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1. Name of Property

   historic name  White Hill Mansion

   other names/site number  Glenk’s Mansion House, the White Hill Mansion Restaurant

2. Location

   street & number  217 Fourth Street

   city or town  Borough of Fieldsboro

   state  New Jersey  code  NJ  Count  Burlington  zip code  08505

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I 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 nationally ☐ statewide ☐ locally. ☐ See continuation sheet for additional comments.

   Signature of certifying official/Title

   Date

   Deputy SHPO  Assistant Commissioner for Natural & Historic Resources

   State or Federal agency and bureau

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

   Signature of certifying official/Title

   Date

   State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

   I hereby certify that this property is:

   ☐ entered in the National Register.  Signature of the Keeper  Date of Action

   ☐ determined eligible for the National Register.  See continuation sheet.

   ☐ determined not eligible for the National Register.  See continuation sheet.

   ☐ removed from the National Register.

   ☐ other, (explain:)

   See continuation sheet.
White Hill Mansion
Burlington, New Jersey

5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>building(s)</td>
<td>Contributing 1 Noncontributing 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-local</td>
<td>district</td>
<td>1 buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-State</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>1 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-Federal</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td>0 structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object</td>
<td>0 objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing
(Enter “N/A” if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)
Traditional Patterned Brickwork Buildings in NJ MPDF

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register
0

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/single dwelling</td>
<td>VACANT/NOT IN USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCE/TRADE/restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions)
Georgian/Federal

Materials
(Enter categories from instructions)
foundation STONE
walls BRICK
WOOD: weatherboard
roof ASPHALT
other

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)
### White Hill Mansion

**Name of Property:**

**County and State:** Burlington, New Jersey

---

#### Statement of Significance

**Applicable National Register Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Period of Significance**

- Ca. 1765-1797
- Ca. 1896-99

#### Significant Dates

- December 1776

---

**Criteria considerations**

(mark "x" in all the boxes that apply)

**Property is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>removed from its original location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>a birthplace or grave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>a cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>a reconstructed building, object or structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>a commemorative property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Architect/Builder**

Unknown

---

**Narrative Statement of Significance**

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

---

**9. Major Bibliographical References**

**Bibliography**

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

**Previous documentation on file (NPS):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>previously listed in the National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>previously determined eligible by the National Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>designated a National Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recorded by Historic American Engineering Record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
White Hill Mansion
Burlington, New Jersey

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of property 3.66

Latitude / Longitude Coordinates
(Note to Preparers: NJ HPO will complete this portion of the Registration Form for all Preparers, based on the coordinates derived from the Site Map or District Map that HPO produces.)

1. Lat. 40.137344 Long. -74.734028
2. Lat. 40.136888 Long. -74.732802
3. Lat. 40.135874 Long. -74.733476
4. Lat. 40.136345 Long. -74.734219
5. Lat. 40.136073 Long. -74.734939

(NJ HPO will place additional coordinates, if needed, on a continuation sheet for Section 10.)

Verbal Boundary Description
(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet for Section 10.)

Boundary Justification Statement
(Explain, on the section sheet following the Verbal Boundary Description, how the chosen boundaries meet the requirements for boundary selection and are the most appropriate boundaries for the nominated property or district.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Douglas C. McVarish (revised + edited by HPO staff)  
organization Friends of White Hill  
date April 2020  
street & number 18 East Podmer Avenue  
telephone (856) 745-3837  
city or town Collingswood  
state NJ  
zip code 08108-1221

Additional Documentation
(Submit the additional items with the completed form that are outlined in the “Standard Order of Presentation” that NJ HPO provides. Each page must contain the name of the nominated property or district, and the State and the county in which the property or district is located. Consult with NJ HPO if you have questions.)

Property Owner
(Either provide the name and address of the property owner here or provide the information separately to NJ HPO. Check with NJ HPO for other requirements. All owners’ names and addresses must be provided, including public and non-profit owners, but their presence on the form, itself, is not required.)

name Borough of Fieldsboro  
street & number 214 Washington Street  
telephone (609) 298-6344  
city or town Fieldsboro  
state NJ  
zip code 08505

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties and to amend existing listings. The proper completion of this form and the related requirements is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.470 et seq.)

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this from to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Projects (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

Direct questions regarding the proper completion of this form or questions about related matters to the Registration Section, New Jersey Historic Preservation Office, Mail code 501-04B, PO Box 420, Trenton, NJ 08625-0420.
Summary Paragraph:
The White Hill Mansion is a two-story, single-pile, brick house that dates from the 18th century and stands on a bluff over the eastern side of the Delaware River and parallel to the river (Photo 1). The main block was built, probably in the early 1760s, as a 5-bay, I-house, facing east, with Flemish checker patterned brickwork across both the eastern (façade) and western (riverside) elevations. A two-story, single-pile brick section of uncertain date (but probably late-18th century) abuts this main block to the south. This building stands on the westerly portion of an irregularly-shaped lot on the aforementioned bluff overlooking the river in the southern portion of Fieldsboro, Burlington County. The walls and the window openings largely remain intact from its 18th century appearance, as does most of the original brickwork, but the house underwent some window replacement in the second quarter of the 19th century, when a new front entrance was evidently also added. The house later was remodeled, probably about 1896, which added cross-gabled bays on the east and west and a gambrel-roofed cross gable on the west side. A second-story oriel window was added to the north end of the main block during this period, and a large, projecting bay wraps around the northwest corner of the house in both the first and second stories, also part of the ca.1896 changes (Photo 1). Additional changes include the construction of a widow’s walk atop the center of the roof ridge of the main block (see the ca.1900 historic photos included in this nomination), as well as a wraparound porch on the east, south, and west sides. That porch was removed during the repairs of recent years. The widow’s walk balustrade is no longer extant. The wraparound porch was later enclosed and other single-story additions were constructed on the west. Portions of its site may be discerned by remains of concrete curb walls adjacent to the house. The present configuration of the front porch was probably built during the early 20th century. The house, currently unoccupied, is in fair condition, due to a general cleaning out and to repairs made by the Borough of Fieldsboro, which holds occasional events in the building.

Summary of the House’s Evolution
Ca.1721 - ca.1750s
The land title records and other documentary evidence indicate that there was a dwelling at White Hill from the 1720s forward. There is no demonstrable evidence of that dwelling in the current house.

Ca.1760-70
Construction of the main, 5-bay block of the present house, for the Robert Field, Jr. family.

Ca.1780-97
Construction of the southern addition of the house, extending its overall length to seven bays.

Ca.1835-50
Installation of the present windows in the main block; replacement of the original entrance with the current entrance.

Ca.1896

1 Hereafter cited as ca.1760.
2 Hereafter cited as ca.1800.
3 Hereafter ca.1896. For the reasoning behind this date, see Section 8 of this nomination. Joseph Crossley, who was responsible for the remodeling, purchased house in 1895, but too late in the year to get new construction underway before 1896.
The Victorian-era remodelling of the house for the Crossley family, adding the additional bays to the front and rear and the oriel window on the north end.

Ca.1905-20
Construction of the present front porch, with the brick knee walls and the paired colonettes.

Ca.1923-
Commercial kitchen installed for Glenk’s restaurant, and refrigeration equipment installed in basement.

Ca.1960
Construction of the 1-story dining room addition to the rear. Other equipment was added for the restaurant use as needed in the succeeding years.

Ca.2011 to present
Current preservation efforts have removed the equipment added for restaurant use.

The Site and its Setting
The White Hill Mansion stands on an irregularly shaped lot in the southwestern portion of Fieldsboro west of Fourth Street (see site map). No outbuildings associated with the mansion still stand. The river forms the western boundary of the property, and the house stands on a bluff about 40 feet above the Delaware River. The railroad now carrying the Camden-to-Trenton “RiverLine,” bisects the property at the base of the bluff. East of the mansion, modern houses have been built on land that once belonged to the estate, reducing the nominated property to just a few acres. A driveway and a field extend between the east side of the house and Fourth Street, and are included within the nominated property. An allee of trees extends along the driveway, dating from the early or middle of the 20th century. Trees mark the southern boundary of the nominated property and screen a view of the Stepan Chemical Company facility to its south. A second house, sometimes known as the carriage house, stands to the south of the mansion, and is served by the same driveway. This dwelling is in separate ownership and has been excluded from the nominated property. It no longer possesses its ca.1900 appearance (see the historic photo of the carriage house). Remnant paving indicates that a circular driveway once extended to an area in front (east of) the house. The house is surrounded by a tall chain-link fence installed in recent years by the Borough of Fieldsboro to deter unauthorized access.

Exterior Description
East Elevation (the façade)
Note: The axis of the White Hill Mansion runs approximately northeast/southwest, but for clarity in this description narrative, the northeastern end of the building will be referred to as the north elevation. The front of the house will be referred to as either the façade or as the east elevation. The rear or riverside elevation will be referred to as the west elevation, and the southwesterly end of the house will be the south elevation.

The façade measures seven bays long and two stories high (Photo 1), including both north and south sections. The north, or principal, section currently appears four bays long. This section comprises the original, main
block of the house and probably dates from the early to mid-1760s. This block originally featured a five-bay, Georgian, central hall plan, but the symmetry of the plan was disrupted by the addition of the previously-mentioned Victorian-era, two-story, wood-framed, canted bay window that replaced the two 18th-century, southern bays (Photo 2).

As noted above, this original portion of the house is laid in Flemish checker: Flemish bond brickwork that employs vitrified headers. The house stands on a fieldstone foundation that extends only to about the present grade level, and plain brickwork rises modestly to a water table course, above which it transitions to Flemish checker. The first and second stories are relatively tall for houses of this period, giving a taller surface for the Flemish checker to cover, and, with the length of the northern main block of the house, a wider one also. Other exterior elaboration includes a three-course-wide stringcourse above the first-story windows (photographs 3 and 4). Splayed, flat-arch lintels with projecting keystones elaborate the window openings that still retain their original 18th-century location and configuration. These lintels mark this main block as dating from the heyday of the Georgian style in New Jersey (see Section 8). The stringcourse projects slightly from the façade plane, but otherwise consists of plain brickwork. (It also reveals that the house was built without pent roofs, a feature commonly found in patterned brickwork houses in southern New Jersey.)

As already noted, the south end of the original block was altered by the addition of a two-story, wood-framed bay window sheathed in clapboards and wood shingles, part of the 1895 remodeling. A widow’s walk platform of uncertain 19th-century date but now sheathed in aluminum, rises from the central portion of the roof ridge, and two interior, corbeled brick chimneys rise from either end of the roof ridge.

Fenestration of the original block consists of six-over-six, double hung, wood sash windows that replaced original windows in the early 19th century. Those original windows were probably of 12-over-12 configuration, given the size of the openings. Aluminum caps their wood frames and sills. Ornamental, louvered, fixed 20th-century aluminum shutters that until recently flanked the windows, have been removed. Two 20th-century casement cellar windows are placed in concrete window wells beneath the two northern bays. The added bay window is fenestrated with one-over-one, double hung, sash windows with aluminum-covered frames and flanking, ornamental, fixed, louvered shutters.

The main entry to the house is placed in the central bay of the original northern block, where it replaced the original entry. The current entry was installed probably in the second quarter of the 19th century when its surround was awkwardly cut into the existing, 1760’s brick masonry to make the fit. The assemblage is in the Greek Revival style, and consists of a transom bar and four-light transom over the over the door, and single-light sidelights, each on a narrow, recessed dado between narrow pilasters (Photo 5). The door, itself, is a single-leaf, wood door, probably installed in the late nineteenth century, featuring a large, beveled glass light over four square, raised, wood panels. Two Colonial Revival carriage lamps that no doubt date from the 20th-century restaurant period have been mounted to either side of the door.

---

4 For reasons of consistency, this date will henceforth be cited as ca.1760, but the construction date has not been nailed down tighter than that approximation.
An early 20th-century covered entrance porch shelters the 19th-century main entry. Brick piers and paired Doric colonnettes support the outer corners. Brick cheek walls close the sides. It is crowned by a shallow-hipped, flat seam metal roof. Its cornice, which, based on historic renderings of the house, may have been ornamented with brackets and/or dentils, is now sheathed in aluminum. Its fascia bears a misleading inscription “CIRCA 1723” for the putative construction date of the first house on the property (which many have come to assume is the current house). This inscription was most likely installed during the house’s 20th-century restaurant period.

