Sites in Middle Tennessee*. Report of Investigations No. 7. Tennessee Division of Archaeology, Nashville.

2003 *A Survey of Civil War Era Military Sites in Tennessee*. Nashville. Research Series No. 14. Tennessee Division of Archaeology,

Steponaitis, Vincas P.

1986 Prehistoric Archaeology in the Southeastern United States, 1970–1985. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:363–404.

Tennessean [Nashville, Tennessee]

1942 State Official Dies in Franklin: Newton Cannon Jr., William County Leader Many Years. December 3.

1946 At Stud: Red Silver Allen 421739. May 12:46.

1947 Engagements: Colley–Cannon. February 16:27.

1947 Miss Colley Weds Mr. Cannon At Ceremony in Scales Chapel. February 24:3.

1972 Howard H. Hill Obituary. October 7:27.

1977 Jennie Cannon West Obituary. May 19:66.

- 1995 Lillie Esther Anglin Hill Obituary. August 15:15.
- 1996 For the Record: Building Permits Issued. May 1:98.
- 2002 Alice McEwen Cannon Patterson Obituary. September 18:82.

Tennessee Department of Agriculture

- 1949 *Aerial Photograph, Williamson County, Tennessee.* Tennessee Department of Agriculture, Nashville. Unpublished document provided by the client.

Tennessee Division of Archaeology (TDOA)

- 2024 *Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Resources Management Studies.* Prepared by the TDOA in Nashville, Tennessee

Tennessee State Library and Archives (TSLA)

- n.d. *Tennessee Blue Book: Student Edition; A History of Tennessee.* A publication of the Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee.

Thomason, Philip

- 1999 *Roper's Knob Fortifications, Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee.* National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form. US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, DC.

U.S. Census

- 1830 Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1840 Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1850a Agricultural Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1850b Industrial Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1850c Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1850d Slave Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1860a Agricultural Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1860b Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1860c Slave Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1870a Agricultural Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1870b Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1880 Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1900 Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1910 Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1920 Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1930 Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1940 Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.
- 1950 Population Census, Williamson County, Tennessee.

United States Geological Survey (USGS)

- 1909 7.5' Quadrangle Map: Franklin Tennessee (63NE), Tennessee.
- 1949 7.5' Quadrangle Map: Franklin Tennessee (63NE), Tennessee.
- 1974 7.5' Quadrangle Map: Franklin Tennessee (63NE), Tennessee.
- 1997 7.5' Quadrangle Map: Franklin Tennessee (63NE), Tennessee.
- 1980 7.5' Quadrangle Map: Franklin Tennessee (63NE), Tennessee.

West, Carroll Van, and Gregory Lynch

2005 *Harlinsdale Farm, Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee*. National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form. US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, DC.

Wetmore, R. Y.

2002 The Woodland Period in the Appalachian Summit of Western North Carolina and the Ridge and Valley Province of Eastern Tennessee. In *The Woodland Southeast*, edited by David G. Anderson and Robert C. Mainfort Jr., pp. 249–269. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.

Willett, James R.

1865 *Topographical Map of Franklin, Tenn. and Vicinity*. Map. National Archives. RG 77, Fortification File, Drawer 147, Sheet 48. Electronic document, <https://unwritten-record.blogs.archives.gov/2019/11/26/mapping-the-battle-of-franklin-tennessee/>, accessed January 31, 2025. Note: This highly detailed map shows the terrain around Franklin, Tennessee. It also shows fortifications, roads, railroads, and some families who lived in the area.

Willett, James R., and T. J. L. Remington

1874 *Battlefield in front of Franklin, Tenn. where the United States forces, consisting of the 4th & 23rd Corps and the Cavalry Corps M.D.M., all under the command of Maj. Gen'l. J. M. Schofield, severely repulsed the Confederate army, commanded by Lt. Gen'l Hood, November 30th*. [S.l., 1874]. Map. Library of Congress. Electronic document, <https://www.loc.gov/item/99448853/>, accessed January 31, 2025.

Williamson County Deed Book (WCDB)

1882a S. K. Johnson et al to Jas. R. Hodge. 4 August. Vol. 9:233–235.

1882b Jas. R. Hodge & wife to Jennie B. Cannon. 9 September. Vol. 9:238–240.

1927a Mrs. Jennie B. Cannon widow to Newton C. Cannon Jr. 55:269.

1927b Newton Cannon Jr. et ux to Mrs. Jennie B. Cannon. 25 February. Vol. 55:270.

