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1. Name of Property
   Historic name: __Louise Cotton Mill_________________________________________
   Other names/site number: _Chadwick-Hoskins No. 4, Textron-Southern, Inc., Louise Plant
   Name of related multiple property listing:
   ___N/A_______________________________________________________
   (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

2. Location
   Street & number: _1101 Hawthorne Lane________________________________________
   City or town: _Charlotte___ State: _NC______ County: _Mecklenburg_______
   Not For Publication: ☐ N/A   Vicinity: ☐ N/A

3. State/Federal Agency Certification
   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
   I hereby certify that this __X__ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets
   the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic
   Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.
   In my opinion, the property __X__ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria.
   I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following
   level(s) of significance:
   ___national   ___statewide   __X__local
   Applicable National Register Criteria:
   __A   __B   __X_C   __D
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4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

__ entered in the National Register
__ determined eligible for the National Register
__ determined not eligible for the National Register
__ removed from the National Register
__ other (explain:) _____________________

Signature of the Keeper _____________________ Date of Action ________________

5. Classification

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

Private: X

Public – Local

Public – State

Public – Federal

Category of Property

(Check only one box.)

Building(s) X

District

Site

Structure

Object
Louise Cotton Mill

Mecklenburg County, NC

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

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

6. Function or Use

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

- INDUSTRY: manufacturing facility

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

- COMMERCE/TRADE: warehouse
- COMMERCE/TRADE: business
- RECREATION AND CULTURE: sports facility
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

[Other: Heavy Timber Mill Construction]

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: __Brick, Stucco, Stone_________________

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

The Louise Cotton Mill is a U-shaped textile mill that was originally constructed in 1897 as a two-story brick building with a rectangular footprint using slow-burning construction methods. As was typical for textile mills at the time, it had a front stair tower, where all the decorative elements were focused, and a less-prominent rear tower. Rows of segmental-arched windows provided natural light and ventilation. The low-pitched gable roof had a monitor with clerestory windows. In 1901, a large addition, built in two sections, was added using the same construction methods, which created a U-shaped building with a courtyard, served by a railroad spur. The additions allowed the weaving functions to be moved out of the second floor of the original mill and into the long one-story addition. This followed the latest thinking in mill construction of having a one-story weaving shed as a means of dealing with the vibration caused by the power looms. In the 1960s, several additions were made to the rear and south end of the building and the front tower was truncated to one-story. There is one noncontributing building on the property, a one-story, gable-roof metal building that is used as a commercial building.
The Louise Cotton Mill, located at 1101 Hawthorne Lane, is a U-shaped building that stands between Louise Avenue and Hawthorne Lane two miles east of the city center in Charlotte, North Carolina. The mill is situated on a 7.709-acre, roughly rectangular-shaped lot. The southeast corner of the lot has been subdivided from the original parcel and sold to a separate owner. The original mill faced southwest toward the Carolina Central Railroad, later known as the Seaboard Airline Railroad, and a railroad spur ran behind the mill from the south. Parts of the track of the railroad spur still survive embedded in the gravel where it entered the courtyard. Louise Avenue, named for the wife of the mill president like the mill itself, runs along the northwestern end of the building and was the main access to the mill. The southeastern side of the building faces Hawthorne Lane and is set back from Hawthorne Lane approximately 265 feet. This area is now occupied by parking lots and grass lawns. A paved driveway extends from the parking lots on the Hawthorne Lane end of the property across the front of the original mill and exits onto Louise Avenue. Several large trees are located in front of the mill. A chain-link fence is located along the Louise Avenue side of the property. The village for workers at Louise Mill is located on the hill above the mill to the northeast and many of the houses survive.

Original Mill
The Louise Cotton Mill, later known as the Chadwick-Hoskins Mill No. 4 and Textron-Southern, Inc., Louise Plant, is a U-shaped textile mill that was constructed in two phases. Modern additions are located along the northeastern side and the southeastern end. The original building, completed in 1897, measures 367 feet 10 inches long by 92 feet 11 inches wide and is a twenty-seven-bay-long two-story rectangular building that faces southwest towards the railroad. Constructed of brick laid in five-course American bond, it features a low-pitched gable roof with exposed rafter tails and a roof monitor with fixed, single-light clerestory windows that provide light to the second floor. Center towers are located on the long sides. The center tower on the front or railroad side of the building housed the main stair. Historically four stories tall, the tower featured recessed panels where the windows and door were located. The fourth floor of the tower held a 10,000-gallon water tank. The front tower was later truncated to one story in height with a gable roof. The rear tower was less prominent and originally three stories high. It is now only two stories in height and features the same recessed window panels as the front tower. The original segmental-arched mill window openings with sloped sills have been infilled with masonry or a combination of masonry and metal vents. Historic photographs show rows of regularly-spaced arched multiple-light wooden windows with multiple-light transoms. The northwestern end and northeastern walls of the original mill are the same as the southwestern façade wall, with segmental-arched window openings that have been bricked in. Several sections of metal louvers have been inserted into the north wall as well as a pedestrian door on the second-floor level. The façade and north end of the original mill have been painted white except for that area on the façade where a 1960s addition was recently removed. Attempts have been made to remove the paint from the north end and rear.

The southeastern end of the mill housed the picker room on the first floor and the slasher room on the second floor. Early but undated photographs of the Louise Mill show this end as a five-by-eight-bay, one-story section with roof monitor; however, by the time the 1900 Sanborn map was
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published, this was a two-story section with a roof monitor. A 1911 postcard also shows the southeastern end as two stories. A low-pitched gable roof with a monitor caps the building and features exposed rafter tails under the projecting eaves. Single-light fixed windows are found on the monitor. A stepped firewall parapet separates the south end from the remainder of the mill. This end of the building has also been parged on the exterior and painted white. Loading openings are located on the first floor and double-leaf doors have been installed in several of the loading openings, while others have been infilled or have a pedestrian door. Some of the second-floor arched window openings have been fitted with replacement multiple-light sash windows with multiple-light transoms. All openings on the front and rear walls of this section have been infilled.