In the mid-nineteenth century, as part of the changed in that period, a first-story door was added—most peculiarly—at and extending across the joint between the original north block and the ca.1800 south addition (Photo 2). An oculus was added in the second story wall above the door to admit light to a second story space. The south addition is two bays wide, although it lacks the original symmetry of the north block. Its brickwork is plain and in the common bond, though the quality of the brick, itself, and of the bricklaying is superior in this part of the east elevation, somewhat finer and more regular than that of the north block. The windows in this south addition tend to be 12-over-12 double-hung wood windows, a peculiar choice for this part of the house, which yields a suspicion that they may have been original windows from the north block, shifted here at the time of the addition’s construction, an unproven conjecture. A brick chimney rises from the roof ridge, slightly offset to the south from the center of the block ridge. Two pedimented gabled dormers fenestrated with six-over-six, double hung, sash windows rise from the northern portion of the front roof slope.

South Elevation
The south elevation is the south wall of the ca.1800 addition (Photo 6). This gabled wall is two bays wide. The first story has a door and a window placed near the center of the wall. The date of the door opening is unclear, but it would be later than an earlier door opening in the southeast corner of the wall (Photo 6). The current door is a late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century wood door with two, slightly raised vertical panels and flat jamb trim. A mid-to-late-twentieth-century storm door was added to protect this opening. A one-over-one, double-hung, sash window in face-pinned frames occupies a space to the west of the door. This window retains pintles and remnant tie-backs for shutters, indicating that its opening is at least of 19th-century construction. A small turnbuckle for a wood storm window is also present. One 12-over-12, pegged sash window occupied the center of the each of the second floor and attic levels (Photo 11). Window trim matches that of windows on the east elevation. The second floor window has twentieth century, non-functional, ornamental shutters. The edge of the gable is finished with beaded rake boards.

West Elevation
The west elevation of the house faces the Delaware River. It is here that the changes to the house are at their most dominant, from the ca.1896 remodeling and the 20th-century adaptive reuse. In its present configuration, this elevation shows a house that is two stories high and nine window bays wide. The ca.1760 north block is divided into four bays. At the first floor level, most of the elevation is obscured by the mid-twentieth century, one-story dining room addition (Photo 7; see the floor plan). This addition consists in part of a concrete foundation and knee walls faced in brick. The walls consist of a structure of large aluminum and vinyl casement windows. Sash doors, contemporary with the additions, are located on the north and west sides. The addition has a flat roof.
The small, exposed portion of the ca.1760 brick wall of the main block (part of the second story) exhibits Flemish checker, an important feature of the building’s architectural significance (Photo 36). It should be understood that the entire west, or riverside, elevation of the ca.1760 block of the house was laid in Flemish checker, but the windows were not accentuated here with the marble, flat-arch lintels that were used in the façade. The northwest corner is marked by a two-story, semi-octagonal, wood-framed bay with a flat roof and decorative iron cresting, evidently part of the ca.1896 remodeling. This bay is clad in aluminum over original wood shingles. Where the shingles are visible, they indicate that the house must have had a Shingle Style-influenced appearance from this remodeling. South of the corner bay is a second-story, three-sided oriel with a partially integrated pyramidal roof (Photo 8). This oriel, also clad in aluminum, contains three 1-over-1 sash windows. South of the oriel, an original window opening has been reduced with brick infill and metal sheeting to accommodate a late twentieth-century, 1-over-1, double hung, vinyl-clad window.

The two-and-one-half-story, semi-octagonal, gambrel-roofed addition mentioned above, which lines up with its counterpart in the east elevation, was part of the ca.1896 remodeling (Photo 10). In the west elevation, it is placed south of this new window mentioned in the above paragraph. This addition is clad in with clapboards in the first story and shingles in the second. One-over-one, sash windows are placed on the south side at the first story level and on the north, northwest, west, and southwest sides at the second story. A pair of two-light casement windows is placed in the west side at the first story level. A single-light awning window is located on the west side with a concrete window well. The gambrel peak features a central tripartite window with a wide center window. The center window features an upper sash with muntins creating pointed aches. The outer windows are narrow casements elaborated with the same Gothic Revival muntin pattern. To the south of the gambrel-roofed addition, a tall, narrow, one-over-one window was placed in part of a larger opening for an older window. A wood lintel for this window is placed below the jack arch lintel of the original window (Photo 10).

The exposed brick wall of the southern end of the elevation is part of the southern block of the building. This brickwork (Photographs 8 and 9) is laid in common bond with seven courses of stretchers between header courses. The wall is pierced by two door openings at the first floor level. These door openings have been enclosed with plywood panels. The preservation plan for the house suggests that these openings may have been converted from windows as they align with the second story windows that appear to be original to the house. Three 12-over-12 windows with pegged frames, probably dating from ca.1800 and comparable to the others, are placed in the second story of the south block. One window is placed at the south end of the wall, while the other two are placed north of the interior chimney. North of these windows, a second, narrow, 1-over-1 sash window was installed to provide light to the upper landing of the straight run staircase (Photo 10).

North Elevation
The northeast gable end is two stories in height, laid in plain Flemish bond brickwork with a brick water table, a continuation of the three-course high stringcourse from the façade, between the first and second stories, and a two-course high string course above the second story above the eaves level (Photos 34 and 35). The northwest corner has been obscured by the two-story, five-sided, wood-framed bay mentioned above. The roof in the gable has a raking cornice, continuous from the façade, and is elaborated with returns.
A rectangular, wood-framed oriel window in the second story is finished with a metal-clad, ogee-arched base and a shallow sloping roof (Photo 34). Both the oriel and the projecting corner bay are parts of the ca.1896 remodeling. The oriel is crowned by a decorative metal sunburst plaque. The original shingle cladding of the oriel is visible. The window within the oriel has a Gothic Revival upper sash, and a single-light lower sash. Two attic-level casement windows with Gothic Revival muntins are placed to either side of the center line (Photo 35).

**Interior Description**

**Basement**

**Room 001. Bar and Hallway, North Block**

The basement under the ca.1760 block is divided into several spaces. The area from the basement staircase to the north wall of the basement is finished as a bar, also with a small seating area of tables and chairs (Photo 31). The floor is carpeted over composition tile, the walls have wood paneling over the exterior stone walls, and the ceiling is coffered, with particle board panels. The staircase adjoins the south wall (Photo 33). It has square balusters and a square newel post with recessed panels. A doorway in the eastern end of the southern wall with a five-panel door leads to the remainder of the basement. A second five-panel door at the other end of the south wall leads behind the bar. At the northeast corner of the room is an octagonal bay with two frosted glass windows. Along the north wall, the original chimney support mass remains in place. The lower two feet of the mass is of stone, while the remainder, including the arch, is in brick. Additional casement windows are placed elsewhere on the walls of the space (Photo 32).

**Room 002. Room under South Parlor, North Block**

The basement room under the south parlor is an unfinished space. The floor is dirt and concrete and the walls are constructed of a variety of materials. The east wall is a combination of stone and brick; the south wall is stone with a large chimney mass in front of it (Photo 32). The west wall is stone at the southern end and vertically-beaded board north of that. The ceiling is open joists. Doors leading out of the space include the four-panel door from the north hallway. A trimmed opening at the western end of the south wall leads into the basement under the south block. This opening likely had a door, now missing. The final opening is a doorway into the storage space under the southern half of the west bay addition. It is enclosed by a four-panel door with recessed panels. Single-light awning windows are placed in each of the three walls of the east bay. The northwest window is covered from the inside. This space houses the boiler, as well as an electric heater.

**Rooms 003A and 003B: Rest Room and Storage Space Under West Bay Addition**

The space beneath the west bay addition is divided into two rooms with concrete slab floors. The northern of the two rooms is a rest room with tile floor and eight-inch-high baseboard, a vertically beaded board wall on the south and east sides. The ceiling is of particle board. A six-panel door is placed in the east wall and opens into the hallway. The door is a reused 18th-century (?) door with recessed panels with a bead panel molding on the restroom side and a raised panel with an ovolo molding on the hallway side. A single-light window is placed in the west wall. The space houses a sink, a toilet and a urinal and is lit by a hanging fluorescent light fixture.

**Room 004. Room under South Block.**
The basement room beneath the south block has a brick floor, stone walls, and an open joist ceiling (Photo 37). Along the north wall a staircase extends upward from east to west beneath the straight run stair at the first floor level. The east wall has two windows, one of which is a single-light awning, while the second is obscured by insulation. A window opening on the west side has been infilled. In the south-center of this room, a brick-arch chimney with an unusually shallow arch supports the kitchen chimney seen on the first-floor plan. From the west cheeck of this chimney, a stone wall extends southward to the south foundation wall. This wall encloses another space (the “Vault”) in the southwest corner of the basement (Photo 38). This space exists under an arched ceiling with the peak of the arch running north-south parallel to the longitudinal axis of the house, and even with the location of the chimney, and supported with stone walls on either side. One steps down one step on entering this space. The walls of the Vault are lined with built-in wooden shelves.

From the east side of the chimney support, a brick wall extends southward to the south foundation wall. This created an additional narrow space behind the chimney that is accessed through a hole in this brick wall, rather than a trimmed opening. This space can be photographed through the hole, which reveals a passage covered by a vaulted, brick ceiling (Photo 39) that extends south beyond the foundation wall, for a short number of feet, where it is blocked by fill. This feature has been labeled a “tunnel” by some observers; it was certainly a passage that extended beyond the south foundation wall of the house, to a feature that has not been identified or for a purpose that is not fully understood today.

An open storage space, considered part of Room 004, occupies the southeast corner of the basement. The front foundation wall has been cut through to provide a space at floor level, about four feet wide by five feet long, through which food was delivered to a refrigerator/freezer unit in the middle of Room 004 during the several 20th-century decades during which the house was used as a restaurant.

First Story
Room 101, Main Entry
The main entry to the house enters into a central hall with a floor laid in twentieth-century slate tile. The walls and ceilings are plastered with a cove cornice. The entrance door, located slightly north of the center of the hall, dates from the ca.1896 renovation of the building and was described as part of the building’s exterior. The remaining doorways in the hall have a trim profile consistent with the ca.1896 alterations. The north doorway, centered on the wall, accommodates a pair of 15-light French doors with a six-light transom and bulls-eye corner blocks. The west hall opening does not have a door and has been partially in-filled to create a smaller opening. The door frame lacks corner blocks. The south doorway, located beneath the staircase lacks a door, but its framed is marked by corner blocks. The doorway at the east end of the south wall lacks a door.

The architectural highlight of the central hallway is the ca.1896 staircase located along the west end of the south wall (Photos 14 and 30). The lowest stairs run up to a landing against the south wall, while an additional eight risers run up to a landing along the west wall. The staircase is elaborated by a free-standing wall and ceiling along its east end, where the steps are perpendicular to the front door and are set about three feet into the

---

5 This feature has been the subject of much speculation, some persons calling it the near end of a tunnel. That claim, however, begs the question, and concludes an answer which has yet to be proven. For historical reasons, tunnels are thought to have existed at White Hill, and many have been keen to find them, even asserting their discovery without convincing proof.
hallway. The under-stair wall is paneled (Photo 14). The panels are raised and have bolection moldings. Panels beneath stair stringers are triangular. The balusters of the railing are reeded with jigsaw cut panel decoration (Photo 15) between the balusters and over spindles. The newel posts are square with flat panels and bolection molding. The corners are finished with applied sections of turned spindles, and the newel posts are topped by large ball finials.

Room 102. North Parlor
This parlor, in the ca.1760 section of the house, was completely renovated in ca.1896 (Photo 12). The floor is currently covered in tongue-and-groove wood boards. The walls and ceiling are coated in plaster with a plaster cove molding, comparable to that of the center hall. The south wall of the room contains the French doors providing access to the entrance hall. The focus of the north wall is a fireplace with a chimney piece of Pennsylvania clouded marble (Photo 12), probably added in the second quarter of the 19th century. The northwest corner of the room is extended by the previously-mentioned, five-sided bay. The room features two hanging crystal light fixtures, one near the center of the room and the other in the northwest bay, that appear to date from the early twentieth century.