1931 Mrs. Jennie B. Cannon to Newton Cannon Jr. 11 April. Vol. 61:474–475.

1935 Newt Cannon Jr. et ux to W. P. Cannon. 13 February. Vol. 66:332–333.

1947 Henry R. Cannon et al to Howard Hill et ux. 30 May. Vol. 88:174–175.

1986 Lillie E. Hill to Gordon E. Inman, trustee. 15 December. Vol. 633:707–709.

1994 Gordon E. Inman, trustee to Elias H. Attea Jr. 29 November. Vol. 1249:498–500.

1995a Elias H. Attea Jr. to Heritage Covenant Church. 24 August. Vol. 1319:761–763.

1995b Heritage Covenant Church to K. Thomas Sidwell. 24 August. Vol. 1319:764–768.

1997a K. Thomas Sidwell, trustee to Elias H. Attea Jr. 21 February. Vol. 1493:615–618.

1997b Elias H. Attea Jr. to Dale G. and Linda B. Van Gorden. 31 March. Vol. 1505:768–770.

2003 Dale G. and Linda Van Gorden to Trace Development LLC. 29 August. Vol. 2991:652–654.

2012 Trace Development LLC to R. Harvey Johnson III. 22 October. Vol. 5730:756–759.

2015 R. Harvey Johnson III to Franklin 240 LLC. 12 November. Vol 6621:304–307.

Appendix A: Qualifications of Report Authors



YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

With this firm: since January 2022

With other firms/agencies: 2017-2021

EDUCATION

Master of Arts, 2017
Mississippi State University

Bachelor of Science, 2014
Middle Tennessee State University

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

Section 106 Essentials (ACHP)

Section 106 Advanced (ACHP)

Archaeological Collections
Management (NPI)

Caring for Museum Collections
(AASLH)

OSHA 30-Hour Safety Training

40-Hour HAZWOPER Training

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

Register of Professional
Archaeologists (#5154)

Tennessee Council for Professional
Archaeologists-Board Member



KATE MCKINNEY
ARCHAEOLOGIST/PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (36 CFR 61)

Based at the Tennessee Branch Office in Nashville, Kate McKinney conducts and manages Phase I-III archaeological investigations throughout the U.S., with a specialty in prehistoric archaeology. She has prepared and directed cultural resources surveys in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, NEPA, and various local and state cultural resource regulations. In addition to archaeological investigations, Ms. McKinney has experience in Native American Coordination as well as artifact analysis and collections management. From 2017-2021, she managed the Archaeology Laboratory and Curation Facility in Nashville for TDOT, in addition to her duties as a staff archaeologist. In 2015, Ms. McKinney completed a curation internship at the Smithsonian National Museum of National History. Ms. McKinney exceeds the qualifications set forth in the *Secretary of Interior's Standards* as an Archaeologist.

REPRESENTATIVE PROJECT EXPERIENCE:

Phase I Archaeological Survey, Town Center Trail Phase 3, Mt. Juliet, Wilson County, Tennessee. Served as principal investigator for a Phase I archaeological survey for a TDOT Local Programs greenway project. Sub-contractor for Kimley-Horn. Completed in 2022.

Phase I Archaeological Survey, Ventosa at Catawba Springs, Denver, North Carolina. Served as principal investigator for Phase I archaeological survey of a private development resulting in five new sites. Completed for Ventosa LLC in 2022. Reviewed by North Carolina OSA.

Phase I Archaeological Survey, East Bank Arterial Connector from Woodland Street to Jefferson Street, Nashville, Davidson County, Tennessee. Served as principal investigator for a Phase I archaeological survey for an NDOT and TDOT Local Programs project. Sub-contractor to RaganSmith. Initiated in 2022.

Phase I Archaeological Survey for the Proposed State Industrial Access Road, Jostens-Allensworth Road, Clarksville, Montgomery County, Tennessee. Served as principal investigator for a Phase I archaeological survey for TDOT Local Programs project. Sub-contractor for TTL. Completed in 2022.

Cultural Resources Documentation: 318 Franklin Road, Franklin, Williamson County, Tennessee. Served as principal investigator for a metal detecting survey at a Civil War site. Completed in 2025.

Phase I Archaeological Survey, Harvest Industrial Facility, Clarksville, Montgomery County, Tennessee. Served as principal investigator for a Phase I archaeological survey for a USACE permitted project. Sub-contractor for TTL. Completed in 2025.



