1. Name of Property

**historic name:** Blooming Grove
**other names/site number:** Mandeville-Rogers House

2. Location

**street & number:** East end of Rogers Court, off Pocket Road
**city, town:** Florence (X) vicinity of
**county:** Florence code: 041
**state:** South Carolina code: SC zip code: 29506

( ) not for publication

3. Classification

**Ownership of Property:**

(X) private
( ) public-local
( ) public-state
( ) public-federal

**Category of Property:**

(X) building(s)
( ) district
( ) site
( ) structure
( ) object

**Number of Resources within Property:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contributing resources previously listed in the National Register:** N/A
**Name of previous listing:** N/A
**Name of related multiple property listing:** N/A
4. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this 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 meets does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property is considered significant nationally statewide locally. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

________________________________________________________ ____________________________
Signature of certifying official       Date


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

________________________________________________________ ____________________________
Signature of commenting or other official       Date

State or Federal agency or bureau

5. National Park Service Certification

I, hereby, certify that this property is:

( ) entered in the National Register

( ) determined eligible for the National Register

( ) determined not eligible for the National Register

( ) removed from the National Register

( ) other, explain:

( ) see continuation sheet

Keeper of the National Register       Date
6. Function or Use

**Historic Functions:** Domestic/Single Dwelling

**Current Functions:** Vacant/Not In Use

7. Description

**Architectural Classification:** Early Classical Revival

**Materials:**

- **Foundation:** Brick/Wood
- **Walls:** Wood/Weatherboard
- **Roof:** Asphalt
- **Other:** Wood

**Description of present and historic physical appearance:**

Blooming Grove is an Early Classical Revival style residence constructed by Cornelius Mandeville ca. 1790 with an an early nineteenth century addition, and late nineteenth and early-to-mid twentieth century alterations. The plantation is located at the east end of Rogers Court off Pocket Road near the city of Florence, Florence County, South Carolina.

Constructed in the I-House form, a house type popular with farmers and planters for its impressive, two-story façade, Blooming Grove features the shallow depth (one room) that avoided excessive expense, another important factor during the period. The historic portion of the two-story house is one bay deep, and four bays wide. The oldest portion of the house consists of a ca. 1790 central hallway I-House with exterior chimneys on the gable ends. A single pen, two-story addition on the north was added in the early nineteenth century and has a chimney on its exposed gable end. A two-story, front gabled, partial-width portico frames the entrance bay of the ca. 1790 house. A small one-story, front gabled porch is also found on the front façade of an early nineteenth century two-story addition to the right of the portico. A small one-story, modern, shed-roofed addition has been added to the rear of the house.

The Blooming Grove plantation house is classified as Early Classical Revival in style. Elements of the style found on the plantation house include the two-story portico, pilaster-like corner boards, the house's symmetrical/rectangular form, and the entrance door flanked by sidelights and transom. This style was influenced by Roman architecture as illustrated by the dentil molding and flat frieze along the roofline. Dentil moldings and crown moldings still exist within most of the rooms on the interior. The interior walls also feature a wainscoting divided into dado panels with a simple baseboard and topped by a chair rail. The mantels in the house are intact, although they have been temporarily removed from most of the rooms while being restored. The mantels are delicately carved, with an elaborate cornice featuring dentils and panels flanking the firebox.

The oldest portion of the house is constructed of hewn heart pine with mortise and tenon joints. Large “shop-made,” or cut, nails are used in the construction. Cedar stumps were used as foundation supports for the approximately 9” X 8” and “5 X 8” sills. During the recent work on the property, the stumps were removed and brick piers were installed to support the dwelling. Soon after the original house was constructed, a two-story addition was made to the right (north) elevation of the house. The construction date of this addition is thought to have been sometime between 1800 and 1820. The sills for this
historic addition are similar in size to the original house, but are sawn instead of hand-hewn. The historic portions of the house are covered in 5" clapboard siding, with the original entrance bay having flush siding. Most of the clapboards and flush siding are original to the property; some boards were replaced in-kind during restoration. Original channeled corner boards are found at the four corners of the house, and there is no break in the clapboard siding for the north side addition. The continuous clapboard suggests that the house was reclad with clapboards at some point and the corner boards were installed at this time. The cornice with dentils and an unadorned frieze is also continuous along the front and rear roofline of the house.