The two-story engine room extends from the rear of the mill where the main part of the mill and the picker room join. A one-story fan room extends from the north side of the engine room. The two-story, shed-roofed boiler room projects from the engine room to the southeast parallel to but originally separated from the picker room. The space between the boiler and picker rooms was enclosed by 1905 to become the one-story machine shop. Southeast of the boiler room stood a tall free-standing smokestack that is no longer extant.

1901 Additions
In 1901, a large, rectangular, nine-bay wide by twenty-two bay long, single-story weaving room was constructed northeast of and parallel to the original mill. Because of the slope of the land, the tall stone foundation on the southwestern side of the 1901 weaving room addition is visible and the floor of the one-story weaving room is at the same level as the second floor of the original building. Foundation vents are visible at the top of the stone foundation. There is a crawl space beneath the weaving room that measures approximately eight feet at the doorway to the crawl space and tapers fairly quickly to about three feet. The weaving room has a gable roof except at the southern corner. The building is taller in that location and the roof of this section slants down to the gable peak. Perhaps the higher ceiling was needed for machinery; this area is labeled motor room on the 1911 Sanborn map. Sanborn maps issued between 1905 and 1953 show the weaving room with a roof monitor like the original mill, but if it was built it does not survive.

The weaving room is connected to the 1897 mill via a two-story, two-by-ten-bay-long rectangular building along Louise Avenue shown as an “ell” on Sanborn maps. The Louise Avenue side of the ell connector has been fitted with four loading doors and a pedestrian door sheltered by a metal canopy, but vestiges of the original segmental arched openings are visible above the canopy. Both sections of the 1901 addition use the same architectural vocabulary as the original 1897 building: brick walls, large segmental-arched window openings, low-pitched gable roofs, and exposed rafter tails. All windows in both sections of the 1901 addition have been enclosed with brick. Small windows have been inserted into the brick infill on the Louise Avenue end (northwestern end) of the 1901 weaving room addition. The southeastern exterior
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A raised loading dock of various materials (brick, concrete, and concrete block) runs the perimeter of both the original mill and the 1901 addition on the courtyard side. A concrete ramp provides access to the loading dock toward the southeastern end of the loading dock on the 1897 mill and there is a set of metal stairs toward the northwestern end of the dock. A shed roof of corrugated metal supported by triangular-shaped iron brackets shelters the loading docks on the engine room, 1897 mill, and 1901 ell connector. Loading-sized doors open on to the docks from the 1897 mill and the 1901 ell connector. These docks were added after the windows were infilled because the loading-dock roof on the original building and the 1901 connector run across the infilled windows near the top. The loading dock on the 1901 weaving room addition is protected by a shed roof supported by poles. The south end of this weaving room addition also has a concrete loading dock sheltered by a metal shed roof supported by the same iron brackets. Most of the walls are painted white beneath the roof of the loading dock, while the paint has been removed above the roof.

Later Additions
Sometime between 1929 and 1953, an enclosed elevated walkway was constructed to connect the second floor of the engine room with the main floor of the 1901 weaving room addition. The walkway is sheathed with metal on the exterior and has a low-pitched gable roof, also covered with metal. The interior of the walkway has plywood walls and a wooden floor.

In the 1960s, two large rectangular additions were built along the northeastern side of the 1901 weaving room addition. Both additions are one story tall and are sheathed in brick laid in common bond. The addition on the northwestern end is the largest and tallest of the two measuring almost 80 feet wide by 224 feet long. The smaller of the two additions, measures 65.6 feet wide and 112.6 feet long. In the early 1970s, a two-story, 80.5 feet by 55 feet office building was built onto the southeastern end of these two additions. The office building is sheathed in bands of brick and projecting concrete panels with projecting brick pilasters and a glass and metal storefront situated at the center of its southeastern facade. A flat roof caps the office building. Lighting and signage components are fixed to the horizontal concrete-panel banding.

Interior
The interior of the original mill maintains its utilitarian appearance and the volume of open space has been retained on all floors. The interior finishes are the same in the original 1897 mill and in the 1901 additions. The walls are exposed brick. Most of the walls, ceiling, and columns are painted although in several areas, the paint has either been removed or the area was never painted. Most of the second floor of the 1897 building is not painted. Bathrooms have tile wainscot and tile floors. Floors elsewhere are wood. All original window and door openings are topped with segmental arches. Later openings have squared tops. Many of the metal fire doors survive. The window openings—although currently infilled—have molded brick openings and
sloped interior concrete sills. An 1897 newspaper article referred to the molded or rounded corners of the windows as a means of diffusing light.²

Round columns support beams that extend the width of the buildings, which in turn hold the floor above in the two story spaces. I-beams have been added to the sides of the wooden ceiling beams on the first floor of the 1897 building and in both the 1901 additions. Wooden beams without the additional I-beams are found on the second floor of the original mill. The wooden floors are set directly on beams without joists as a means of fire resistance. Sprinkler pipes are exposed on the ceilings and in some cases along the walls. Florescent lights are suspended from the ceilings.

The main part of the 1897 mill as well as the slasher room on the southeastern end has a monitor roofs with clerestory windows. The original four-light fixed windows have been replaced by single-light fixed windows. The framing of these monitor roofs consist of a vertical member on top of the horizontal beam aligned with a column. These vertical members support beams that run the width of the monitor. The ceiling of the monitor is sheathed with wooden boards laid lengthwise.

The column spacing is the same in all three buildings in the long direction at 10 feet 8 inches on center. The 1897 mill is four bays wide with columns at 22 feet 6 inches on center, while the long 1901 weaving room addition has four bays with columns at 24 feet 11 inches on center. The 1901 “ell” or connector has four bays on the first floor with columns at 12 feet 11 inches on center. The second floor of the connector has a single line of columns down the center at 25 feet 11 inches on center. These measurements generally correspond to the industry standards at the time for a building of this size and were based on the properties of mill construction and the dimensions of the machinery.³

The first floor of the 1897 mill building was originally used for carding, spinning, and warping. Today it is organized as one open space and is currently used for storage. The door to the front tower has been partially infilled with brick and a single pedestrian door inserted in the center. Bathrooms and a small freight elevator are located in the rear tower. The original bathroom doorways have been infilled with brick and modern pedestrian doors have been inserted into these openings.