Room 103. South Parlor
The south parlor has tongue-and-groove flooring oriented north-south. The walls and ceiling are plastered and have a cove cornice. The baseboard and the window trim are typical of those elsewhere in the first story of this section. A wide, rectangular opening connects the parlor to another to its west. A doorway at the eastern end of the north wall provides access to the central hall. The east wall has a three-sided bay with one-over-one sash. The fireplace has a brick hearth, glazed tile firebox surround, and a high-Victorian wood mantel consisting of free-standing colonettes on either side of the firebox, two shelves, brackets, a large, center, beveled glass mirror, four small square beveled glass mirrors, and turned posts.

Room 104. Southwest Parlor
Room 104 was formed from the western portion of the original south parlor and the ca.1896 west bay addition. The floor is of tongue-and-groove wood running north-south. Three openings provide access to the room. In the east wall, a wide opening finished with trim typical of ca.1896 renovations was made to create a double parlor. A pair of single-light, swinging doors connect to a kitchen service room (Photo 20).

Room 105. Dining Room Addition
The dining room addition (Photo 16), built about 1960, is located west of the entrance hall and parlor and partially overlaps the west bay addition. The floor in this space is concrete. The east wall, part of the exterior wall of the 1760 block, is sheathed in drywall. (Removal of the drywall would re-expose more of the original brickwork of the ca.1760 house.) The north, west and south walls contain ribbons of windows, some casement and some fixed in place, and sash doors are placed in the north and west walls. The knee walls are finished in wood paneling, and the ceiling is a composition acoustic tile.

Room 106. Kitchen and Secondary Entrance Hallway
The doorway at the eastern end of the south wall in Room 103 leads into a small entrance hall that was created at the bottom of the straight run staircase along the north wall of the south block (Photo 13). The small room
spans the seam between the two sections. The walls and ceiling are plastered except for the south wall, which is finished in drywall.

The south end kitchen, which had been constructed to serve the building when it was used as Glenk’s Mansion Restaurant, has been gutted (Photo 17). The north wall, which formerly was the location of the stove and ovens backed by metal sheeting, now consists only of studs and lath. The former tile floor has been removed, exposing the wood floor beneath. The primary remaining element is the fireplace in the south wall between two doorways, clad in Art Deco style tile (Photo 18).

Room 107. Kitchen Storage Room
The kitchen storage room is located at the south end of the house and is connected to the kitchen by two doors in its north wall. The room is currently unfinished with the former tile floor removed. The current floor is in a variety of conditions with some portions unsafe to walk on.

Room 108. Kitchen Service Wing
This room is located in the kitchen addition at the north end of the west wall of the southern block. The room has a mid-twentieth century tile floor. Portions of the walls are paneled in plywood, while the remainder has exposed studs. Portions of the paneling are missing. On the east side, the brick of the original exterior wall is exposed. The north wall contains a pair of swinging doors connecting it to Room 104.

Second Floor
Room 201. Hallway
The second floor hallway extends down the spine of the northern block (Photo 30). It features a wood floor, typical ca.1896 baseboard, and a small, coved, wood cornice. The main stairway provides access to this hall and also extends up to the third floor. The space is lit by a one-over-one window in the stairwell. To the north of the stairwell is a five-panel-door with a mid-twentieth century knob and ca.1896 trim. Two additional doors are located in the east and south walls. The east door has an early twentieth century metal knob and eared backplate. The south door has a modern door knob and different door trim than other doors on the floor.

Room 202. North Bedroom
The north bedroom is located over a portion of the north first floor parlor (Photo 21). This room is rectangular with the second story of the five-sided bay in its northwest corner. Its floor is tongue-and-groove wood. The baseboard is typical of ca.1896 renovations, and the walls and ceiling are plastered. A five-panel door in the south wall appears to have been added in about ca.1896.

The fireplace at the center of the north wall has a Queen Anne mantel with a modified firebox (Photo 21). An oriel window occupies the east end of the north wall. The oriel has tongue-and-groove flooring and a typical ca.1896 baseboard. The window in the oriel features a Gothic Revival sash over a single light sash. Ceiling lights with bronze chains and a frosted glass globe hang from the ceiling of the corner bay and from the center or the ceiling of the room.

Room 203. Northwest Bedroom
The northwest bedroom, located on the west side of the second floor, features a three-sided bay from the ca.1896 remodeling along its west wall. The room has tongue-and-groove flooring and a baseboard typical of the same period. The walls and ceiling are plastered. A beam is located at the ceiling level and runs north south on the east edge of the bay. The five-panel door located in the east wall displays typical ca.1896 trim. The bay includes three 1-over-1 sash windows, also typical of late nineteenth century installation.

**Room 204A & 204B: Rest Room and Lounge**
The northern of two connected rooms (Room 204A) on the east side of the second floor is a rest room with access through the lounge immediately to the south. The walls and ceilings are plastered. The room includes a tall baseboard with a simple cyma recta cap and door stoop. A typical late nineteenth century, five-panel door with typical trim and an old knob are located in the south wall. A single six-over-six window with typical ca.1896 trim is located in the east wall. Two toilets in stalls are placed in the northern end of the space, and a sink is located against the south wall.

The south room has a particle board floor, a shorter baseboard with quarter-round cap molding, and plaster walls and ceiling. Five-panel doors are placed in the north and west walls, both with a simplified version of the ca.1896 door trim found elsewhere in the house. The door knobs are metal with an eared, rounded, rectangular backplate. A six-over-six window is located in the east wall.

**Room 205. South Hallway**
A hallway extends east-west on the southern side of the south stair hall, connecting the stair hall with a bedroom and a bathroom (probably an earlier hallway). Its eastern end is narrower than the western end. The hall has a typical ca.1896 baseboard and plaster walls and ceiling. Four doorways extend off the hallway. At the east end of the north wall, there is a five-panel door that provides access to Room 201. At the eastern end of the south wall is an altered five-panel door that opens into a bathroom.

**Room 206, Bedroom above the South Parlor**
The south bedroom has a concave curving bay along its east wall (Photo 22). The room has random width, tongue-and-groove flooring laid north to south. The flooring in the eastern portion of the room is narrow than that in the remainder of the room. The baseboard is of typical ca.1896 installation, except at the east end of the north wall where a simpler version was used. The walls and ceiling are plastered. A doorway is located near the center of the north wall. This doorway lacks a door and has typical ca.1896 trim. East of this doorway is an eighteenth-century door with six raised panels with integral ovolo panel molding fixed in place. (It is possible, but not certain, that this is a reused door from the 18th-century section of the house. Another doorway is placed in the south wall. The door surround is typical of a late nineteenth century date. Three one-over-one windows with typical late nineteenth century trim are placed in the east wall. A fireplace in the south wall lacks its mantel. The ghost of the mantel suggests that it was a typical late nineteenth century design. A light fixture with three bronze chains and a bowl-like diffuser hangs from the central part of the ceiling.

**Room 207, Bathroom**
This bathroom (Photo 23) has tongue-and-groove flooring laid in a north-south direction and a plain, six-inch high baseboard with a rounded top edge. It features wainscoting consisting of alternating reeded and unreeded
vertical boards. An elaborate, reeded chair rail extends along the walls. The walls are plastered, while the ceiling is drywall. There are two doorways, one at the north and the other at the south end of the room. The south door is a typical five-panel type and a one-over-one window is located in the west wall. The bathroom fixtures may date from the house’s early twentieth century conversion to a restaurant, the bathroom forming part of a caretaker’s apartment for the owner’s family.

Room 208. Kitchen
The room, situated on the second floor of the west cross-gambrel block, has a typical ca.1896 baseboard, plastered walls, and a drywall. The entrance to the room is located at the northern end of the east wall. Three one-over-one windows are placed in the canted west bay walls and in the adjacent north wall.

Room 209. Stair Hallway
The straight run stairs on the north wall of the south addition terminate in a small second floor hallway with a closet. The stringer cap of the stairwell displays a half-bead over a three-quarter bead cap. The baseboard measures about six inches high with a similar cap molding. The floor level in this section is about six inches lower than the floor level in the north block. The walls and ceiling are plastered. The closet is located south of the staircase and has a stacked five-panel door with slightly raised panels. A one-over-one window in the west wall has casing trim similar to that of other second story windows. An early twentieth-century light fixture hangs from the ceiling.

Room 210. North Bedroom, South Block
The baseboard in this room is short with a half-bead cap, and the walls and ceilings are plastered. Doorways are spaced around the walls: one in the northwest corner leads to the main stair hall, one in the northeast corner leads to a bathroom at the base of the attic stairs, one in the southeast corner leads to the southwest corner stair hall, one in the middle of the south wall leads to a closet, and one in the southwest corner leads to a closet shared with the south bedroom. All doors have six slightly-raised panels with no panel molding. The surround of the door on the western end of the north wall is flat, suggesting an eighteenth-century fabrication date (Photo 28). The trim around the southwest and south middle doors is a simplified version of ca.1896 trim. A six-panel door in the west wall leads into the south bedroom in the south block and also has simplified 1890’s trim. A window in the east wall is filled by twelve-over-twelve, double-hung sashes.

Room 211. Southeast Stair Hallway
The quarter-turn winder staircase in the southeast corner of the house terminates in a small second story hallway. Within this space a four-panel door with slightly raised panels (Photo 24) and leads to the north bedroom in the south block. The door casing has simplified 1890’s trim. A six-panel door in the west wall leads into the south bedroom in the south block and also has simplified 1890’s trim. A window in the east wall is filled by twelve-over-twelve, double-hung sashes.

Room 212. South Bedroom
The south bedroom in the south block has wide, random-width, tongue-and-groove floorboards that run north to south. The baseboard in the room varies in height with the average being about six to eight inches and has
different cap moldings. Three doors are placed in the walls of the room: two in the north wall and one at the southern end of the east wall leading to a closet. Door trim is typical of other doors in the south block. Two 12-over-12 windows are placed in the south wall and one in the east wall. A fireplace located in the north wall was rebuilt in the mid-twentieth century.

Attic
Room 301 and 301A: Hallway and Unfinished Space
The ca.1896 staircase continues as an open stair up to the third floor. A stud wall with plywood paneling on the stair side was added during the twentieth century at the third floor level to create an enclosure. A hand-planed, early eighteenth century, two-panel door with raised panels was reused in this wall at the top of the stairs (Photo 24). (Doors of this rare type are known to have been used in the 1720s and ‘30s. This door is not, however, in its original location, and cannot be argued with certainty to have come from an earlier dwelling on this site, yet its presence in this house is a considerable curiosity. It is likewise hinged with its original H hinges, an early variant of the later and very popular H-L hinges. ) Walls and ceiling of the staircase are plastered. The west wall is pierced by a Gothic Revival window with ca.1896 trim. The floor of the hallway consists of random-width tongue-and-groove flooring with a typical ca.1896 baseboard. The walls and ceiling are plastered, and the ceilings slopes on the east side. A wood-framed hatch in the ceiling provides access to the widow’s walk via a ladder stored in the hallway.

North of the stairs is a closet with a four-panel door with raised panels and an ovolo panel molding with typical ca.1896 trim. The door is of the six-panel type with raised, Federal-style panels, a small bead around the edge of the raised field, and quirked ovolo panel molding.

Room 302, North Bedroom
The floor of this room has wide, random width, tongue-and-groove boards laid north to south. The baseboard and window and door trim are typical of the 1895 period. The walls and ceiling are plastered and the ceiling slopes on the east and west sides. The chimney mass of the north interior end chimney is centered on the north wall. The chimney mass is flanked by two casement windows, each with a Gothic Revival sash. The south end of the room contains a door to the hallway. Two more windows are located in dormers on the west wall. Their Gothic Revival sash suggest a late nineteenth century construction date (Photo 25).

The floor of the hallway consists of random-width tongue-and-groove boards running north and south beneath a typical, 1895 baseboard. Walls and ceiling are plastered and the ceiling slopes on the east side. A closet with a raised, four-panel door and typical ca.1896 trim is located north of the stairs. A door at the north end of the hallway leads to the north attic bedroom.