ROBBIE D. JONES

PRINCIPAL SENIOR ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIAN (36 CFR 61)

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

With this firm: 2021-present

With other firms: 29

EDUCATION

Master of Arts in Public History and
Historic Preservation, 2002
Middle Tennessee State University

Bachelor of Architecture, 1992
University of Tennessee- Knoxville

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

Section 106 Essentials (ACHP)

Section 106 Advanced (ACHP)

Section 106 Agreement Documents
(ACHP)

Working Effectively with Tribal
Governments (ACHP)

**PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS
AND REGISTRATIONS**

Southeast Chapter of the Society of
Architectural Historians (SESAH);
Treasurer and former President

Historic Nashville, Inc; former President

AME60 Committee of TRB

FEMA Federal Emergency Response
Official (2022–2028)



Robbie Jones has over 32 years of experience working as an architectural historian, historic preservation planner, and project manager with extensive experience with preservation laws such as Section 106 and Section 4(f). He is highly experienced in conducting cultural resource survey, effects assessments, Memoranda of Agreements, minimization and mitigation plans, and public involvement requirements. He has experience working with NHL and historic site museum properties, including serving as Director of Preservation at Andrew Jackson’s Hermitage (2000-2008). Mr. Jones has authored or coauthored over 265 technical reports, resulting in the NRHP-eligibility evaluations of 7,500 resources through the U.S., primarily in the Southeast. He has published articles, encyclopedia entries, book reviews, book chapters, and a book about historic architecture and has presented at professional conferences across the U.S. He has received 10 professional awards from local, state, and federal agencies. Mr. Jones exceeds the qualifications set forth in the *Secretary of Interior’s Standards* as an Architectural Historian and Historian. Based in Nashville since 1994, he serves as RGA’s Tennessee Branch Manager.

REPRESENTATIVE PROJECT EXPERIENCE

African American Historic Context and Reconnaissance Survey, Frankfort, Kentucky. Served as the principal senior architectural historian in the preparation of an African American historic context and reconnaissance survey of African American and Civil Rights Movement resources in the City of Frankfort, Kentucky, along with NRHP-eligibility recommendations for over 100 resources. Sub-contractor for Cultural Heritage Resources to the City of Frankfort. Completed in 2022. Coauthor of report, available online at www.frankfort.ky.gov/aahistoriccontext.

Historic Architecture Survey and Section 106 Assessment of Effects Report for the East Bank Connector, Woodland Street to Jefferson Street, Nashville, Davidson County, Tennessee. Served as the project manager and principal senior architectural historian for an architectural survey and assessment of effects report. Evaluated 35 resources, including industrial facilities, commercial buildings, and transportation facilities. Project included assessment of effects to NRHP-eligible CSX Railroad Swing Bridge. Sub-contractor to RaganSmith. Initiated 2022; ongoing.

Historic Architecture Survey and Section 106 Assessment of Effects Report for the Livingston Courthouse Plaza Renovation, Overton County, Tennessee. Served as the project manager and principal senior architectural historian for an architectural survey and assessment of effects report. Evaluated a nineteenth-century courthouse square district and twentieth-century commercial development. TDOT Local Programs project prepared for Lose Design. Completed in 2022.

Nashville Civil Rights Movement Documentation Project. Served as the project manager, principal senior architectural historian, and coauthor for an NRHP Multiple Property Documentation Form for 110 resources associated with the Civil Rights Movement in Nashville and an NRHP nomination for the Clark Memorial Methodist Church Complex. Project included public engagement, public meetings, and interviews with veterans of the Nashville Student Movement. Federally funded, NPS grant project completed for Metro Historical Commission in 2023. Undergoing review by NPS.