The first-floor picker room at the south end is separated from the main mill by a narrow space that houses stairs at the front, a doorway between the picker room and the main mill, a dust shaft, and a beltway at the rear. According to the 1900 Sanborn map, the beltway was originally a two-story space. A wooden floor with 2” x 8” wooden floor joists supported by steel I-beams was inserted at a later date.⁴ These interior walls are brick and the original doorways into these

² Charlotte Observer, May 20, 1897, p. 5.
spaces have segmental-arched openings. Although the equipment has been removed from the beltway, the wooden stair survives and has a solid balustrade of vertical beaded boards. The picker room is currently subdivided by a modern frame wall covered with plywood.

The engine room, boiler room, and machine shop are all organized as open spaces. The engine room was originally a two-story space. A concrete floor was later inserted, creating two floors. The second floor of the engine room currently connects the 1897 building with the elevated walkway. The tops of the now-infilled segmental-arched windows openings are visible on the second floor. Likewise, the boiler room was also a tall open space from a basement to the second floor that housed the vertical boilers. Concrete floors were later inserted to create rooms on each level. The ceilings in both the engine and boiler rooms have metal trusses and tie rods attached to the bottom of the original wooden beams.

The second floor of the original mill building was used for weaving until the 1901 addition was constructed. It was then used for sawing and spooling. Today it consists of open space with metal studs and plywood walls inserted to create storage areas. The bathrooms are located in the center of the rear tower. The single-light, fixed clerestory windows of the roof monitor flood the second floor with light even with the wall windows infilled.

The south end of the second floor housed the slasher and warping room and has the same space between it and the main mill as the first floor. The slasher room is currently organized as one open space. Six windows on the south end have been reopened and fitted with new windows. The clerestory windows of the roof monitor provide ample light into this space.

The first floor of the 1901 connector “ell” originally operated as a cloth room. Twisting, reeling, and warping were performed on the second floor. Today, both the first and second floors are organized as open space. On the first floor there are remnants of a wooden corner stair on the northeastern end and a small office was constructed in the southwestern corner. The second floor is open with only a center line of columns. Loading openings are located on the north side (Louise Avenue side). The interior finishes are characterized by wooden flooring, round wooden columns with smaller metal posts on the first floor that support the wooden beams, painted walls and ceiling, fluorescent lighting and exposed sprinkler pipes.

The interior of the large 1901 weaving room addition is an open space, later broken up into storage units with less-than-full-height plywood walls. The storage units fill much of the volume of the space, leaving only a central corridor between them. Otherwise, this space is much like the 1897 mill and the 1901 “ell” connector. The interior finishes of this 1901 addition are characterized by wooden flooring, painted masonry walls, plywood partition walls (storage units), exposed structural components, and single-leaf paneled doors. Near the south end of the building, the elevated bridge connects the 1901 addition to the 1897 engine room. At the south end of the 1901 addition, a narrow motor room, restrooms, and small offices separate the main mill space from the loading dock.

The interior of the 1960s addition on the northwestern end consists of one large room that has been subdivided by a partial-height frame wall. The middle section has been subdivided into
smaller rooms. The finishes are characterized by concrete flooring, exposed painted concrete-block and brick walls, concrete ceiling, exposed HVAC ducts and sprinkler pipes and fluorescent lighting. The exterior wall of the large 1901 mill addition with infilled windows is visible inside this space. This area is used as a fitness center on the southeastern end, and is now vacant on the northwestern end. The southeastern-most addition is a two-story office building with an open stair in the center, offices, and modern finishes.

**Historical Outbuildings**

Several other buildings and structures once existed on the mill site, having been constructed contemporaneously to the mill in 1897–1901. The area between the mill and Hawthorne Lane was the site of the 6,000,000-gallon mill pond that provided water to fight fires, if necessary. The dam for the mill was located just northeast of the railroad spur and a creek drained southwest from the pond. Hawthorne Lane did not exist until after the pond was filled in. The pond had been filled in by the time the 1929 Sanborn map was published, which shows a large water tank in the area of the mill pond.

Several other buildings that are no longer extant once stood on the mill property. The largest was a frame, two-story cotton warehouse with brick firewall that divided it into two sections. It stood at the southeastern end of the 1897 mill building. A wooden platform provided access from the railroad spur to the warehouse. The warehouse appeared on the 1900 Sanborn map and was still standing when the 1953 Sanborn map was published.

Also located at the southeastern end of the mill adjacent to the boiler was the tall smokestack shown in the early photographs of Louise Mill. A one-story, rectangular waste house stood northeast of the mill but the 1901 weaving room addition was built in this location. A new frame waste house was built on the north side of the pond. Several smaller buildings that included stables stood east of the waste house in 1900 but were gone by 1905. Additional outbuildings are shown on the 1929 and 1953 Sanborn maps.  

The mill village for the Louise Cotton Mill stood on the hill above (northeast) the mill and eventually included seventy-two houses, two churches, and a school.  

The village was laid out in a grid plan of four parallel streets with the house placed on the front of the rectangular lots. The side yards were relatively modest but there were larger rear yards. The house plans were similar to houses in the Alpha Mill village. They were one-story, frame dwellings that generally had a side-gable section which encompassed the front door and a single window and had a two-bay front porch with an adjacent projecting front gable section that had a paired window. The village remains relatively intact. The biggest changes to the individual houses include a change in siding and the replacement of windows, especially the paired window on the front-facing gable. They have frequently been replaced with a single large window. The mill village is not a part of this nomination.