Room 303, South Bedroom, North Block
A roughly T-shaped room, it is comprised of the southwest corner of the ca.1760 house and the attic level of the west gambrel-roofed addition. In the ca.1760 section, the flooring is wide, random-width tongue-and-groove board running north and south. The west side of the room has uniform five-inch-wide tongue-and-groove flooring running east-west. Typical ca.1896 baseboards are used throughout the room. The walls and ceiling are plastered; the ceiling slopes along the east wall, as well as along the north and south sides of the west bay.
addition. Two doors are placed in the room: a four-panel door with recessed panels and quirked thumb molding in the north wall leading to the hallway, and one four-panel door, designed with a diagonal top edge to accommodate the roof line that leads to the attic of the south addition. A tripartite window is located in the west wall. It has a double hung sash window in the center and Gothic Revival casements in the side windows, typical of other ca.1896 windows (photos 26 and 27).

Room 304
Room 304 consists of the western half of the attic over the southern block between the north wall and the chimney and the attic stair along the north wall. The space features very wide, random-width, tongue-and-groove floorboards running north and south, except at the north end where the floor has been sunk into the space between the joists to provide headroom for those ascending the stairs or entering from the adjacent higher attic space. The walls and ceiling are plastered. The east wall of the space may be an eighteenth-century board wall covered in particle board.

A door with a diagonal cut top is placed in the north wall of this room. This wall is the original south wall of the ca.1760 block. At the bottom of the stair, a sliding panel provides access to the plumbing of the second-floor bathroom. The east wall contains a door into the northeast room, an old, probably 18th-century, four-panel door with raised panels and an ovolo panel molding. A second doorway leads into the southeast room. Finally, a four-panel door with recessed panels and ovolo panel trim is placed in the south wall to provide access to the south attic room.

Room 305, Northeast Room, South Block
This room has wide, tongue-and-groove floorboards running north and south. The walls and ceiling are finished with particle board. A dormer in the east wall contains a six-over-six window with plain trim.

Room 306, Southeast Room, South Block
This room has wide, tongue-and-groove floorboards running north and south, and walls and ceiling sheathed in particle board. The space contains a dormer with a six-over-six window with plain trim.

Room 307, South Room, South Block
This room constitutes the southern section of the attic of the south block. Its floor consists of the same wide, random-width, tongue-and-groove floorboards used in other attic rooms in the south block. The ceiling slopes down to the east and is sheathed in particle board. An 18th-century, four-panel door with raised panels and ovolo panel molding is placed in the north wall, while a 12-over-12 window is placed in the south wall. The door has plain trim, H-L hinges, and a wrought iron thumb latch. The room is dominated by a large wood cistern seated on railroad ties that bear on the exterior wall and the interior chimney mass. Two black metal straps extend across the floor from the south wall to prevent further movement of the cistern.

Architectural Integrity
The complex history of the mansion is visible in its exterior and interior appearance. The earliest period, the Robert Field occupancy, is exemplified by the original patterned brickwork block of the house. The period of occupancy by his widow Mary Peel Field is exemplified by the southern addition to the original block. The
interior of the house strongly reflects changes made during the occupancy by Joseph and Martha Crossley, and its later operation as a restaurant by Henry and Katrina Glenk. Although the house does not retain architectural integrity exclusively from any particular historical period, but it reflects a sequence of significant events and important owners, of the property, not all of which are extensively treated in this document.

Archaeological Excavations and Findings

The property was the subject of two archaeological investigations, undertaken in the summers of 2011 and 2013 by Monmouth University faculty and students as part of its annual archaeological field school.

The 2011 study area centered on an approximately 175-foot square area including the mansion itself and the surrounding domestic core. Within this study area 63 shovel test pits (STPs) were plotted at 25-foot intervals and in judgmental locations, an additional eight excavation units (EUs) of various sizes were tested.

Archaeological testing revealed intact prehistoric Native American and mid-18th to late-19th century historic deposits around the mansion. A total of 437 prehistoric artifacts were recovered of which 160 were found in intact subsoil contexts. The report conclusion discussed historic period artifacts recovered during the 2011 excavation:

The earliest dated artifact recovered from the site was a bottle seal with the numbers “…54” possibly representing the date 1754 AD coinciding with Robert Field, Sr.’s tenure on the tract. White salt glazed stoneware, buff bodied slipware, and red earthenware were also recovered from the site, but these cannot be concretely dated to Robert Sr.’s period of ownership, as their manufacture extended into the late eighteenth century…

Archaeological materials recovered from Features 8, 11, 12A and 15 were sheet middens. Feature 11 dates from the mid-18th century and contained a rich collection of mid-late 18th century artifacts, including Chinese Export Porcelain, creamware, pearlware, tin glazed earthenware, redware and porcelain…A substantial quantity of oyster shell was also found in these contexts. Overall, this appears to be a domestic deposit associated with an upper-class family that had access to the latest in European ceramics, and could afford marked wine bottles—a rarity in New Jersey…

Despite extensive historical documentation of British and Hessian military occupation on the property during the late 1770s and a recent metal detector survey, no military-related artifacts were identified on the property. Discussions with John Glenk…also revealed that a cannon was once present near but outside the northwest corner of the study area.6

The 2013 investigation included the additional excavation of 71 STPs plotted at 12.5 and 25-foot intervals and 10 EUs at judgmental locations. The excavations produced 988 prehistoric artifacts and 18,484 historic period artifacts. In addition, 47 historic cultural features were identified at the site including possible buried tunnel remains, post holes, foundation remains, a deep earthfast cellar, middens, and refuse pits. The management summary for the investigation discussed the findings of the archaeological excavations:

---

6 Michael J. Gall, R.P.A., and Richard Veit, Ph.D., R.P.A., Monmouth University Archaeological Field School, White Hill Mansion (28-Bu-738), 217 4th Street, Block 13, Lot 3.08, Fieldsboro Borough, Burlington County, New Jersey (West Long Branch: Monmouth University, 2012, 4-82-4-83.)
….where archaeological testing was conducted, particularly the southern portion of the study area, revealed the presence of dense deposits of early/mid-18th – to late 19th-century cultural deposits and features associated with the Field family (1721–1810); Annis Boudinot Stockton (1797-1801); the Isaac Field, Jr. or Lewis French (1847-1869), Andrew Ingersoll (1877-1885), and Joseph Meyer (1885-1895) occupations. Collectively, the historic archaeological resources in the archaeologically tested portion of the study area south of the N325 transect of the White Hill Mansion Site (28-Bu-738) represent a contributing element to the New Jersey Register-listed White Hill Mansion historic property under Criterion D for their ability to provide significant information in New Jersey history on the daily lives of the Field, Stockton and Meter families, 18th and 19th century farmstead estates; domestic economy; landscape use; foodways; and rural genteel life in the Delaware Valley. Additionally, the historic resources at this site are recommended eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion D for their ability to provide important information about identity formation and maintenance, consumer behavior, and the large multi-venture plantations among rural genteel Quaker planter families in the Delaware Valley during the 18th and early 19th century.

---

7 Because the documentation of Criterion D significance of the property would require comparison to other similar sites and greater analysis of the cultural material found in the excavations, Criterion D significance is not claimed in this nomination.

8 Michael J. Gall, R.P.A. and Richard Veit, Ph.D., Supplemental Monmouth University Archaeological Field School, White Hill Mansion (28-Bu-738), 217 4th Street, Block 13, Lot 3.08, Borough of Fieldsboro, Burlington County, New Jersey (West Long Branch: Monmouth University, 2014), ii.
Summary of Significance
Built in the 1760s as the home of the Robert Field family, and enlarged probably ca.1780-97, the White Hill Mansion was associated in December 1776 with the Hessian occupation of nearby Bordentown in the events immediately before and surrounding the first battle of Trenton on December 26, 1776. The Field family who occupied the house was well-connected socially and politically in New Jersey. Their house is architecturally significant under Criterion C for its extensive use of traditional patterned brickwork. The property on which the mansion stands was occupied in prehistoric times by Native Americans, and significant archaeological deposits have been identified during field schools there conducted by Monmouth University in 2011 and 2013. It is expected that archaeological information from this site also will eventually yield a richer understanding of the appearance and operation of the Fields’ White Hill property during the Revolutionary War. As a consequence of these several associations, White Hill Mansion possesses local significance under National Register Criterion A in military history and local archaeological significance under Criterion D, both for the information value that it is likely to provide for Native American studies and for the information the mansion site is likely to provide related to the use of the property and the evolution of its farmstead during the Field family occupancy between 1721 and 1810. The mansion, itself, also possesses local architectural significance under Criterion C for its ca.1896 eclectic remodeling by the Crossley family, which returned the home to being a fashionable residence once again. For Criterion C, the period of significance extends from ca.1765 to ca.1797 and from ca.1896 to ca.1899, encompassing the major construction campaigns that characterize the mansion.

Archaeological Significance, Prehistoric Period (local significance, Criterion D)
(Late Archaic Period to Late Woodland Period)
The two field schools that Monmouth University anthropologists Richard Veit and Michael Gall conducted at White Hill in 2011 and 2013 discovered 555 prehistoric artifacts, a large percentage of which were found in intact subsoil deposits. They discovered two concentrations of fire-cracked rock and at least one storage pit feature that supported one of the fire-cracked rock locations (see the plan labeled Fig. 4.7, among the historic maps of this nomination). Artifactual evidence also suggests that tool production and food processing activities were conducted at these locations. Upon evaluation, these findings have suggested the presence of two encampment sites within the 175 x 175-foot archaeological survey area encompassed by the two field schools and the possible presence of one longer-term occupancy, perhaps within a semi-permanent dwelling. Native American cultural material was disbursed across the White Hill Mansion property, but was found in greater densities. Some artifacts were found re-deposited in historic-period features. The data indicates quartzite comprised nearly one-third of the entire raw material assemblage, followed by argillite and chert. Artifact types


2 The White Hill Mansion property is also important for its associations with several persons important in our past, including Archibald Crossley, co-founder with George Gallup of public opinion polling in the United States, for whom the White Hill mansion was his birthplace and childhood home, but these Criterion B associations will not be argued for in this document. The property may have been occupied since about 1680, but the location of the early dwelling has not yet been determined to have been located within the nominated property. There is greater confidence that the nominated property has been occupied since the 1720s.
were largely composed of flakes followed by fire-cracked rock. The density of artifacts indicates Native American occupation of the landform was characterized by multiple campsites where hunting, cooking, food processing and storage, raw lithic material reduction, chipped stone tool production and refining, and other activities were conducted. No Native American cultural features were identified, but a notably dense deposit of debitage indicative of tool production and re-sharpening was found. There, significant quantities of quartz, chert, shatter and flakes were noted, as was a hammerstone and a triangular argillite biface. The presence of a Lackawaxen projectile point and pottery suggests occupation from the Late Archaic through the Late Woodland periods. The evidentiary basis of these findings is sufficient to suggest that were additional archaeology to be conducted within the same survey area, additional evidence would likely be found that would strengthen and refine these conclusions. Collectively, the data highlights the dynamic complexity of occupation of the site from the prehistoric period through the era of European contact.

Colonial-Era Background History
The White Hill Mansion stands overlooking the Delaware River, on a high bluff known since the 1680s as “White Hill.” The numerous white blossoms in springtime of the trees that covered the hill are believed to be the source of the estate’s name. The property was the subject of a rather convoluted title history during the next four decades, which has been well traced in the Monmouth University report on the second of its field schools (see note 1). It is unclear, however, whether any occupancy of the mansion site occurred before the 1720s. Born on November 6, 1694, Robert Field, Sr. was the eldest son of Benjamin and Experience Allen Field of Chesterfield Township, Burlington County. He bought a 500-acre tract of land that included the site of the present house in 1721 from his uncle, Nathan Allen, the founder of Allentown. Allen, a locally-prominent figure, was his mother’s brother. Robert subsequently married Mary Taylor, daughter of Samuel and Susanna Taylor of Chesterfield, New Jersey. Their oldest son, Robert, Jr., was born on May 9, 1723. It has long been understood that the Fields lived in a house at the site of the present mansion, and there has long been a conflation of that house with the present mansion, which accounts for the “Circa 1723” sign that still remains on the mansion’s front porch (see Section 7). The Field family continued to occupy the property for nearly ninety years. One door that survives from an earlier dwelling, probably from the 1720s or ‘30s, has been kited to the attic of the mansion, but the origin of that door is unknown (see Section 7 and Photo 24).