The historic landscape around the Blooming Grove house date from the nineteenth century. Native cherry trees once created an avenue along the entrance road leading from Pocket Road to the dwelling (still existing and now known as Rogers Court). A half-mile avenue lined with oaks and hickory trees continued from the front of the plantation house to the Old Georgetown Road (see photograph #1). The current landscape of the house includes native trees around the dwelling, including cedars (including an old cedar at the front of the house), Carolina Cherry and Black Locust trees. Some of the cherry trees along the avenue to Pocket Road still survive. The avenue to the Old Georgetown Road is overgrown and barely discernible. A brick-lined well located at the rear of the house and covered with a mid-twentieth century concrete slab (see attached site plan sketch) also contributes to the historic character of this property. No historic utilitarian or farm-related buildings exist on the property. Currently, Blooming Grove consists of forty-nine acres. In 1890 the acreage of the plantation was one hundred and twenty-five acres, and it is said that at one point in its history that the plantation property extended from “what is now known as Muses Bridge on Black Creek to the Great Pee Dee River.”

The façade of the house has a formal entrance door with sidelights and transom in the original central bay. The sidelights, transom and door are delineated with channeled molding similar to the corner boards of the house. The two-story portico is attached to this façade (see photograph #4) and the wall shared by the portico and the dwelling features flush siding (see photograph #9). The second story of the portico also has a similar entrance, with a door with sidelights and a transom. The columns on the portico are reproductions of the original columns that had deteriorated over time. A small, front-gabled, one-story porch is attached to the front façade of the early nineteenth century addition. This entrance door has six vertical panels forming a “double cross.” There is flush siding, but no sidelights or transom details for this entrance. All windows on the facade are nine-over-nine, double-hung sash windows with surrounds that are flat with a rounded nosing. Channeled corner boards on the façade support a plain frieze with dentil molding.

---

3 Florence County Deed Book B, p. 213, Florence County Courthouse, Florence, S.C.
4 Howard, pp. 1-2.
5 Howard, p. 2.
The south elevation of the house consists of one bay with a pair of windows flanking the area where a chimney has been removed (see photograph #7). The chimney was damaged during the Charleston earthquake of 1886, but was still in use until the middle of the twentieth century. The second story portion of the chimney had recently fallen and the whole chimney was subsequently removed. The void has been infilled with clapboard. This elevation has flush eaves and channeled corner boards.

The north elevation of the house is similar to the south elevation, except that the entire chimney was destroyed by the 1886 earthquake and never rebuilt. The void left by the chimney’s collapse was replaced with a small, fixed, four-light window on the first floor and the remainder infilled with clapboard siding. A modern, one-story, shed-roofed addition on the rear (west) elevation and featuring clapboard siding and flat corner boards is visible from the north.

The rear elevation of the house also features a modern screened porch with a roof balcony and two entrance doors under construction. Simple, flat dimensional lumber is being utilized in its construction and it is to be sealed and left without paint to differentiate it as a modern addition to the dwelling. There are three original doors on the first floor of this rear elevation. These doors access the parlor, the first floor hall and the kitchen. The door to the first floor hall is wider than the typical doors found in the dwelling, but is still of the “double cross” pattern. There are three second floor windows. A door that once accessed a two-story addition on the rear of the house still exists and will be used as an entrance door to the roof deck created on the roof of the first floor screened porch. The elevation is covered with clapboards and a dentil molding, with flat frieze beneath, is found along the roofline. During the renovation of the house, previous deteriorated additions were removed from the rear of the house. These additions included a two-story, one room addition dating from the early to mid-twentieth century (see photograph #6) and an ell from the nineteenth century two-story addition. A small, one-story, shed-roofed bathroom addition was added to this elevation in 2004; the room features a transom-like window. This addition is also differentiated from the original portion of the house by its tan paint, flat corner boards, and a flat window surround.