---

7 Ibid.
Noncontributing Building

There is a modern building located on the eastern corner of the property close to Hawthorne Lane. It is a one-story, three-bay building with a four-bay porch across the front. The gable roof covered with metal has a tall wooden parapet at the front. The windows have multiple lights and there is an exterior chimney on the north side at the front. This building was constructed in 1976 for use as the gubernatorial campaign headquarters of Ed O’Heren. It currently houses Hackerspace, which is a community technology space.\(^8\)

---

8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

☐ A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

☐ B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

☒ C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

☐ D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

☐ A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes

☐ B. Removed from its original location

☐ C. A birthplace or grave

☐ D. A cemetery

☐ E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure

☐ F. A commemorative property

☐ G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Architecture

___________________

___________________

___________________

___________________
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Period of Significance
1897-1901

Significant Dates
1897
1901

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)
N/A

Cultural Affiliation
N/A

Architect/Builder
Asbury, Foil, & Co.
Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

Louise Cotton Mill meets National Register of Historic Places Criterion C in the area of Architecture as an important example of textile mill architecture in Charlotte. When it was built in 1897 it was the largest cotton mill in Charlotte. It was substantially enlarged in 1901 and the additions created a U-shaped plan with courtyard, which was not found in other Charlotte mills. The use of slow-burning construction methods, brick construction, heavy-timber framing, large and plentiful windows and monitor roofs with clerestory windows in the original mill and its additions represent the best practices of textile mill design and technology at the time for dealing with fire resistance, structural strength, vibration, natural light, and ventilation. It is one of only three intact cotton mills that survive in the city from the late nineteenth century and one of two surviving mills that were built or expanded in 1901. It retains significant architectural integrity of its historic location, association, setting, feeling, design, materials, and workmanship. Louise Mill operated as a cotton mill from 1897 until 1957, when it was closed. The period of significance is from 1897, the date that the original building was completed, until 1901, the year the mill was enlarged.

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

The city of Charlotte rose to prominence in the cotton industry in the 1880s as railroad expansion better enabled manufacturers to construct mills in the heart of cotton country. Mecklenburg County was among the leading cotton-growing counties in North Carolina before the Civil War. By 1900, of the ten counties with cotton mills, Mecklenburg County ranked third with sixteen; Gaston and Alamance Counties had twenty-three and twenty-one mills, respectively. Charlotte, through which the Carolina Central Railroad ran, became an important commercial center for banking and cotton products.


---

10 Ibid.
One other mill was constructed in Charlotte before the end of the century. In 1887, thirty-one-
year-old Hubert Smith Chadwick, a “draftsman and selling agent” for the Franklin Machine
Company, a Providence, Rhode Island, cotton textile equipment manufacturer, arrived in
Charlotte to oversee the installation of machinery in the Ada Cotton Mill. Evidently Chadwick
liked what he saw of Charlotte, which was developing rapidly as a center of cotton
manufacturing. Although he returned temporarily to Providence, he moved permanently to
Charlotte early in the 1890s. In 1892, he organized the Charlotte Machine Company and served
as its president. Chadwick also became president of the Manufacturers’ Club, the Dover Mill at
Pineville, and the Dilling Mills at King’s Mountain. He married Blanche Louise Dodsworth in
Charlotte on January 29, 1896.  

Also in January 1896, Chadwick, Edward A. Smith, Jesse P. Wilson, and William S. Mallory
organized a company they named the Louise Cotton Mill for Chadwick’s wife. In March, the
Charlotte construction firm of Asbury, Foil, and Company received the contract to build the mill
(Josiah F. Asbury and Richard J. Foil, contractors and brick manufacturers, were the partners).
The first bricks were made on April 29, as the construction of a dam for a pond to serve the mill
neared completion. On May 27, the first bricks were laid at the mill site, the farm that belonged
to Kate W. Moore and adjoined the Carolina Central Railroad. In July 1896, Chadwick
announced that the “Louise Cotton Mill is being erected and will soon be ready for equipment.”

The construction of the mill and pond had begun long before Moore completed the sale of her
farm to Chadwick on February 18, 1897. Consisting of three adjoining tracts of land totaling
almost three hundred acres, the farm became the site not only of the mill but also of the mill
village.

Three months later, the mill was nearing completion. The Charlotte Observer described the new
mill, which according to the headline was “Built Upon the Most Modern Ideas,” in considerable
detail:

To the right of the mill, looking west, is a round smoke stack 136 feet high. An
iron ladder inside the stack reaches from the ground to the top. In the middle of

---

13 Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, March 3, 1899, p. 7; New York Tribune, March 3, 1899, p. 10; Sampson, Murdock, and
Co., The Providence Directory, and Rhode Island Business Directory, 1890–1891 (Providence, R.I.: Sampson,
4. Chadwick’s first and second names are often rendered as H. S. in newspapers and documents such as deeds. His
first name is sometimes, as in his death notices, erroneously given as Herbert. In the earliest record concerning him,
however (U.S. Census, 1860, Vermont, Schedule of Inhabitants, p. 41), his first name was clearly written as Hubert.
He was a son of Orson P. Chadwick, a farm laborer, and his wife, Mary A. Chadwick. Hubert S. Chadwick was born
on September 22, 1856. In the announcement of his forthcoming wedding (Charlotte Observer, January 16, 1896, p.
4), his full name is given: Hubert Smith Chadwick.

14 Charlotte Observer, August 25, 1901, p. 2; ibid., January 16, 1896, p. 4; ibid., March 29, 1896, p. 6; Maloney
Directory Company, Maloney’s Charlotte 1897–98 City Directory (Atlanta, Ga.: Maloney Directory Company,
1897), 128, 166; Charlotte Observer, April 29, 1896, p. 4; ibid., May 28, 1896, p. 4; Engineering News,

15 Mecklenburg County, Deed Book 116, pp. 501–503, deed written February 18, 1897, and recorded February 25,
1897, Mecklenburg County Register of Deeds, 720 E. 4th St., Charlotte, North Carolina.
the building on the front part is a tower tank that holds 10,000 gallons, and to the rear of this tower is one that holds 5,000 gallons.

When once in the mill, one is impressed with the softness of the light that pours in from the sides, which are thick with glass, and from the top of the mill, that is made like a sky-light for the purpose of letting in light for the central portion of the building. All the corners inside the building are made round to soften the beams of light as they come in. This works with great effect.