Although much remains to be discovered about the activities of Robert Field, Sr. at White Hill, the broad parameters of his impact there seem to be understood. White Hill in the 1730s was becoming an important landing site on the Delaware River, in competition with the landing at Bordentown. The road known today as Delaware Avenue originated by the 1730s as the road to the White Hill landing, and it extended through the Field property. The Fields sold property on the north side of Delaware Avenue to encourage the construction of a tavern to serve the landing clientele. In the 1740s, a stage line began operation from White Hill, operating

3 Gall and Veit, 3-18.
5 For more on Allen, see histories of Allentown, New Jersey. This connection to the Allens also meant that Field was related through marriage to the Montgomery and Burnet families, prominent families in what would become Upper Freehold Township in Monmouth County. Robert Burnet, Nathan Allen’s father-in-law, owned a full share in the East Jersey proprietorship. Field was also related through his parents’ generation, to the joiner-turned-merchant Isaac Marriott. These were some of the Field family’s social connections.
across the colony through Monmouth County. In 1752, Robert Field, Sr. placed an advertisement in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* offering the lease of his property for a period of four or five years:

```
To let, the dwelling house and plantation where Robert Field now lives, at Whitehill in West New Jersey, being a beautiful seat by the river Delaware, a very good dwelling house and good barn, a good and convenient bake-house under the bank by the river, with a wharf to the channel to accommodate, about 150 acres of cleared land and meadow, a good orchard, garden and all in good order and good fence.
```

Central New Jersey had become an important producer of wheat by the middle of the 18th century, and the presence of a commercial bake house at White Hill suggests the Fields had found a way to generate a return from the wheat trade. The advertisement also indicates that Field’s property included a wharf extending to the channel in the river, whereby they would have encouraged the landing of commercial vessels. If Field were in failing health by the early 1750s, it would make sense for him to have chosen to lease the property to generate additional income. Field, only about sixty years of age at the time, wrote his last will in 1754, and devised to his son, Robert, Jr. (Robert [2]), all the lands of his plantation. A decade later, this younger Robert [2] married Mary Peel of Philadelphia in 1765 and started a family. Together they brought seven children into the world: Lydia and Mary (twins), Robert (died young), Grace, Susan, Samuel, and a second Robert [3], but only Lydia, Mary, and Robert [3] survived to adulthood. It was during that decade and in these circumstances that Robert [2] had the White Hill mansion constructed.

### The Fields and the Construction of their Mansion

The north block of the mansion, its principal section, is a brick house in the vernacular Georgian style that witnessed a heyday in New Jersey from the 1750s through the 1770s. Based upon building fabric, the north block of the building was probably constructed about 1765, and certainly before 1771 when it is explicitly mentioned in a mortgage that the Fields secured. Physical evidence in the basement of the southern section of the house also suggests that the 1760s construction was even more extensive than the north block alone. The presence of a portion of a brick-arch ceiling in the southwestern corner of the house suggests that this space began as an underground vault likely built when the north end was built, and perhaps served by an underground passage from the cellar of the north block. This is a conjectural conclusion, but it fits with the limited information available. Awkwardness in the manner with which the remains of this “vault” connect with the 2-story southern section of the house above it suggests the likely possibility that the vault is older than the above-ground structure of the south addition. That addition was probably built in the in the 1780s or ‘90s (see below).

Governor William Franklin appointed Robert a justice of the peace for Mansfield Township in 1767, a position akin in most ways to a municipal judge today. Justices, however, also performed many routine administrative tasks, and the fees that they were legally entitled to charge for these services significantly enlarged their income. Justices also served as county court judges, and they served on the county governing body known at

---

6 For this and other stages that operated out of White Hill and Bordentown, see Wheaton J. Lane, *From Indian Trail to Iron Horse: Travel and Transportation in New Jersey, 1620-1860* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1939).

7 [To let]. *Pennsylvania Gazette*, March 3, 1752


9 Gall and Veit, page 3-20, 30, 33.
that time as the board of justices and freeholders (forerunner of the modern boards of chosen freeholders). To be a justice was to be a conspicuous figure both locally and on the county level.

It was not unusual for justices to use some of their additional prosperity to improve their properties. In Nottingham Township (now Hamilton Township), for example, Isaac Pearson, who, himself was also named a justice in 1767 on the same roster that included Field’s name, had his (now) Register-listed house built in 1773, several years into his justiceship. Pearson held more property than any other Nottingham taxpayer, and paid the highest taxes.\(^\text{10}\) Field, not quite as land-rich, still had the very impressive main block of the mansion built for himself and his family.

**Traditional Patterned Brickwork.** (Criterion C, local significance, architectural history)

The White Hill mansion embodies notable patterned brickwork in its design. Both the façade (east elevation) and the riverside-facing west elevation were laid in Flemish checker, with vitrified black headers. That these two principal elevations were laid in Flemish checker means that this diaper pattern was very extensively displayed, more so than on nearly all other examples of this pattern. This treatment is associated with property owners of above-average wealth and social position, even among owners of patterned brickwork houses. The Fields certainly were one such family. The relatively few examples that exhibit Flemish checker across both front and rear elevations include two extraordinary ones: the William Trent house in Trenton, built for wealthy Philadelphia merchant and New Jersey Chief Justice William Trent, and the Abel and Mary Nicholson house in Salem County, a National Historic Landmark, built for a “weighty Friend” of the Salem Monthly Friends Meeting. Both of those houses were built in the early 1720s, which could give rise to a suspicion that it may be possible the main block of the White Hill mansion was also built in the 1720s, but the Trent and Nicholson houses have other diagnostic features that reveal their early construction dates, in contrast to White Hill.

The brickwork of White Hill is also adorned in its façade with a stringcourse between the first and second stories. Three courses wide, it is composed of plain brickwork that projects slightly from the façade plane. The stringcourse contrasted with the Flemish checker above and below it. These visual qualities were set aside when the house exterior was first painted, probably in the 19th century. It was subsequently kept in paint until recent decades, when vacant and unmaintained, the paint has gradually flaked away, revealing the vitrified headers that the paint was meant to hide. The stringcourse is also positioned slightly above the lintels over the first-story windows, rather than just below the second-story windows. This was the fancier or more stylish of the two alternatives, which also meant that the house was not built with a pent roof in the front, leaving still more area to display the Flemish checker.

Despite many alterations to the house, several of the window openings in the façade exhibit their original size and positions (their frames and sashes were replaced in the 19th century). The elegance of the house was greatly enhanced by the installation of stone lintels over the first- and second-story windows (Photo 4). These were of a near-white marble known to geologists as “Corkeysville marble,” after the location in Maryland where the stone was quarried. They are of a specific form that was a hallmark of some of the better Georgian-style houses of the 1760s and 1770s. The lintels are each of a single piece of stone, cut to form a splayed lintel across the entire width of the window opening, but each face is cut and tooled to convey the appearance of five voussoirs.

as if collectively forming a flat arch, with a large keystone at the center. This was an expensive decoration. Even more than the Flemish checker walls, it reveals the lengths to which the owner was prepared to pay for a fashionable house. Such lintels adorn the first- and second-story windows of the John Hatton house, built in Swedesboro about 1762, but only the first-story windows of the Isaac Pearson house, built in Nottingham (now Hamilton) Township in 1773. Hatton was the Royally-appointed customs collector for the southern New Jersey ports. More often, where such window lintels appear, they were executed less expensively in wood, as in the second story windows of the Pearson house.

The window lintels offer clues to where some of the materials may have come from to build the house. The distribution of their placement within New Jersey (leaving Pennsylvania aside), suggests that they were the finished product of Philadelphia stone carvers. While the lintels do not provide a “signature” feature by which the identity of a specific carver can be determined, their presence in this house opens up an avenue for research that a future architectural historian may wish to pursue. If records of such a carver have survived, and if they link the purchase of such lintels to Robert Field, then the dates of such transactions would yield a more precise construction date for the main block of the house.

**The Fields and the Revolutionary War (Criterion A, local significance, military history)**

Sadly, neither Field nor Pearson survived well into the Revolutionary War years. Pearson died from gunshot wounds only three days after the first battle of Trenton in December 1776. Field died even sooner, in the Delaware River in what has been characterized as a drowning. He died on January 29, 1775 in what was described in the newspaper as a mysterious boating accident: “On Saturday night last, as Robert Field, Esquire, was going in a canoe to board his shallop he unfortunately fell overboard and drowned. He had only his Negro man with him, who threw over the paddle to him, but Mr. Field sunk immediately.” His death was chronicled this way in a family genealogy:

> His death has always been involved in mystery. He was going down to Philadelphia from his home at White Hill on a sloop….He left the sloop for a few hours during a calm and went on shore to call on a pioneer; when the wind arose at twelve o’clock at night, the captain sent a rowboat for him attended by one man. When the boat reached the sloop he was missing, and was never heard from again, although every effort was made to recover his body.

Although Robert Field’s death occurred before the beginning of military action in the American Revolution, he played an important local role in actions that culminated in the conflict. His death made his wife Mary Field a widow during the most tense period of the Revolutionary War in New Jersey.

Within the arena of New Jersey’s Revolutionary-era politics, the northern part of Burlington County presented considerable opposition to British trade policies and regulations, and one of the most active townships in this opposition was Mansfield, of which Robert Field was a commissioner. On September 8, 1770, the Commissioners of the neighboring townships of Chesterfield, Mansfield, Hanover, Springfield, and  

---

11 “Isaac Pearson House.” National Register nomination. (See Section 8).
12 *Pennsylvania Evening Post*, February 4, 1775.
13 Pierce, 255.
Nottingham approved a non-importation resolution.\textsuperscript{14} This Burlington County action led to the formation of standing committees of correspondence to coordinate communications among various towns. In addition, the Mansfield Township committee was charged with superintending the boycott and punishing violators. Robert Field, his home overlooking the White Hill landing where enforcement actions would likely take place, chaired the Mansfield committee. Its other members included William Potts, Peter Tallman, Clayton Newbold and John Black,\textsuperscript{15} each one active in the civic life of the Township.\textsuperscript{16}

The British continued to apply pressure on the American colonies by implementation of new regulations, fees, and taxes. In response, the Massachusetts House of Representatives issued a formal call in June 1774 for a continental congress to convene in Philadelphia to “consult upon the present State of the Colonies…and to deliberate and Determine upon wise and proper measures…for the Recovery and Establishment of their Just Rights and LIBERTIES Civil and Religious, and the Restoration of Union and Harmony between Great Britain and the Colonies.”\textsuperscript{17} The New Jersey response to this call began in Essex County where the inhabitants of the county were asked to meet in Newark to “consult, deliberate, and firmly resolve upon the most prudent and salutary measures to secure and maintain the Constitutional Rights of his Majesty’s subjects in America.” On July 17, 1774, Burlington County held a meeting to concur with the approach laid out by Essex County. Robert Field was selected to chair the meeting. Those present agreed to send a committee representative of the county to a state meeting whose purpose would be, in part, to elect delegates to the first Continental Congress, as well as to establish a colony-wide committee on correspondence. Robert Field was one of the committee members named to represent West Jersey.\textsuperscript{18} When the meeting was held, Robert Field was one of three Burlington County residents selected to serve as a member of the New Jersey Committee on Correspondence.\textsuperscript{19}

The importance of the Committees of Correspondence in developing support for independence has been noted by numerous historians. Taylor Stoermer has called the Committees of Correspondence the “engine of revolution.” Ronald M. McCarthy indicated that the primary element of independence of the colonies was the ability of the American colonies to dispense with royal direction of their political institutions, and noted that “the first really significant step in the creation of on-going parallel institutions was the creation of the committees of correspondence.”\textsuperscript{20} Robert Field’s commitment to this network of colonial communication,

---


\textsuperscript{16} Ibid. 433-434, n. 81

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 205.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 451, n. 41

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 452, n. 45. The other two Burlington County members were Joseph Borden, Jr. whose father was the namesake of Bordentown and was known as a militia officer, quartermaster and politician; (https://revolutionarynj.org/rev-neighbors/joseph-borden-2/). The third member was Isaac Pearson, who had served as Nottingham Township tax collector, justice of the peace, township clerk and delegate to the Provincial Congress. Pearson’s house, which was built on 1773, is listed in the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places. Pearson was murdered two days after the Battle of Trenton.

support, and activism is testified to by his service on his township’s, his county’s, and his colony’s committees on correspondence.