The first floor of the house contains five rooms (the bathroom addition makes a total of six rooms) and the second floor contains six rooms. The first and second floor plans of the house feature wood floorboards that are approximately 5 ½" – 6" wide and held in place with cut nails. The flush ceiling boards are 5 1/2" – 6" in width on the first floor, but increase to 9” – 12” wide on the second floor. The ceiling boards have a bead detail where they abut one another. All of the interior walls in the historic part of the house have retained the original split and sawn lath on framing with remnants of original plaster in places. All of the doors found in the house are original, unless otherwise noted, and have a “double cross” pattern. Similarly, the windows of the house are nine-over-nine, double-hung sash windows. All interior rooms, unless otherwise noted, feature a baseboard, wainscoting, chair rail and cornice molding with dentils.

The first floor, central entrance hall of the original ca. 1790 house (see photographs #14 -16) is accessed from the portico on the house’s façade. The door at the end of the hall connects to the screened porch being constructed on the rear of the house. A stair to the second floor landing is found on the right side of the room with a door into the kitchen located at the first floor landing of the stairs. A door on the left leads to the parlor. The stair stringer features original delicate scrollwork underneath the ends to each tread of the stair. The balusters and newel post are rectangular in design, and the banister is elliptical in section. The chair rail and wainscoting continue from the first floor, up the staircase, and to the second floor.
The parlor (see photographs #17-22) features wainscoting with individual dado panels beneath the windows. Some of the plank wood panels of the wainscoting have become detached from the wall and will be reinstalled during restoration of this room. The mantel for the room is intact. The plaster on the walls, like much of the rest of the dwelling, has fallen from the walls and has been in such disrepair that the remaining plaster and the split lath in this room has been recently removed and replaced with gypsum board. A door at the back of the room leads to the screened porch at the rear of the house.

The kitchen is located to the right of the central hall (see photographs #23-25) and features wainscoting with individual dado panels beneath the windows. A door on the rear wall connects to the screened porch and a door on the north wall connects to the early nineteenth century two-story addition. The fireplace in the room is in severe disrepair and its mantel has been removed for restoration. A built-in cabinet with paned-glass doors and two drawers, and a closet associated with the early nineteenth century addition, is to the left of the fireplace. An original closet, currently lined with shelves for use as a pantry, is located on the south wall of this room and fits under the central hall stairs. This room was utilized as a kitchen during a period from the 1940s through the 1950s, as evidenced by the pantry and a sink located on the west wall.

The first floor room of the early nineteenth century addition (see photographs #26-27) is known as the workroom. A door on the east wall accesses the one-story front porch of this addition. There is a closet on the interior with wood wall pegs for hanging clothes, believed to be original to the room. A pair of windows flanks a small, fixed, four-light window centered in the north wall and there is a window on the east wall. A ca. 1950 partition wall recently divided the rear of the room, but has been removed. The original fireplace and chimney were destroyed in 1886 and not replaced; the chimney opening was filled and the whereabouts of the fireplace mantel is unknown. The detailing of the room, including the “double-cross” doors and similar moldings and wainscoting, suggest that historic addition was constructed not long after the original house was built.

The first floor bathroom is a modern addition on the northwest corner of the house (see photograph #28) with no access to the workroom; it is accessible from the rear screened porch. This small addition is unobtrusive and serves to prevent new plumbing from having to run through the house. The wall treatments in the bathroom will be gypsum board, with a simple baseboard molding and window surrounds. A fixed, transom-like window is found in the western wall of this addition.

The second floor hall of the original house (see photographs #29-30) is accessed by the stairs. A door on the west side of the hall once led to the early to mid-twentieth century addition that has since been removed. This doorway will now provide access to the second floor roof deck over the rear porch. An anteroom is located off of the hall as well as the second floor of the front portico. The door to the portico features sidelights and a transom. There is evidence that another door may have been located in the hall, although it appears to have been infilled early on as there is sawn lath across the apparent opening. There is no cornice molding in this room.

Bedroom #1 (see photographs #31-32) is entered from a door roughly centered on the south wall of the second floor hall. Pairs of windows are centered on the south, east and west walls of the room; however, one window appears to have been infilled during the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century due to the use of split lath. The fireplace mantel has been removed to prepare for restoration.
The anteroom located off the second floor hall is a small room roughly four feet by four feet that was created ca. 1950 by the addition of the western partition wall to bedroom #2. This anteroom provides access to bedroom #2 and the second floor bathroom. The door to bedroom #2 is different than the rest of the doors in this house, featuring two long vertical panels. There are no windows in this room. Only one wall has baseboard, wainscoting, chair rail and cornice molding with dentils similar to that found in the rest of the house. The other walls feature a simple cap-like chair rail and a simple plank wainscot without a baseboard.