Appendix B: Artifact Catalog


Context	Ct.	Group	Artifact Material	Artifact Type	Description	Measurements	Date Range
CW1	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail; head missing	H: 4.0cm	1820-1900
CW2	2	HRDW	Metal	Wire	Fence Wire		1867-Present
CW3	1	HRDW	Metal	Weight	Tire weight		Late 20th c.-Present
CW4	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Flat metal fragment		Late 20th c.-Present
CW5	1	AUTO	Metal	Wheel	Pulley Wheel		20th c.-Present
CW6	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail; fragment	H: 2.5cm	1820-1900
CW7	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Flat metal fragment w/ two nails		Indet.
CW8	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 8.0cm	1820-1900
CW9	1	ACT	Metal	Animal Hardware	Horseshoe with nails		Late 19th c.-Present
CW10	0	HRDW	Metal	Wire	Fence Wire; discarded		1867-Present
CW11	1	HRDW	Metal	Wire	Fence Wire		1867-Present
CW12	1	HRDW	Metal	Wire	Twisted Wire-poss. Bale tie		Indet.
CW13	1	HRDW	Metal	Wire	Poss. Fence Wire		1867-Present
CW14	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Wire nail; No head	H: 4.8cm	1900- Present
CW15	1	HRDW	Metal	Nut	Hexagonal Nut	W: 5cm	Indet.
CW16	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Indeterminate metal piece		Indet.
CW17	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 4.4cm	1820-1900
CW18	1	ACT	Metal	Animal Hardware	Horseshoe with nails; partial		Late 19th c.-Present
CW19	0	HRDW	Metal	Wire	Fence Wire; discarded		1867-Present
CW20	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 3.5cm	1820-1900
CW21	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Flat metal fragment		Indet.
CW22	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Flat metal fragment w/ hole		Indet.
CW23	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 7.5cm	1820-1900
CW24	1	ARCH	Metal	Lock	Lock Plate	H: 9cm W: 8cm	Indet.
CW25	1	ARCH	Metal	Lock	Lock Plate	H: 9cm W: 6cm	Indet.
CW26	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 1.8cm	1820-1900
CW27	0	HRDW	Metal	Wire	Fence Wire; discarded		1867-Present
CW28	1	HRDW	Metal	Bracket	Bracket		Indet.
CW28	1	ACC	Glass	Flat	Clear oval flat glass; poss. Accessory glass		Indet.
CW28	1	KITC	Glass	Jar	Clear jar base with "A-108 GAC" mark		20th c.
CW29	1	KITC	Metal	Faucet	Metal water pump/faucet		1900-Present
CW30	1	HRDW	Metal	Hook	"J" Hook; cast iron		Indet.
CW31	1	FURN	Metal	Pull	Brass Drawer Handle		20th c.
CW32	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Misc. hollow metal pipe		Late 20th c.-Present
CW33	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Indet. metal fragment		Indet.
CW34	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Indet. Flat metal fragment		Indet.
CW35	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Possible stake fragment	H: 13cm	Indet.
CW36	1	ACT	Metal	Animal Hardware	Horseshoe with nails		Late 19th c.-Present
CW37	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Cast Iron object; poss. Decorative piece	H: 6cm W:10cm	Indet.
CW38	1	HRDW	Metal	Bolt	Bolt with threading		Modern
CW39	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Indet. metal fragment		Indet.
CW40	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 8.0cm	1820-1900

Context	Ct.	Group	Artifact Material	Artifact Type	Description	Measurements	Date Range
CW41	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Indeterminate metal fragment		Indet.
CW42	1	HRDW	Metal	Nut	Hexagonal Nut	W: 10cm	Indet.
CW43	1	KITC	Metal	Door	Cast Iron Oven door fragment		Indet.
CW44	1	HRDW	Metal	Hinge	Door Hinge		Indet.
CW45	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Indeterminate lead metal fragment		Indet.
CW45	2	KITC	Ceramic	Misc.	Whiteware shards; poss. Platter		1820-Present
CW46	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 7.0cm	1820-1900
CW46	1	ARCH	Metal	Tile	Cast Iron Tile	4x4 in	Indet.
CW47	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 3.5cm	1820-1900
CW48	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 7.3cm	1820-1900
CW49	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail; missing head	H: 4.8cm	1820-1900
CW50	1	HRDW	Metal	Spike	Metal spike with threading at head	H: 20cm	Late 20th c.-Present
CW51	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 7.5cm	1820-1900
CW51	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 3.5cm	1820-1900
CW52	1	KITC	Ceramic	Vessel	Porcelain Jar Seal shard		1870-1930
CW52	1	KITC	Ceramic	Vessel	Prob. Pyrex sherd w/ clear fruit etching		Late 20th c.-Present
CW52	1	KITC	Glass	Vessel	Milk glass shard		1890-1960
CW52	1	KITC	Glass	Vessel	Shard		Indet.
CW52	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Indet. Nail Fragment	H: 2cm	Indet.
CW53	4	KITC	Glass	Jar	Clear glass shards		20th c.-Present
CW53	1	ARCH	Ceramic	Vessel	Stoneware sherd		19th c.
CW53	2	KITC	Ceramic	Vessel	Whiteware sherds; burned		1820-Present
CW54	2	KITC	Glass	Vessel	Clear Jar sherds		20th c.-Present
CW54	1	KITC	Glass	Vessel	Milk glass shard		1890-1960
CW54	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Indet. Fragment		Indet.
CW55	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 2.5cm	1820-1900
CW56	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Indeterminate metal fragment		Indet.
CW57	1	MISC	Metal	Misc.	Indeterminate metal fragment; poss. large stake head	H: 4.5cm W: 2.5cm	Indet.
CW58	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 8.5cm	1820-1900
CW58	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 2.5cm	1820-1900
CW58	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 3.7cm	1820-1900
CW59	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 9.0cm	1820-1900
CW60	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 5.5cm	1820-1900
CW61	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 6.5cm	1820-1900
CW62	1	HRDW	Metal	Nail	Type B Square cut nail	H: 4.5cm	1820-1900
CW63	1	HRDW	Metal	Hook	Spring Hook		Late 20th c.-Present
CW64	1	ACT	Metal	Animal Hardware	Horseshoe with nails		Late 19th c.-Present
CW65	1	HRDW	Metal	Wire	Twisted Wire; poss. Bale tie		Indet.