The building is heated or cooled, just as the occasion might be, with air blown by an immense fan placed near the engine room. It enters the mill through transits supplied with dampers for regulating the amount of air to be blown in. Around the mill three 18-inch sewer pipes are grounded and connected with the branch near by, and the drainage is made perfect.\[16\]

The newspaper also described the nearby dwellings built for the mill workers:

One of the main features of this large mill is the neatness and quality of the houses for the tenant[s]. In number there are 60, in five rows, 12 to a row. Each house fronts a street and has a garden 150 by 60 feet. Some of the houses have four and others have three rooms; each room has a fire place and a roomy closet. The building material is of the best kind all the way through. The painting is white trimmed with green. It is a departure from the usual small house. This bunch of houses is on a knoll, and the natural drainage is perfect.\[17\]

On May 31, 1897, Blanche Louise Chadwick “christened” the new mill in a ceremony at which she set the “big wheel” in motion in the engine room. According to the Charlotte Observer, numerous prominent residents of the city attended the event, and Major Clement Dowd (mayor of Charlotte, 1869–1871, and U. S. Congressman, 1881–1885), addressed the crowd. The Louise, he said, was “regarded as the finest mill in the city,” and the enterprise was “in the hands of men who had made a brilliant and eminent success of everything they had undertaken,” “who knew when and where to expend money, and he hoped to see the big wheel turn smoothly, and that the enterprise would be a great success.” With that,

the engineer, Mr. Wm. Welsh [sic], notified Mrs. Chadwick that all things were in readiness, she stepped forward, and turned the small wheel that turned the big wheel, and the latter made its first revolution ‘midst shouts and huzzahs that rent the air. “Look how she goes,” exclaimed Engineer Welch, and everybody looked and admired the beautiful machinery.

After some minutes Mr. Chadwick thanked Major Dowd for his remarks and good wishes, and the crowd for their presence and cheers. He felt that both were good omens, and that the success of his pet scheme—the Louise—was assured.\[18\]

\[16\] Charlotte Observer, May 20, 1897, p. 5.
\[17\] Ibid.
\[18\] Ibid., June 1, 1897, p. 4; Clement Dowd biographical sketch on Wikipedia website, \[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clement_Dowd\], accessed July 5, 2013; the correct spelling is Welch, not Welsh:
When the mill officially opened in August 1897, it had 7,000 spindles and 368 looms.\(^{19}\)

In 1898, during the Spanish-American War, Chadwick served as captain of the Queen City Guards, which was part of the 1st North Carolina Regiment. Because of ill health, however, he was honorably discharged from the service in Havana about December 1, 1898. On March 2, 1899, while in Boston, Massachusetts, Chadwick committed suicide. His wife, accompanied by several friends and family members, traveled to Boston and arranged for Chadwick’s burial in Woodlawn Cemetery outside New York City; the service took place on March 4.\(^{20}\)

The Louise Cotton Mill company’s board of directors at Chadwick’s death included Edward A. Smith, M. P. Pegram, Sr., J. P. Wilson, R. B. Hopkins, Morris Whitridge, J. H. Sloan, and W. S. Mallory. In May 1899, the board elected Smith president to succeed Chadwick. Smith moved quickly to increase the mill’s production capacity, adding 8,000 “spinning spindles, 2,000 twister spindles,” and 154 looms.\(^{21}\)

On November 6, 1900, the *Charlotte Observer* reported that

> the capacity of the Louise Mill is to be increased from 15,000 to 24,000 spindles. The mill building will be made one-third larger in size. Work on this enlargement of the building has already commenced.

> This mill is running night and day, but will make day runs only after the first of the year. In view of this change the work on the improvements will be pushed rapidly to completion.\(^{22}\)

Smith resigned in May 1901 and the directors elected J. P. Wilson president. By August 1901, under Wilson, the mill building had been doubled in size and expanded from 7,000 spindles and 368 looms to 20,000 spindles (4,000 fewer than the newspaper had predicted) and 522 looms. The original mill building measured 90 by 360 feet and was two stories high. Wilson’s addition, located to the east of the first building and connected by a 60-by-100-foot ell, was one story in height, 100 feet wide, and 815 feet long. The mill had 450 employees, and like the mill itself, the adjoining village had expanded to include 27 additional houses, two churches (Methodist and Baptist), and a school with two teachers and about 100 students. In addition, the mill’s success and expansion, according to the *Charlotte Observer*, had spurred other development all around it, including

---

\(^{19}\) *Charlotte Observer*, August 25, 1901, p. 2.

\(^{20}\) *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot*, March 3, 1899, p. 7; *New York Tribune*, March 3, 1899, p. 10; *Charlotte Observer*, March 7, 1899, p. 5. The reason for Chadwick’s suicide is not known. A doctor in Boston, according to the newspaper accounts, blamed liquor but offered no explanation or evidence.


\(^{22}\) *Charlotte Observer*, November 6, 1900, p. 6.
the suburban town of Belmont, a casket factory, cotton batting mill, plough and wagon works, and a show case factory. In its [Belmont’s] residence section are ten new residences, including Heathcote, the most elegant suburban home about Charlotte. What was four years ago a barren field, is now a thickly built up manufacturing centre. . . . [Belmont] has grown within four years from a grove to a town of 125 houses and a population of 800. Many of the Louise Mill hands own their own houses in that locality.\textsuperscript{23}

By 1901, Louise Cotton Mill had 23 cards, 520 looms, and 13,500 ring spindles to produce “Fine Cotton Cloth and Yarns.” The mill was capitalized at $125,000. Carey, Bayne, & Smith, New York, were the sales agents for the cloth, and W. M. & F. W. Sharples, Philadelphia, sold the yarn. The mill was the largest employer of Charlotte’s thirteen mills then in operation, with 450 workers.\textsuperscript{24}

By October 1906, change was coming to Louise Cotton Mill. Arthur J. Draper, who served as secretary of the Calvine (formerly Alpha), Chadwick, Hoskins, and Louise mills, had for some time been increasing his financial interests in the mills. At about this time, J. P. Wilson had decided to retire from the active direction of Louise Cotton Mill, and the company selected Draper as Wilson’s successor.\textsuperscript{25}