The Hessian Occupation of Trenton and Bordentown

The British forces and their Hessian mercenaries fighting the American colonists for control of the thirteen colonies had a right to feel confident in December 1776. By a series of victories on the battlefield, they had forced General George Washington’s troops to retreat across New Jersey and the Delaware River into Pennsylvania. With winter coming and the positive outlook of his victorious troops, British General William Howe wrote to Hessian Colonel Carl Emil Ulrich Von Donop on December 13 requesting the Hessians establish winter cantonments at several locations in southern New Jersey:

You are to command the troops to be cantoned at Trenton, Bordentown, and Burlington to report and receive orders from Major General Grant at Brunswick and to communicate with Brigadier-General Leslie at Princetown.

The Brigade of Railee, fifty yagers\(^{21}\) and twenty Dragoon to be stationed at Trenton with six Hessian three pounders. The Dragoons to be relieved one a week from Princeton.

Three Battalions of Hessian Grenadiers and a Detachment of Yagers, with six Hessian three pounders and if you please two British eighteen pounders, to take post at Bordentown.\(^{22}\)

The same order specified that area farmers would be ordered to give the exact list of their cattle, grain and forage from which magazines would be formed for the subsistence of the troops. In addition, any quantity of salt provision or flour exceeding what was necessary for use by a private family was to be considered as rebel store.\(^{23}\)

A critical element of General Howe’s strategy proved to be his decision to place his troops in three separate cantonments. The largest and most overcrowded of these was in Bordentown. Then, as now, a compact village, it was unable to accommodate the 2,000 Hessians assigned to be billeted there. According to local historian Lloyd Griscom, the town “was in sorry shape, every house occupied with Royal Highland or Hessian Jager compatriots. Housewives, jammed with their entire families into a kitchen, tried frantically to cook for friend and foe while the unwanted visitors pillaged fences and fields for fuel and forage, emptying the barn of hay and grain.”\(^{24}\)

The small village could only accommodate a portion of the Hessian forces. Other soldiers were encamped in the hinterlands surrounding Bordentown including White Hill on the Delaware River to the south. The White Hill Mansion may be the last surviving landmark of this dispersal of forces by the Hessians in their “Bordentown” occupation. In a letter written by the widow Mary Field, she described the arrival of the Hessian forces at the mansion:

---

\(^{21}\) See below for information about the yagers (jagers).


\(^{23}\) Ibid., 356-357.

[We]…waked very early with the Compliments of one of the Hessian Capts. And would be glad to Speak to Mrs. Field… I was Sure if they wanted me they wou’d see me (and prudently for once in my life) Concluded to put on a Short gown and Ran Down to him. Upon entering the room I see an officer and Soldier. The Officer Ran up to me and kissed both my hands, found me Much alarm’d, Spoke but very little English and appealed to the Soldier who he brought as a linguist and spoke tolerably to make an apology for coming so early; Said his reason was the officers had the Right before Orders to please themselves with Quarters and all the gentlemen seem’d to fix upon this house; and as he wanted to be & was the first, beg’d he might be Indulg’d.  

The officer who presented himself to the household and requested accommodations was Carl August von Wreden, Captain of the first Jager Company. The term “jager” may be translated as “hunter” and members of these companies were drawn from among huntsmen, foresters, gameskeepers, and others expert at shooting. In the American war the Jagers served both mounted and on foot and were supplied with rifled weapons. Unlike ordinary field soldiers, Jagers “had to be men of sufficient reliance and intelligence,” able to work in smaller units engaged in scouting and patrolling. Jagers included both volunteer and professional soldiers. A Jager company consisted of four commissioned officers, 16 non-commissioned officers, one noncombat officer, and 105 men. The Company was posted along the road between Black Horse (Columbus) and present-day Fieldsboro. Mary Peel Field described their commanding officer, Captain Wreden as “the sweetest little Dutchman you ever see, the politest, most obliging creature in the world.” 

Wreden’s superior officer was Count Carl Kurt Emil von Donop, Commander of the Second Brigade, Royal Forces, the senior Hessian officer in southern New Jersey in late 1776. Forces under his command included two battalions of Hessian Grenadiers and a detachment of Jagers at Burlington; a battalion of Hessian Grenadiers between Burlington and Bordentown, and a battalion of Grenadiers and a detachment of Jagers at Bordentown. 

The second Jager Company was commanded by Johannes Ewald, whose journal was discovered and published in the 1970s. 

During the Hessian occupation of Bordentown, many houses in the area surrounding White Hill were ravaged, the farms stripped of their crops, and their outbuildings disassembled and carried off as firewood. White Hill was left untouched. On December 17, Colonel von Donop, commander of Hessian troops in southern New Jersey visited White Hill to present Mary Field with a protection paper. Throughout the remainder of the Hessian encampment, the White Hill mansion and farm remained unpillaged due to a dozen successive protection papers. Other occupants of the house during that time included a Hessian physician who stayed on for several days, and 27 prisoners who were on their way to be exchanged.

26 Quoted in William O. Dwyer, The Day Is Ours: An Inside View of the Battles of Trenton and Princeton, November 1776 – January 1777 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 178. Dwyer, p.409, cites his source for the statements and sentiments he attributed to Mary Peel Field to a contemporaneous letter that she wrote, which was "recently discovered" in the 1940s, and reproduced in full in a June 1943 article in the Princeton University Library Chronicle.  
The White Hill Mansion and the Hessian Maneuvers Associated with the Battle of Trenton

As noted, during December 1776, the White Hill Mansion served as the headquarters for Carl August von Wreden, Captain of the First Jaeger Company, one of the Hessian units that participated in the diversionary skirmish in Mount Holly. Lacking first person accounts of Hessian activities during their occupation of White Hill, it is not possible to fully reconstruct the activities that occurred and the decisions that were made in the house. It is, however, likely that von Donop’s visits to the mansion were not merely to pay his respects to an attractive young widow. These visits were most likely also an opportunity to plan strategy for countering the movements of the Continental forces, specifically the role of the Jagers under the command of von Wreden. As the headquarters of a major element of the Hessian forces stationed in the Trenton area, White Hill may be conclusively associated with the New Jersey campaign as a site of decisions that resulted in the Hessian forces’ ill-advised military actions in the Mount Holly area in the Christmas season of 1776.

The British and Hessian forces (Historic Maps 1 and 2) encamped at Bordentown, Burlington, and Trenton viewed these places as unattractive backwaters. They were open places each with a number of roads radiating from them out into an adjacent countryside that was cleared of woodlands and lacked any redoubts. Their perimeters were defensible only by constant vigilance and active patrolling. In the days prior to the battle, the Trenton Hessian commander, Colonel Johann Rall, dispatched a company of Hessians to White Horse, about half-way between Trenton and Bordentown, where they may have occupied the Isaac Pearson house, and certainly did occupy his tavern.

As General Washington and the Continental Army developed plans for an attack on Trenton, those plans included supporting attacks upon British and Hessians forces in New Jersey to occupy or divert them from reinforcing the Trenton garrison. Washington’s forces would cross the Delaware at McConkey’s Ferry and march eight miles to engage Rall’s forces in Trenton on the day following Christmas Day. Brigadier General James Ewing and a force of about 600 militiamen would cross the river to Trenton and secure the Assunpink Bridge at the southern end of town, thus preventing the enemy from escaping along the road to Bordentown; Captain Cadwalader would cross the Delaware River with his troops to attack Hessian posts below Trenton. General Israel Putnam was to send additional troops to join with General Griffin’s troops for an attack on the Mount Holly area.28

Given both the difficulty of assembling American fighting forces and the very challenging Christmas 1776 weather, Washington’s plans proved unduly optimistic. An alternative strategy employing hit-and-run attacks by small bands of guerilla forces, brief skirmishes by underequipped American forces, and a deliberate disinformation campaign was effectively used instead. The British and Hessian forces, expecting an uneventful cantonment, were besieged, from the time of their mid-December arrival in central New Jersey, with frequent rumors and reports of American soldiers on the march toward Trenton, Burlington, Mount Holly, and Bordentown. Responding to these rumors, von Donop at Bordentown was compelled to send varying numbers of Hessian troops out into the hinterlands of Burlington County south of Trenton. The most effective diversionary actions were undertaken by Colonel Samuel Griffin, ordered by General Putnam to march into the area with a force of between 450 and 600 men and two small artillery pieces. As Americans spread rumors of a

force of 800 to 1,000 growing in size as it picked up recruits from Burlington County farms. Colonel von Donop took the lure, moving the entirety of his forces from Bordentown and White Hill into the countryside to repel the rumored attack. An initial brief skirmish occurred at the “Pettycoat Bridge” in Springfield Township, followed by a withdrawal to Mount Holly. The next day, December 23rd, the American forces, numbering about 400, occupied the high ground in the area of the present Episcopal Cemetery in the south end of the town, where they lobbed a few ineffectual shells northward toward the Hessians stationed on the Mount, the high ground at the north end of town. This skirmish, known as the Battle of Iron Works Hill, was short-lived. The Americans, realizing that they could not directly engage the superior Hessian forces, withdrew southward to Moorestown.29

The Hessian forces remained in Mount Holly until December 26th, due in part, as was reported by Johannes Ewald, to von Donop’s dalliance with a young Mount Holly widow. On December 24th, von Donop ordered an assault on the purported Colonial forces, only to find that they were gone. On December 26th, 1776, the British controlled the countryside from Burlington to Trenton but received word that the Trenton garrison had fallen to Colonial forces. The Hessians positioned between White Hill and Mount Holly were unavailable to support the Hessian forces in Trenton. Numerous historians attribute the American victory in the Battle of Trenton to the imbalance in force strength due to the diversion of Hessian forces to central Burlington County.30

Later Revolutionary War military actions took place in the vicinity of the White Hill landing on the Delaware, but only one is known to have been directly associated with the house.31 In October 1777 a Continental Navy force commanded by Commodore John Barry, who was acting under orders from General Washington, flooded two American frigates, the Washington and the Effingham, thereby sinking them into the mud of the Delaware River at White Hill, not far from the landing, but with the hope of eventually raising them again.32 Half a year later, a force of British Army soldiers, while preparing for the Army’s evacuation of Philadelphia, came to White Hill on May 7th, 1778, taking advantage of the landing. They found the sunken frigates in the river and set fire to them, and rounded up and set fire to as many watercraft as they could find. Altogether, fifty-four vessels were burned. At that time, U.S. Commodore Barry, who had been responsible for the sinking months before, was staying at the White Hill Mansion. He escaped in the last moments before British soldiers arrived at the mansion seeking his capture. Failing in that objective, they briefly occupied the White Hill mansion.33


30 See, for instance Dwyer and Fischer.

31 This conclusion is discussed in detail in the two Monmouth University archaeological reports cited elsewhere in this document.

32 Michael J. Crawford, editor, Naval Documents of the American Revolution, Volume 12 (Washington, D.C.: Naval History and Heritage Command, Department of the Navy, 2013), 321-322, 332. See Gall and Veit, “Supplement Monmouth University Archaeological Field School, White Hill Mansion (28-Bu-738)” (West Long Branch: Monmouth University, 2014), 3-37 and Galal and Veit, “Monmouth University Field School White Hill Mansion (28-Bu-738). In their conclusion to the latter report, the authors wrote, “Despite historical documentation of British and Hessian military occupation of the property during the late 1770s and a recent metal detector survey, no military-related artifacts were identified on the property” (4-84). The second excavation season discovered some gunflints, but not enough to provide evidence of extensive military use of the land surrounding the house. Available documentary evidence does not indicate that the White Hill Mansion was involved in the May 1778 raid.

33 The incidents of the sinkings and of Barry’s escape before the British arrival at White Hill is recounted in Tim McGrath, John Barry: An American Hero in the Age of Sail (Yardley, PA: Westholme Publishing, LLC, 2010), 168-170. It is unclear (to this
Mary Field and her family, 1778-1788

With the death of Robert Field [2] in January 1775, his last will and testament shaped the future of the White Hill farm and mansion. Robert Field [2] had drafted his will on September 1, 1774. He intended that 300 acres of his property, including the mansion, should go to his then only surviving son, Samuel, to be received after he reached maturity. But Samuel also died in childhood, leaving Robert [3], the child that Mary was carrying at the time of his death, as the only male heir. And so Mary Field’s widowhood began. Commodore Barry’s colleague, Commodore Thomas Read, who had commanded the Washington, in 1777, one of the sunken frigates, visited the White Hill Mansion with Barry. It is thought that it was then that he met Mary Field. They married in 1779, and this marriage was another sign of the Fields’ continuing social standing. The Reads would make their official residence in Philadelphia, but kept White Hill as their country seat and spent their summers there for the next decade.