The second floor bathroom is roughly four feet by six feet and is entered from the anteroom and by bedroom #3 (see photograph #33). This room was created ca. 1950 by the addition of the western partition wall to bedroom #2. In this bathroom is a steeply slanting, unfinished staircase that probably dates from the time of this partition wall addition as well. The door that accesses bedroom #3 is smaller than the typical doors in the dwelling and features one long vertical panel. Remnants of the original baseboard, wainscoting, chair rail and cornice molding with dentils are found in this room. A window is located on the left side of the west. This room is a part of the original ca. 1790 house; its north wall was moved to line up with the chimney of bedroom #3 when the addition of that room was built in the early nineteenth century. A ghosting of the original wall evidences this. The current bathroom is not large enough to fit modern bathroom fixtures and the new bathroom will prevent new plumbing from having to be run through the house.

A partition wall was added to bedroom #2 (see photographs #34 – 35) ca. 1950 to create the second floor anteroom and bathroom. The bedroom is accessible from the anteroom and bedroom #3. The partition wall has a smaller wainscoting without a baseboard and no apparent cornice molding. The lathe of the partition wall is sawn lath. There is just one window in this room. The fireplace located on the north wall is in fair condition. The mantle for the fireplace survives and has simple rectangular decoration, with dentils beneath the mantel ledge.

Bedroom #3 (see photographs #36-40) is located on the second floor of the early nineteenth century addition. This room is accessible from the bathroom and bedroom #2. The door connecting to bathroom is smaller than the typical doors in the house and has one long vertical panel. The doorway to a small anteroom off bedroom #2 does not have a door, though it has door casings similar to those found in the rest of the house. This anteroom was created by extending a partition wall from the chimney in the east wall of bedroom #3. This wall was built after the original construction of this room and it does not have the wainscoting, chair rail, or cornice molding with dentils. In fact, the wainscoting and chair rail from the original walls of this room continues through this partition wall into the anteroom. The construction of this partition wall probably dates to the early to mid-twentieth century. The wainscoting of this room is unique as it features early nineteenth-century decorative faux graining. The original fireplace and chimney were destroyed in 1886 and not replaced; the chimney opening was filled and the whereabouts of the fireplace mantel is unknown.

The current owner has undertaken stabilization, rehabilitation and restoration efforts in 2003 and 2004, and this work is planned to continue into 2005. The historic, intact fabric of the property has been retained and those deteriorated original elements of the property have been replaced in-kind. There are plans to rebuild the chimney on the south elevation of the house, and to repoint the interior chimney at a later date. Currently there are no plans to rebuild the north elevation chimney.
8. Statement of Significance

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:

( ) nationally  ( ) statewide  (X) locally

Applicable National Register Criteria:

( ) A  (X) B  (X) C  ( ) D

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): (X) N/A

( ) A  ( ) B  ( ) C  ( ) D  ( ) E  ( ) F  ( ) G

Areas of Significance (enter categories from instructions):
Architecture

Period of Significance:
ca. 1790-1945

Significant Dates:
ca. 1790
ca. 1800-ca. 1820

Significant Person(s):
Rogers, Frank Mandeville (1857-1945)

Cultural Affiliation:
N/A

Architect(s)/Builder(s):
Unknown

Statement of Significance (Areas of Significance):