On October 14, 1908, the newly incorporated Chadwick-Hoskins Company purchased Louise Cotton Mill, as well as all of its debts, obligations, and assets including the mill, machinery, and land. This acquisition was one of several that Chadwick-Hoskins made in 1908, when the company also purchased the Chadwick, Hoskins, Calvine, and Dover Mills. The new company designated Louise Cotton Mill as Chadwick-Hoskins Mill No. 4, with 26,000 spindles and 750 looms.\textsuperscript{26}

After World War I, declining sales of cotton products forced many mills to reduce their hours of operation, lay off workers, or close altogether. In June 1920, D. I. Williams, the superintendent of Louise Cotton Mill denied “rumors on the street” that the mill, which then employed about two hundred men and women, was going to close on July 1 for thirty days. “Our mill is going to close for July 4, but outside of the one-day holiday our looms will continue to run,” said Williams.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{23} Charlotte Observer, January 17, 1901, p. 6; Charlotte Observer, August 25, 1901, p. 2. Heathcote, long since demolished, stood at the intersection of Louise and Central Avenues.
\textsuperscript{25} Charlotte Observer, October 2, 1906, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{27} Charlotte Observer, June 29, 1920, p. 4.
In mid-November 1920, however, the rumors came true:

About 1,200 cotton mill operatives in North Carolina and Virginia, it is estimated, have been thrown out of employment by the order issued by the Chadwick-Hoskins Company, authorizing the closing down for an indefinite period the six of its textile plants.

Two of the mills are at Chadwick-Hoskins, four miles west of the city [Charlotte]. The others include the Calvine mill, in North Charlotte; the Louise mill, in Belmont, one at Pineville, and another [Martinsville Cotton Mill] at Martinsville, Va.

The officials of the company have not ventured a guess as to when the mills will again start their spindles. Lack of orders to give the mills enough to work on was assigned as the reason of closing down.

For the last several weeks the company has been running its mills on part time, working three and four days out of the week.

The Chadwick-Hoskins company with its six plants has one of the largest aggregates of spindles in this country.28

A month and a half later, in anticipation of a strengthening market for white cotton cloth, Chadwick-Hoskins announced that all of its mills would reopen on January 10, 1921.29

In November 1921, Chadwick-Hoskins changed hands “to a new syndicate composed mainly of North and South Carolina bankers and manufacturers” when they purchased the company’s stock. The syndicate included Benjamin B. Gossett “one of the best known cotton mill men in the two Carolinas,” who was a board member or officer of at least nine mills and three banks. The thirty-eight-year-old Gossett, the son of James P. Gossett, an eminent South Carolina cotton manufacturer, was elected president of Chadwick-Hoskins, which was capitalized at $3,800,000.30

During the 1920s, Charlotte was the focal point of cotton manufacturing, banking, and electrical power in North Carolina. Charlotte had the advantage of seven major banks, four rail lines, and the rapidly expanding Southern Power Company. By the middle of the decade, the city was home to twenty-eight textile company presidents and was “the hub of a network of almost 800 mills with more than 10 million spindles.”31

After World War II, the control of Gossett’s holdings shifted to a northern corporation when Chadwick-Hoskins, as well as Gossett Mills, agreed to merge with Textron Corporation on July 31, 1946. The merger created a new entity or “surviving corporation,” Textron Southern, Inc., and included the following officers: Royal Little, Narragansett, Rhode Island, chairman of the

---

28 Ibid., November 19, 1920, p. 2.
29 Ibid., January 7, 1921, p. 4.
30 Ibid., November 18, 1921, p. 1–2; Greensboro Daily News, November 18, 1921, p. 1.
Royal Little founded Textron (first called Special Yarns Corporation) in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1923. During World War II, Little focused on producing rayon for parachutes and then shifted to making lingerie, blouses, and other domestic products as government contracts declined after 1943. Early in the 1950s, textile production—especially for cotton goods—declined nationally as a result of cheap imports and reduced domestic demand. Textron diversified, first acquiring a company that manufactured cushioning materials for the automotive industry. In 1960, Textron purchased Bell Aerospace, the helicopter manufacturer. For most of the 1950s, however, Textron attempted to maintain its textile base, first through Textron Southern and then, in 1955, through the formation of a new textile subdivision, Amerotron Corporation.33

The experience of Textron—falling demand requiring diversification—exemplified the plight of the cotton-manufacturing industry as a whole after World War II. Intense competition among domestic mills, foreign competition, and the competition from new fabrics all spelled doom for the mills and companies that could not diversify. Many companies made the attempt, automating or otherwise updating their factories, but the profit margins were so low and the competition so intense that their efforts merely staved off the inevitable.34

In June 1951, Textron Southern sold the Louise Cotton Mill to Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee. The university “bought the mill as an investment and immediately leased the property to Textron Southern for 11 years with renewal options.” The sale did not affect operations or employment at the mill. Textile experts claimed that the university would not have to pay North Carolina income taxes and that Textron Southern would likewise escape paying taxes by leasing instead of owning the property.35

The transaction resulted in a blistering editorial in the Greensboro Daily News, which asserted that “Vanderbilt will, as we understand it, not be liable to income taxes; Textron, not holding title, will escape ad valorem [real estate tax].” Vanderbilt’s attorney, Julius C. Smith, of Greensboro, immediately replied that “the property is and will remain upon the tax books of Mecklenburg County and the City of Charlotte for ad valorem taxes,” which he said that Textron Southern agreed to pay as part of the lease agreement. The newspaper then retracted its earlier assertions.36

Although the controversy died down, foreign competition and the increasing popularity of artificial materials such as rayon and nylon proved impossible for the cotton industry to overcome. Textron Southern assigned the lease on the mill from Vanderbilt to the parent

32 Mecklenburg County, Deed Book 1216, pp. 303–334, agreement of merger written July 31, 1946, and recorded October 4, 1946, Mecklenburg County Register of Deeds, Charlotte, N.C.
34 Glass, Textile Industry, 83–84.
35 Ibid., Deed Book 1513, p. 272, deed written June 29, 1951; Greensboro Record, June 30, 1951, p. 5.
president for manufacturing for Amerotron Corporation, announced that Louise Cotton Mill,
which then employed between 300 and 400 workers, would close “soon” as a consequence of the
“adverse textile market. He added that if market conditions later became favorable the mill will
be reopened.” Conditions did not again become favorable, and the 1958 city directory noted that
the building at 1000–1003 Louise Avenue was “vacant.” 37