One of the unresolved mysteries of White Hill has been determining when the south addition to the mansion was built, and who paid for its construction. One possibility is that Read was responsible, during the years following the war. He had the wherewithal to do so, and, one might speculate, may have wished to make that improvement. The 1780s, however, was probably also the decade that the White Hill tavern down by the landing was rebuilt. This building, also known as the Field-Stevens house, was an expensive brick building even larger than the mansion, with a prominent patterned brickwork decoration known as horizontal banding in its north end elevation. That decorative pattern, hardly known before the 1780s, enjoyed a brief vogue that ended in the early 1790s.34 Tragically, Thomas Read died in 1788, before his step-daughter Mary's marriage that December to Richard Stockton (“the Duke”), of Morven, in Princeton, the namesake son of one of New Jersey’s signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Stockton, himself, would become a major figure in New Jersey’s legal community in the early 19th century.35 The owner of Morven in the 1780s, Annis Boudinot Stockton, widow of the Signer, oversaw a major building campaign there, timed to be completed before her son Richard’s marriage.36 This new construction added a wing to the existing mansion house, probably the east wing.37 Annis turned over management of the Morven estate to Richard upon his marriage, and for a time Annis probably resided in the east wing, but soon moved into a separate house in Princeton.38 While these facts have no direct bearing on the White Hill Mansion, Mary Read’s son, Robert S. Field, would marry Richard Stockton’s sister Abigail in 1797. Another possibility for the

---

34 The Field-Stevens house was recorded by the Historic American Building Survey (HABS NJ-203) in 1936-37. It was demolished about 1976. For a discussion of horizontal banding as a brickwork decoration, see “Traditional Patterned Brickwork Buildings in New Jersey Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF),” copy on the NJ HPO website, at nj.gov/dep/hpo/1identify/nhpr_a_NJ_Statewide_Patterned_Brickwork_MPDF.pdf


36 Ibid., 54-55.

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid., 46, 55.
timing of the enlargement of the mansion would be in anticipation of that marriage, following the Morven example.

The period of Robert S. Field’s ownership of the White Hill estate was one of growing indebtedness. Although this red ink has not been fully accounted for, the Monmouth University report of the second archaeological field school in 2014 extensively analyzed documents related to more than twenty lawsuits filed against Field in Burlington County court between 1796 and 1800.\(^{39}\) Evidently none of those claims were made by persons involved in the building trades, so they don’t identify the years in which the mansion was enlarged. The authors of the report note, however, that Field advertised his White Hill property for sale in 1800, and that in that advertisement he indicated that he added a large barn to the mansion farmstead in 1799.\(^{40}\)

In 1797, Mary Field transferred ownership of the property to her youngest child, Robert Stockton Field. He experienced frequent financial difficulties, however, and, as noted above, in 1800 placed an advertisement in the Pennsylvania Gazette advertising his estate for sale:

The Subscriber being desirous of changing his present place of residence, offers for Sale, that elegant, healthy, and valuable situation on the river Delaware, well known by the name of White-Hill, about 2 miles below the village of Bordentown, 9 from the cities of Trenton and Burlington, and about 30 from Philadelphia, containing upwards of 200 acres of land, between 60 and 70 of which are excellent woodland about 35 of meadow, the rest arable, between 25 and 30 of which are now in clover, and will mow this season very large crops. – On the premises is a large handsome and commodious brick dwelling house, with milk house, smoke house, and ice house; a large barn and cow houses built last season; commodious stables and carriage house; with a small farm house adjoining thereto; a large garden, with a large variety of fruit, besides a very great number of large and productive English cherry, which compose two extensive and beautiful avenues; one of the largest orchards in the country, containing between 2 and 3000 of the best assorted apple trees, with excellent cider works, and a distillery thereto belonging—also, another brick house with a wharf and store house in complete repair…\(^{41}\)

To settle judgments against him, the Supreme Court of New Jersey assumed control of Robert’s estate which was auctioned to the highest bidder. It was sold on February 28, 1804 to attorney Jonathan Rhea. Rhea, who had occasionally served as Field’s attorney, was the clerk of the New Jersey Supreme Court and an influential figure among New Jersey’s Jeffersonian Republicans. To help maximize the return from the sale, part of the property was laid out into a village plat of small residential lots and called Fieldsboro. The Mansion property lot containing the house was described in the 1804 advertisement: “The Mansion House, being a large and well-finished building, with a number of spacious and complete out-houses, in the best order; a Garden containing excellent fruit; an Orchard of several thousand Apple-Trees of the best kind…and about one hundred acres of adjoining land with a sufficient portion of wood and timber thereon…”\(^{42}\)

Several acres had previously been sold by Robert and Abigail Field in an attempt to hold on to most of the plantation. In 1806 Richard Stockton of Princeton, Field’s brother-in-law, purchased the 100-acre mansion

---

\(^{39}\) Gall and Veit, 3-39, 40. [see footnote 1].  
\(^{40}\) Ibid., 3-41.  
\(^{41}\) Pennsylvania Gazette, May 31, 1800.  
\(^{42}\) Trenton True American, July 2, 1804.
property from Jonathan Rhea. Through these and other maneuvers, Richard and Mary Stockton tried to financially help their Field siblings, and during the first decade of the century, Robert S. and Abigail Stockton Field continued to occupy the mansion as tenants. The era of the Field occupancy of White Hill came to an end when Robert S. Field died in 1810. He was only 35 years old.

**Archaeology of the Field Family Farmstead, ca.1721-1810 (local significance, Criterion D)**
The Monmouth University field schools considered the many issues surrounding the evolution of the White Hill Mansion farmstead, with special emphasis on the eighteenth-century occupancy by the Field family.

Unanswered questions surround whether the Field family occupied a dwelling on this site from the 1720s forward (or was their dwelling at some other unidentified location); more precisely when was the principal, north block of the house built (now understood to have certainly been built before 1771 and almost certainly during the 1760s); and when was the south addition constructed (now understood to be sometime between 1780 and 1797)? The precise date of the latter would determine which persons would have been responsible for sponsoring that addition, and therefore who its initial occupants would likely have been. The complexity of the basement construction in that part of the house has produced questions about whether that basement work precedes the date of the two-story brick section that stands atop it.

The archaeological work, however, focused on areas outside the walls of the house’s foundation, spread across the 175 by 175-foot archaeological survey area noted above. Physical and remote sensing evidence was found for several outbuildings that once stood to the south and southeast of the mansion. No evidence was found of the existence of outbuildings to the east of the mansion, leading to the provisional conclusion that there had been none. Such a historical outcome would also have been consistent with the architectural treatment given the façade of the north section of the mansion, which would have been intended to be seen from a distance. The largest feature located and identified during the archaeological survey was the foundational remains and related evidence of a barn (see Fig. 4.7 in the historic maps section), believed likely to have been the large barn referred to in an 1800 sale advertisement as having been constructed in 1799 for Robert S. Field. Other outbuildings were also found by the survey, and these findings were reinforced by small-unit excavations, without their dates of construction nor the purposes they served as clearly determined. The evidence from the survey, however, supports a provisional conclusion that the outbuildings that were part of the Field family farmstead before 1810 tended to be located to the south and southeast of the house, including on land beyond the property included in this nomination (and currently under other ownerships).

The survey also focused on the still- vexing question of the presence of a tunnel or tunnels that may have been present at the time of the Revolutionary War, and which would have linked the house to a point on or above the riverbank. Rumors of a tunnel at White Hill have abounded for a century or longer, but clear documentary evidence and physical evidence have, alike, remained elusive. William O. Dwyer, in his book *The Day Is Ours: An Inside View of the Battles of Trenton and Princeton* flatly stated that a tunnel was present, without providing a source for that statement. Archibald Crossley, who lived in the White Hill Mansion during summers

---

43 Burlington County Deed Book O:2, February 28, 1804.
44 This is the interpretation provided by Greiff and Gunning in *Morven: Memory, Myth, and Reality*, pp.81-82, based in large part on surviving Stockton family correspondence.
45 Dwyer, *The Day is Ours*, 174. The house "could be reached by way of a tunnel from the river’s edge."
between 1897 and 1911, is believed to have commented that he once went “through the tunnel,” but no written statement by him to that effect has been produced.\textsuperscript{46} On December 12, 1776, the Field household was disturbed by repeated approaches from British and Hessian officers that by several reports from neighboring witnesses, Mrs. Field was hiding “rebels” in her house or on her property. A tunnel would have facilitated such hiding, but Mrs. Field never admitted that any rebels were secreted in her house, and the British never succeeded in finding any.\textsuperscript{47} Contemporary references that specifically mention a tunnel have not been produced.

The tunnel question refuses to disappear. A system of tunnels is known to have been present at the Point Breeze estate of Joseph Bonaparte (the ex-King of Spain) in the early nineteenth century, but Bonaparte was orders of magnitude wealthier than the Fields were. Several eighteenth-century New Jersey houses are known to have had underground passages that lead to underground storage vaults (and this author\textsuperscript{48} has personally visited some of them, walked through their passages, and stood in their vaults). White Hill also might have had such a passage to a similar vault. None of them, however, have been shown to have had a tunnel like that described for White Hill. Nonetheless, however, the 2014 report that summarized the work of the two field schools, says that one of their excavation units revealed a feature that they evaluated as a “possible underground tunnel.”\textsuperscript{49} Future archaeology will probably be needed to resolve this extraordinary possibility. During the Prohibition era in the 1920s, the White Hill Mansion, then being operated as a restaurant by the Glenk family (see below), was raided for providing illegal alcoholic beverages to their customers. Surveillance of the restaurant suggests that the Glenks were taking delivery of alcoholic beverages at points along the Delaware River shore. Left unsaid has been how the alcohol was brought into the mansion, while the latter was being watched. The use of a tunnel for this purpose would have made delivery of the alcohol easier, but references have not been found to the discovery of a tunnel by the police, prosecutors, or Federal agents.

\textbf{The White Hill Mansion after 1810}

Stockton divided this property into three lots and sold all three to a John Thompson,\textsuperscript{50} as recorded in a deed dated March 19, 1811. The lots were described as “that tract or parcel of land [containing] the Mansion house and the outbuildings including the orchard and farm” containing 6 acres, plus one lot of 11 acres and one lot of 12 acres.\textsuperscript{51} Thompson, however, sold the same three lots to one Charles West in 1814.\textsuperscript{52} West died intestate seven years later, and his land was offered for public sale in an attempt to settle his debts. A Joseph McKnight bought all three lots at a public sale and sold them plus an additional adjacent lot to one David Bruce for $10,000 in November 1821. Bruce, a Scottish-American printer and type founder, arrived in New York City from Scotland in the late eighteenth century and soon found employment as a newspaper typesetter. During a career in printing he embarked on various ventures with his brother George and his son David, Jr. The family revolutionized the typecasting and stereotyping businesses through a series of inventions and innovations.

\textsuperscript{46} Sara Piccini to Bob Craig, personal communication, April 2020.
\textsuperscript{47} Dwyer, \textit{The Day is Ours}, 174-77.
\textsuperscript{48} Bob Craig, of NJ HPO staff.
\textsuperscript{49} Gall and Veit, P146a, p.4-47.
\textsuperscript{50} It is unclear (to this author) of a relationship between the Stocktons and John Thompson in 1811, but Richard and Mary Stockton’s daughter Annis married John R. Thompson, in 1826; see Greiff and Gunning, \textit{Morven: Memory, Myth, and Reality}, 84,88.
\textsuperscript{51} Burlington County Deed Book N2:82, March 19, 1811.
\textsuperscript{52} Burlington County Deed Book Z:659., March 29, 1814.
David Bruce purchased White Hill as a retirement retreat and lived there for sixteen years. In 1837, he sold the four lots to a John Bacon. Under Bacon’s ownership, the Mansion sat vacant for ten years.