Blooming Grove is significant at the state level of significance under Criteria B for its association with Frank Mandeville Rogers (1857-1945) and his efforts to promote the growing of Bright Leaf tobacco South Carolina. Like his father and grandfather before him, Rogers was a prosperous and progressive farmer who was interested in promoting good agricultural farming methods and practices. Eldred E. Prince Jr. observes in Long Green: The Rise and Fall of Tobacco in South Carolina, “Although no person was solely responsible for introducing Bright Leaf into South Carolina, Frank Mandeville Rogers merits first mention.” Rogers recognized the possibility that tobacco could grow in South Carolina and be an economic boon to the lagging agricultural economy of the 1880s; this passion lead him to experiments with growing tobacco here at Blooming Grove. Through his network of friends and business associates, as well as his letters and articles printed in newspapers and journals, he was able to spread his ideas about and his experience with tobacco as a prominent cash crop. Rogers’ knowledge of tobacco and its cultivation in South Carolina influenced other farmers in their decision to farm tobacco, which soon rivalled, and in some places surpassed, cotton as a cash crop for most of the twentieth century.
Blooming Grove is also significant under Criteria C as an example of an Early Classical Revival house with alterations in the early and late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This house type is relatively early and rare in the Pee Dee region, with its I-house form featuring a central hallway and details such as wide wainscoting and “double cross” style doors. More recent later twentieth century additions to Blooming Grove have been removed due to their lack of structural integrity, leaving the original ca. 1790 house, with its early nineteenth century addition and other minor late nineteenth and early twentieth century alterations, intact. Other than a small bathroom and a screened porch that have been newly constructed on the rear of the house, Blooming Grove plantation house appears as it did in the early nineteenth century.

National Register Criteria:

Blooming Grove is eligible under Criterion B at the state level of significance for its association with Frank Mandeville Rogers, perhaps the most influential proponents of tobacco farming in South Carolina, who helped develop an improved method of curing tobacco at Blooming Grove, and encouraging Pee Dee and other eastern South Carolina farmers to follow his lead, beginning in the 1880s. It is also eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C, as an example of an Early Republic period residence constructed in the Early Classical Revival style.

Criteria Considerations (if applicable):

N/A

Period of significance (justification):

The period of significance for Blooming Grove is 1790-1945. The construction of the plantation house by Cornelius Mandeville dates from circa 1790. The house was occupied by the Mandeville and Rogers families through the later part of the mid-twentieth century. As farming became less profitable in the mid-twentieth century, the plantation was subdivided and sold; outbuildings were abandoned or demolished. The construction of Interstate 95 was another detrimental impact to the plantation. The end date for the period of significance corresponds to the year of Frank Mandeville Rogers’ death and the approximate date that farming ceased on the property.

Contributing/Noncontributing Resources (explanation, if necessary):

The .46 acre boundary for Blooming Grove contains two contributing resources: 1) the plantation house and 2) a brick-lined well located at the rear of the house. There are no noncontributing resources within the proposed boundary.
Developmental history/historic context:

The history of Blooming Grove Plantation begins with Cornelius Mandeville (d. 1831). Mandeville was a native of Orange County, New York, and a Revolutionary War soldier in the New York militia. Cornelius and his brother David were farmers in New York state before they moved to the Cheraw District, South Carolina, in the late 1780s. Cornelius Mandeville and his brother were merchants, and Cornelius also established a plantation in Darlington District, as well as operating a ferry called Cashua Ferry. The 1790 United States Census records Cornelius Mandeville in Cheraw District as head of a household consisting of three males and one slave. One of the males is believed to be his brother David.6

In 1792 Cornelius Mandeville married Frances McCall and they moved into his plantation house, which he named Blooming Grove. Family history has maintained that the plantation house was built shortly before this marriage, around 1790. Cornelius and Frances Mandeville had twelve children; only three of the children (Henrietta, Martha and Frances) survived their father. Cornelius left no will when he died in 1831, and so the court settled his estate. Apparently the plantation went to his daughter Henrietta, for when she married Robert Rogers in 1832, the plantation passed into his possession.7 It is thought that the two-story single-pen addition was added to the north elevation of the house before 1831.

Robert Rogers (fl. 1871) was the only son of Benjamin Rogers, Jr., a planter and public official of nearby Marlboro District.8 Robert Rogers was one of the first wardens of Christ Church Parish and was a magistrate for Darlington District, as well as a charter member of the Darlington District Agriculture Society, established in 1846 to promote “the planting interest” in the district. He served as vice president of the society in 1846 and again in 1871. He was also part of a group of planters and merchants who purchased the Darlington Hotel in the mid-nineteenth century.9 While Robert Rogers owned Blooming Grove its boundaries were described as from “Muses Bridge on Black Creek to the great Pee Dee River.”10

Upon Robert Rogers’ death, the plantation passed to his son Robert Mandeville Rogers (1841-1913). Rogers married Cornelia Mandeville, a distant cousin from Mississippi, in the 1860s; they had seven children.11 According to family records, Fannie, Meta and Ellwyn Rogers lived into the mid-twentieth century. During the Civil War Robert was a member of the Old Darlington Guards.