On December 1, 1959, Vanderbilt University and Textron Corporation agreed to cancel the lease
from Vanderbilt to Textron, since the Louise Cotton Mill was “no longer in operation” and the
university had found a buyer for the property. Vanderbilt sold the land and building to Pargo
Realty, Inc., on December 7, 1959. 38

Pargo Realty sold the property to Eckerd Drugs, Inc., a Delaware corporation with an office in
Charlotte, on January 30, 1970. The drug company used it as a warehouse. By 1993, Eckerd
Drugs sold the property to Hanford’s, Inc., a Charlotte-based, family-owned wholesale florist
business that had been established in 1905. After World War II, under the direction of John Van
Hanford, Jr., the company grew to become “the Southeast’s largest wholesale florist business.” 39
Hanford’s sold the building to Hawthorne Mill, LLC, on October 31, 2001. The property was
sold to Hawthorne Mill Partners, LLC, the current owner, on December 30, 2003. 40

ARCHITECTURAL CONTEXT

The city of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County experienced an explosive growth of the textile
industry beginning in the late nineteenth century. As railroads became the main means of
transportation for industry, textile mills were constructed along railroads throughout piedmont
North Carolina. 41 The Louise Mill was built in 1897 along the Central Carolina Railroad (later
known as the Seaboard Airline Railroad) about two miles east of downtown Charlotte and just
outside the city limits. It was the seventh of eight cotton mills built in Charlotte late in the
nineteenth century during the expansion of the textile industry in the city. The largest cotton mill
in Charlotte when it was built, the Louise Mill was constructed in a manner typical of textile
mills with its rectangular plan, slow-burning construction materials, large windows and roof-top
monitors to provide natural light, a front stair tower, and a shorter rear tower. 42 The 1901

37 Mecklenburg County, Deed Book 2119, p. 433, agreement written December 1, 1959, and recorded December 10,
1959, Mecklenburg County Register of Deeds, Charlotte, N.C.; Greensboro Record, June 13, 1957, p. 8; Hill’s
38 Mecklenburg County, Deed Book 2119, p. 433, agreement written December 1, 1959, and recorded December 10,
1959, Mecklenburg County Register of Deeds, Charlotte, N.C.; ibid., Deed Book 2119, pp. 509–511, deed written
December 7, 1959, and recorded December 10, 1959.
39 Ibid., Deed Book 3156, pp. 465–466, deed written January 30, 1970, and recorded February 3, 1970; Diane M.
Young, “Louise Cotton Mill,” draft National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, submitted to the North
40 Ibid., Deed Book, 12836, pp. 886–890, deed written October 31, 2001; ibid., Deed Book 16623, pp. 211–215,
41 Glass, Textile Industry, 38.
additions to the mill created a U-shaped building with a courtyard, which was uncommon in Charlotte textile mills. Even though the U-shaped footprint was unusual, the overall construction of Louise Mill followed standards of textile mill design that were becoming well established by the late nineteenth century.

Most textile mills in Charlotte had a rectangular footprint with a tower or towers located somewhere on the building. Smaller wings or additions may have been added in a linear pattern or may project from the building. While the original building at Louise Mill was similar to the other Charlotte mills and followed a standard rectilinear plan, the U-shaped footprint formed when the mill expanded in 1901 was not found elsewhere in Charlotte. There are many configurations of industrial buildings and textile mills and changes in the process or textile machinery may require changes to buildings and their plans. The linear layout of rectangular-shaped building with additions added in a straight line was common. Where the amount of available land created constraints on how a building could be enlarged, an industrial quadrangle or in the case of Louise Mill, a U-shaped plan was adopted. At the Louise Cotton mill, the original building was located at the Louise Avenue end of the property while a large mill pond stood at the other end of the property. The location of the primary mill building between a street and a mill pond may have precluded its expansion in either direction and instead it was expanded to the northeast towards the mill village. The creation of a courtyard may also have provided convenience in handling materials as well as additional security for anything stored in the yard. The railroad spur that entered the courtyard from the southeast end provided easy access with a loading platform at the northwest end of the courtyard as well as the main platform, which was located at the southeast end of the mill near the cotton warehouse.

The textile mill was a specialized type of building designed for a specific industry. During the nineteenth century, mill engineers and fire insurance companies combined to improve the design of textile mills by establishing criteria for slow-burning construction and methods for dealing with the vibration caused by the machinery. In addition, the requirements of northern textile machinery manufacturers further dictated the architecture of the textile mill. By the late nineteenth century, these elements of mill construction had become standardized, and mill engineers trained in the Northeast, which had a well-established textile industry, spread these mill construction methods as they moved into other regions of the country. There were also a number of industry articles and manuals published in the 1880s that helped to standardize textile mill design and construction.

Slow-burning or fire-resistant construction was important for textile mills, which were susceptible to fire because of the combustible nature of cotton lint and dust, and fire insurance companies began requiring fire-resistant construction in the 1880s. By the late nineteenth

---

44 Ibid.
45 Bradley, The Works, 68.
46 Glass, Textile Industry, 38.
47 Bradley, The Works, 129.
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In the 19th century, textile mills used brick construction with flat or very low-pitched gable roofs, and timber-framed interior construction. Fire walls separated areas that were more prone to fires or where fire could spread quickly, such as the picker room, engine room, boiler room, and stair towers. In addition to fire resistance, some of the same features of brick construction and wooden framing members were better at absorbing the vibration generated by power looms. Vibration was a major concern, especially in larger buildings.

In the 1860s, pressed brick became the preference for fire-resistance construction. Pressed brick was denser and had a greater resistance to higher temperatures. Flat or low-pitched roofs provided greater stability and also had aspects of fire-resistance construction. They eliminated attic spaces where flammable cotton dust could accumulate. Additional fire-resistant construction was found in the use of heavy wooden plank flooring laid directly on beams without any accompanying joists, which were smaller pieces and would have burned more quickly.