In 1847, Isaac Field, hoping to save the derelict plantation from falling into ruin, bought a 64-acre parcel including the mansion, bringing it back into Field family ownership. Greek Revival details, most notably the main entry and surround, were probably added at this time (Historic Map 3; Historic Image 1). In 1850, the village that had been laid out in 1804 to be called Fieldsborough, but which was still often popularly called White Hill, was formally incorporated as the Borough of Fieldsboro, to honor the family and their extensive influence in the area. Afterward, Isaac Field sold the same 64 acres to a Lewis French on October 11, 1856 for $10,000.

French, in turn, held the farm through the Civil War years, before selling it and a separate parcel known as Lot 109 to one Walter Mole on August 3, 1868 for $24,400. In his last will and testament Walter Mole, who died in 1869, left the same property to his son James. James did not retain the full property, however, but instead sold half of it, 32 acres, including the mansion, to Isaac Cathcart of Metuchen, New Jersey, in April 1869 for $9,900. Cathcart sold the same 32 acres including the house to John Harned of Hamilton Township, New Jersey, for $20,000 on March 31, 1870 (Historic Map 3). Harned sold the same property to his brother-in-law, Dr. Andrew Ingersoll, of Corning, New York, in June 1877. Eight years later, Ingersoll sold it to a Trenton pottery manufacturer, Joseph Mayer. Both Ingersoll and Mayer evidently used the Mansion as a summer place. The period of the Ingersoll and Meyer ownerships roughly coincides with the start of a period when farms of this type were being bought up by industrialists or other wealthy individuals who operated them as gentleman’s farms.

**The ca. 1896 Remodeling (Criterion C, local significance)**

In December 1895, Joseph Crossley, president of the Crossley Machine Company, of Trenton, New Jersey, bought the White Hill mansion and the 32 acres of associated ground from Mayer. He was a successful manufacturer of machinery used in the processing of clays, which was important to the pottery industries of Trenton, one of Trenton’s leading industrial product categories by the end of the 19th century. As with Mayer,

---

53 Henry Lewis Buller, “David Bruce, Jr., Inventor of the First Successful Typecasting Machine,” *The Inland Printer* (April 1922), 64.
54 Burlington County Deed Book P4:62, March 18, 1847.
55 Burlington County Deed Book X6:497, October 11, 1856.
56 Burlington County Deed Book W7:274, August 3, 1868.
57 Burlington County Deed Book Z7:442, April 23, 1869.
58 Burlington County Deed Book L8:512, November 13, 1871.
59 For Harned and Ingersoll, see [https://lists.rootsweb.com/hyperkitty/list/nysteube@rootsweb.com/thread/18431538/](https://lists.rootsweb.com/hyperkitty/list/nysteube@rootsweb.com/thread/18431538/) Dr. Andrew Ingersoll permanently resided in Corning, New York, where he operated a “water-cure” hospital. His wife and Harned’s were sisters, born in Bordentown. They probably kept White Hill as a vacation home.
60 Burlington County Deed Book O9:180, June 1, 1877; ibid., E11:2171, June 4, 1885.
61 For an exploration of the gentleman’s farm phenomenon in the greater Trenton area during this period, see the National Register nomination for the Fernbrook Historic District, in Chesterfield, Burlington County. Fernbrook was purchased in 1881 by Charles Morgan, of the famous New York City banking family, who improved it as a gentleman’s farm. For a more extensive treatment concerning this phenomenon in Somerset County, New Jersey, see “Country Place-Era Resources of the New Jersey Somerset Hills (MPDF).” For copies of both, contact the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (HPO), Trenton, NJ.
Crossley continued to operate the property as a gentleman’s farm and to occupy the Mansion as a summer home for his family, which this time included his wife and several young children. His youngest child, Archibald Crossley, would be born at White Hill in 1896, and spend his childhood summers there.

The White Hill mansion had been only modestly altered during the 19th century, in ways described in Section 7: the replacement of the original entrance during the Greek Revival years; the replacement of the window sash in the ca.1760 main block of the house; and the long covered porch added in the middle of the 19th century. Even with these changes, the house still largely reflected the appearance it had had at the start of the century, when still occupied by the Field family. This changed significantly under Crossley. Within the first few years of his ownership, he sponsored remodeling work that introduced the projecting bay windows and oriel that expanded the house beyond the confines of its 18th-century brick walls, giving the house the architectural character it still possesses. Photographs taken for the Crossleys in ca.1899-1900 show the new work to have been recently completed (see historic photos).

The remodeling was probably performed to the designs and specifications of an architect, although the work has not yet been ascribed to anyone. This work added one projecting bay on the east side to enlarge Room 103, a projecting bay on the north end of the house to enlarge the North Parlor (Room 102) and the upstairs north bedroom (Room 202), an oriel window in the north end wall for the north bedroom (Room 202), and a larger, projection on the west side that enlarged Rooms 104 and 208. It was further highlighted by an exceptional covered porch featuring pairs of columns linked by balustrade. At the peak of the roof, the Crossleys had a “widow’s walk” added, with a balustrade that matched that of the porch. The base of this walk remains, but the balustrade, like the porch itself, has been removed.

This work was both bold and eclectic, and very competently carried out. In its massing, the shape of some of its forms, and in some of the small details in individual bays, the clear inspiring influence came from the Queen Anne style. The result was an asymmetrical design the major components of which were of different sizes and shapes, each interacting differently with the building’s other major elements. But the work was not a pure example of any single style, and the Queen Anne style was already a decade out-of-date by 1896, even though some builders continued to build it and some architects to design to it. In the manner in which shingles were employed in the work, some of the characteristics of the Shingle Style were present. The Shingle Style was frequently used in summer or winter resort architecture, of which the White Hill Mansion could be considered an example. Most of the “pure” examples of the Shingle Style, however—in New Jersey at least—date from the 1880s and the early 1890s. By the end of the decade, designers were introducing more elements of other styles into their shingled buildings, especially the Colonial Revival style. At White Hill, the porch is executed in the Colonial Revival style, and the widow’s walk made to match it.

The architectural significance of the White Hill remodeling lies in the impact that the work had on the relationship that the house had with the river and with other prestigious properties along it. The Crossleys effectively re-oriented the house toward the river, at least visually. The projecting bays and the porch gave them fine views of the river they would not otherwise have had, both from within the house and from the porch. In the process, they gave a second façade to the house, and made the riverside one architecturally stronger than the east side, which had always been the visually more dominant elevation. In the process, they reasserted for a new generation the social prominence of this location along the Delaware River bluffs, which since the 18th...
The White Hill Mansion was listed in the New Jersey Register of Historic Places in 2012.

Archaeological testing undertaken at the mansion acre parcel including the mansion revealed a Revolutionary War era mansion, as an adult, Archibald Crossley, son of Joseph and Martha, was born at White Hill in 1896, too young to remember the remodeling as it happened. Later, as an adult, he wrote a short memoir of his childhood years there. Archibald would go on to become a leading figure, along with George Gallup, in the emergence of public opinion polling in the United States. In December 1911, Joseph Crossley sold the property to one Susanna Graham. After owning it for three years, Graham sold the property to a Martin McCarrick. McCarrick sold the mansion to Stilwell Sales, a real estate company, on November 13, 1916. In 1922, the property was purchased by Ross Kell.

Henry and Katrina Glenk bought this property from Kell on August 13, 1923 (Historic Images 3 through 6). The Glenks, owners of a Trenton restaurant, converted the mansion into a restaurant by the installation of a commercial kitchen on the first floor and refrigeration equipment in the basement. Construction of the dining room addition came much later. Glenk had begun his career as a chef in Trenton. When he opened his own establishment, called the Mansion House, many among his high-powered, politically-connected clientele followed, now able to reach the restaurant by automobile. They enjoyed its seclusion, and the quality of the food and ambiance made the Mansion House popular among public officials. Although Glenk could boast of many important friends, these friends failed to keep him out of jail during Prohibition. He was arrested in 1924 for illegal alcohol possession. The charges read “seized 1,000 gallons of liquor; large quantities of beer, wine, and whiskey were found at various places along the Delaware.”

The Glenks survived this setback, outlasted the Depression, and endured the war. They added the dining room addition about 1960, which required removal of the Crossleys’ riverside porch. The White Hill Mansion continued to operate as the Glenk’s Mansion House until 1972, when it was sold to new owners who continued to operate it until 1992. Meanwhile, the Stepan Chemical Company, which operated the property that abutted White Hill to the southwest, had bought the White Hill Mansion property in 1987 with the intention of converting it to serve as their company’s offices. These plans fell through, however, after which demolition of the building was its likely fate. In an attempt to save the house, the Borough of Fieldsboro condemned a three-acre parcel including the mansion in 1999. That partial victory bought time for the advocates of preserving the mansion to organize and gather strength. The grounds immediately surrounding the mansion were the subject of archaeological testing undertaken by Monmouth University in two summer field schools in 2011 and 2013. The White Hill Mansion was listed in the New Jersey Register of Historic Places in 2012.

---

62 A copy of Archibald Crossley’s unpublished memoir was provided by Sarah Piccini, a Crossley descendant.
64 For the Glenks and Prohibition, see Veit and Gall, p.3-53. Also see a statement written for the Friends of the White Hill Mansion, at http://www.whitehillmansion.com/history.html and for the Glenk’s reluctance to talk about Prohibition, see https://communitynews.org/2013/08/05/dig-reveals-revolutionary-war-era-mansions-history/
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Verbal Boundary Description

The boundary of the property includes the entirety of Borough of Fieldsboro Block 13, Lot 3.08, indicated on the appropriate Fieldsboro tax map as containing 3.688 acres.

Verbal Boundary Justification

The boundary was chosen to include the entirety of the present parcel upon which the house sits. This parcel is bonded on the northeast by Fourth Street, on the northwest by the present New Jersey Transit RiverLine right-of-way and on the remaining sides by parcels containing buildings and structures not within the period of significance of the property.
List of Photographs

The following information is the same for each photograph:

1. White Hill Mansion
2. Burlington County, New Jersey
3. Douglas C. McVarish, photographer (photos #2 through 33); other photos provided by Westfield Architects, Haddon Heights, NJ.
4. September 2016, except as noted below
5. Photograph files are digitally stored at the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office, Trenton, NJ.

Exterior views
1 of 39. General view of southeast and northeast sides of house toward west. (Photo taken ca.2019)
2 of 39. South block of house, southeast façade, toward southwest.
5 of 39. Main entry, southeast façade, toward northwest.
6 of 39. Southwest and southeast side toward west.
7 of 39. Dining room addition, west side, toward southeast.
8 of 39. Central portion of west wall toward northeast.
9 of 39. Southern portion, west side, toward southeast.
10 of 39. General view of west side toward north.
11 of 39. South end of west side and southwest gable end toward east.

Interior views
17 of 39. Room 106: View of northeast wall of kitchen showing stripped wall surface with studs and lath toward north.
20 of 39. Room 104: View ion southwest parlor, first floor, toward south.
22 of 39. Room 206: Bedroom above south parlor toward southeast.
24 of 39. Room 301: Early 18th-century door, with raised panels and hung on original H hinges. Relocated to the top of the central staircase from unknown source.
26 of 39. Room 303: South bedroom, 1760 block, toward north, showing closet.
27 of 39. Room 303: South bedroom, general view toward northwest.
28 of 39. Room 210: North bedroom, south block, showing six-panel door to stair hallway toward west.
29 of 39. Room 210: North bedroom, south block, showing fireplace, toward south.
30 of 39. Room 201: Central hall stairway between first and second floors. South parlor at right toward south/
31 of 39. Room 001: Basement bar area toward northeast.
32 of 39. Room 002: Basement. Room under south parlor, showing chimney arch toward south.
33 of 39. Room 001: Main stairway between basement and first floor toward northeast.

Additional Photos
36 of 39. Exterior: Detail of west elevation showing Flemish checker and misc. details of alterations.
37 of 39. Room 004: Detail view of framing, supporting first floor.
38 of 39. Room 004: Detail of cellar vault; photo taken ca.2011.
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2. Detail, *Plan of the operations of George Washington, against the Kings troops in New Jersey, from the 26th of December 1776 to the 3rd January 1777*.
5. Fieldsboro (White Hill), Burlington County (Scott 1876)
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