Total Artifa 82

Context	Ct.	Group	Artifact Material	Artifact Type	Description	Measurements	Date Range
Key:							
			HRDW=Hardware		Indet.=Indeterminate		
			MISC=Miscellaneous		H=Height		
			AUTO=Automotive		W=Width		
			KITC=Kitchen				
			ACT=Activities				
			ARCH=Architecture				
			FURN=Furniture				


Appendix C: Additional Project Maps



Map showing the existing and proposed boundaries of site 40WM104
(Source: USGS Topo Map, Franklin, Tenn. [63 NE], 1997).



Map showing the APE and the location of the identified structures and metal detector finds (Source: USGS Topo Map, Franklin, Tenn. [63 NE], 1997).



Map showing the APE and the location of the identified structures and metal detector finds (Source: Franklin 240, LLC 2024).

Appendix D: Annotated Project Information

Principal Investigator: Kate McKinney, MA, RPA
Primary Authors: Kate McKinney, MA, RPA, and Robbie D. Jones, MA
Project Manager: Robbie D. Jones, MA
Title: Cultural Resources Documentation, 318 Franklin Road, Franklin, Williamson
County, Tennessee
Date: February 2025
RGA Database Title: 318 Franklin Road
RGA Project No.: 2024-379TN
State: Tennessee
County: Williamson
USGS Quad: Franklin, Tennessee [63 NE]
Drainage Basin: Harpeth River, Cumberland River
Regulation: Local
Project Type: Private
Project Sponsor: Franklin 240, LLC.
Coordinating Agency: None
Client: Franklin 240, LLC.
Level of Survey: Metal Detecting and Archival Research
Cultural Resources: 40WM104; Civil War military fortification; stone cistern; farmstead



FACTORY DISTRICT NORTH

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE | 04/21/2025



SITE DATA

SITE ACREAGE: 20.13 AC

PARCELS: MAP 63, PARCEL 33.00
 MAP 63L D, PARCEL 14.00
 MAP 63L D, PARCEL 15.00
 MAP 63L D, PARCEL 16.00


ADDRESS: 318 FRANKLIN ROAD
 1123 HARPETH IND. CT
 1121 HARPETH IND. CT
 1117 HARPETH IND. CT

EXISTING ZONING: ESTATE RESIDENTIAL
 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL

PROPOSED ZONING: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

ZONING OVERLAY: HHO
 500' HHO BUFFER
 HPO
 SCO
 CFO

ENVISION FRANKLIN: FACTORY DISTRICT



METAL DETECTOR SURVEY RESULTS




Figure 22. Results of the metal detector survey (Source: Esri 2022).



Figure 23. Photograph of selected Type B square cut nails recovered from the site.



Figure 24. Photograph of the horseshoes recovered from the site.

ENVISION FRANKLIN

The vision of the district is to **expand the types of uses found in the Factory at Franklin** to surrounding properties in order to create a **memorable destination**. The **vibrant uses** at the Factory at Franklin should extend beyond its walls and integrate into Harpeth Industrial Court. Key characteristics of the district should include **high-quality architecture, plazas, outdoor dining, art, tree-lined streets, and pedestrian and bicycle amenities**.





ENVISION FRANKLIN



The vision of the district is to **expand the types of uses found in the Factory at Franklin** to surrounding properties in order to create a **memorable destination**. The **vibrant uses** at the Factory at Franklin should extend beyond its walls and integrate into Harpeth Industrial Court. Key characteristics of the district should include **high-quality architecture, plazas, outdoor dining, art, tree-lined streets, and pedestrian and bicycle amenities**.





ARCHITECTURAL IMAGES



ARCHITECTURAL IMAGES



ARCHITECTURAL IMAGES





WITH TREES:

[LINK](#)

WITHOUT TREES:

[LINK](#)

NEXT STEPS

- PRE APP SUBMITTAL:
05/23/2025
- HZC SUBMITTAL:
05/23/2025
- ANTICIPATED PC MEETING:
07/24/2025