Stair towers on mills were an additional aspect of fire-resistance construction in addition to being one of the few places of architectural expression—they were frequently the only articulation in a long façade. The front stair tower generally extended above the roof line while the rear tower, which housed toilets and transmission shafts, was less prominent. The towers frequently did double duty and held water tanks for sprinkler systems.

The Louise Mill, like other textile mills in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County, incorporated many of these precepts. It was a two-story building constructed of pressed brick and had heavy-timber interior framing with flooring laid directly on the beams without joists, which were elements of fire-resistance construction. The heavy-timber framing also mitigated vibration from the machines. It is not known why or when steel beams were added to both sides of the first floor wooden beams. Typically, wooden beams were better at handling the vibrations caused by machinery used in cotton mills, particularly the weaving looms. It may have been that the beams had begun to deflect and this was to strengthen them or the steel may have been added after the cotton mill closed and it was used for warehouse purposes where vibration was not as much of an issue.

Both the original mill and the later additions have low-pitched gable roofs that are almost flat. There are no attic spaces where dust could build up. The front tower housed a 10,000-gallon water tank on the fourth floor and the rear tower held a 5,000-gallon water tank. Additional fire prevention elements were housing picker functions and boilers in spaces separated from the main mill floor. Bales of cotton were opened and the cotton paced on the picker machines in the

48 Glass, Textile Industry, 38.
49 Bradley, The Works, 126.
50 Ibid., 128, 135.
51 Ibid., 119.
52 Bradley, The Works, 126.
53 Charlotte Observer, May 20, 1897, p. 5.
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picker room. This process released a great deal of highly-flammable lint and cotton dust into the room. At Louise Mill the picker room was located in an end room that was separated from the main part of the 1897 mill by two walls that function as a fire wall and both had fire doors. One of the walls extended above the roof to help prevent the spread of fire. Likewise, the boiler room was originally physically separated from the main mill building and only connected to it by the engine room. The space between the boiler room and the mill was eventually infilled to create a machine shop.

During the dramatic growth of the textile industry in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg area, fifteen textiles mills were constructed, eight late in the nineteenth century and seven early in the twentieth century.\(^4^\) Of the eight built late in the nineteenth century, only three survive substantially intact. They include the Orient Manufacturing Company, also known at the Alpha Mill (1889), although the surviving buildings at the Orient Manufacturing Company date from 1901, the Atherton Cotton Mills (1893), and Louise Cotton Mill (1897). The Victor (1889) and Magnolia (1899) mills have been demolished and only a portion of the Ada (1889), Charlotte Cotton Mill (1880-1881), and Highland Park Manufacturing Company Plant #1(1892) remain. The seven mills built in the early twentieth century include the Chadwick Cotton Mill (1901), the Elizabeth Cotton Mill (1901), Hoskins Cotton Mill (1904), Highland Park Manufacturing Company Plant No. 3 (1904), Mecklenburg Cotton Mill (1904), the Savona Manufacturing Company (1908), and the Johnston Manufacturing Company (1913). Both of the mills erected in 1901, the Chadwick and the Elizabeth, have been demolished as has the Savona Mill.

Louise Cotton Mill is a representative local example of a late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century cotton mill. Its distinctive floor plan, brick construction materials, heavy timber interior framing, and roof form all survive. The windows openings, although infilled, survive on the interior with the segmental arched tops and molded edges. The bricked-in openings are visually discernable on the building’s exterior. Its only material loss is three of the four stories of its front tower and one story from its rear tower. Several additions were made to the mill during its period as a warehouse in the second half of the twentieth century. These include the loading docks on the courtyard side, two masonry additions in the 1960s on the northeastern side of the weaving room, and the construction in the early 1970s of a two-story office building to the end of one of the 1960s additions. The mill, however, continues to be able to sufficiently convey its industrial past as a cotton mill particularly on the interior which retains a high degree of architectural integrity.

All of these mills have much in common including the brick construction, low roofs, rows of windows, towers, and a generally rectangular plan. The Louise Mill incorporated all of these features in addition to its U-shaped plan, uncommon among the Charlotte mills.\(^5^\) When it was built, the Louise Mill was a full two stories high and was the largest mill in Charlotte at the time. It continued to be the largest textile mill until the Highland Park Manufacturing Company Plant No. 3 was built in 1904.\(^6^\) It is one of a handful of late-nineteenth century/early-twentieth

\(^4^\) Morrill, A Survey of Cotton Mills in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County.
\(^5^\) Hanchett, The Belmont-Villa Heights-Optimist Park Survey Area, 8.
\(^6^\) Hanchett, Charlotte and Its Neighborhoods, The Growth of a New South City, 1850-1930, p. 11.
century cotton mills that survive in Charlotte. The Louise Mill with its characteristic textile mill construction and uncommon courtyard design is one of the best-preserved textile mills in Charlotte.  
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1 of 14. Façade, view to the northwest (Swallow)
2 of 14. Façade and truncated tower, view to the east (Swallow)
3 of 14. North end of 1897 mill building, view to the southeast
4 of 14. Southeastern end of 1897 mill building, view to the west (Swallow)
5 of 14. Courtyard, rear of 1897 mill building on left, 1901 “ell” connector on right, view to the northwest (6/2013)
6 of 14. Courtyard, 1901 weaving room building on right, 1901 “ell” connector on left, view
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to the northwest (6/2013)
7 of 14. North end of 1901 weaving room building, view to the southeast
8 of 14. North end of 1901 weaving room building on right, 1960s addition on left, view to the south
9 of 14. Second floor of 1897 building showing roof monitor, view to the northwest (7/2013)
10 of 14. Second floor of 1897 building showing doorways into rear tower, view to the northeast (6/2013)
12 of 14. Second floor of 1901 “ell” connector, view to the southwest
13 of 14. Entire complex, view to the northwest
14 of 14. Non-contributing resource, view to the north (Young) [HPO staff verifies that the building has not been altered since 2009]
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