---

6 Frank Mandeville Rogers III, Rogers Family of the Pee Dee South Carolina and Allied Families, unpublished typescript, Florence, S.C., 1958, p. 34.
7 Ibid., pp. 36 – 37.
8 Ibid., p. 13.
9 Ibid., p. 15.
10 Ibid., p. 2.
11 Rogers, p. 37.
Prior to Robert M. Rogers' death in 1913, Blooming Grove was given to his daughter Meta.\(^\text{12}\) She in turn gave the plantation to her mother, Cornelia M. Rogers, in 1890.\(^\text{13}\) Apparently Cornelia M. Rogers must have turned the plantation over to Frank Mandeville Rogers, Sr., prior to 1905; in that year Rogers turned control over to his son, Gilmore Simms Rogers. In 1905, the plantation contained 125 acres. Approximately five years later, Gilmore Rogers turned control of the plantation over to his brother Frank Mandeville Rogers (1857-1945).\(^\text{14}\) It is believed that Frank Mandeville Rogers was managing Blooming Grove Plantation long before 1910, even if he was not the sole owner until that date.

In 1884 Rogers was one of the first South Carolinians to experiment with growing tobacco in the Pee Dee region, and one of the first to succeed at it. Based on the success of this first experiment at Blooming Grove, he planted three acres in 1885 and built a tobacco-curing barn on the plantation. In 1885, he also experimented with a new method of curing tobacco. He cured half of his crop using the traditional curing method which entailed waiting for the whole plant to ripen before curing, while he used his new curing method on the other half, which entailed curing the leaves as they ripened. Reportedly this new curing method reportedly increased the price of the tobacco by 200 percent. Rogers’ three acres sold for approximately $600, a much larger sum than the same acreage planted in cotton would have yielded.

In 1886 the South Carolina Commissioner of Agriculture decided to award a $100.00 prize to the South Carolina farmer having the best sample of tobacco grown in the state. Rogers won this prize.\(^\text{15}\) In 1887 Rogers employed Robert E. Currin and Richard E. Rives from North Carolina to help him manage his tobacco crop of twenty acres. This crop realized a net profit per acre of $146, compared to the approximately $15 per acre that a good cotton crop would yield.\(^\text{16}\) In 1887, Rogers increased his crop to thirty acres.\(^\text{17}\) In 1935 Frank wrote an article for the Florence Morning News describing his experiences fifty years before as part of a Golden Tobacco Jubilee held in Florence.\(^\text{18}\)

\(^\text{13}\) Florence County Deed Book B, p. 213.
\(^\text{14}\) Florence County Deed Book 4, p. 31.
\(^\text{16}\) Prince, p. 54.
\(^\text{17}\) Rogers, “History of First Planting of Tobacco In This County And State.”
\(^\text{18}\) Ibid.
What makes Frank Mandeville Rogers so important to the growth of tobacco farming in South Carolina is that he reported all of his successes to his neighbors, other farmers and the press. In the 1880s Rogers would often invite neighbors to inspect his crop and his curing barn while he would explain the profits that he was making from his forays into tobacco. Through his example and encouragement, neighbors such as Thomas Ashby, John C. Calhoun Brunson, Smilie A. Gregg, Eli Gregg, Captain John McSween, and Thomas W. Williamson began growing tobacco. Not only did Rogers relate his experiences with tobacco to the local newspaper, the *Darlington News*, but he also corresponded with several newspapers including the *Charleston News and Courier* and agricultural publications in the state about the subject. Even the *Baptist Courier* reported on Rogers and his neighbors' success with tobacco in 1889. Part of the reason the press embraced tobacco growing was that it appeared to “embody the New South ideals of progress, resource development and economic diversity.”

Another important contribution of Rogers to the tobacco industry in South Carolina was the establishment of the first tobacco auction house in nearby Florence. Investors in the Florence Tobacco Manufacturing and Warehouse Company were some of the major tobacco growers in the area and included John C. Calhoun Brunson, Eugene F. Douglas, Gus McSween, Captain John McSween, and Thomas W. Williamson as well as Rogers himself. This warehouse held its first auction on October 1, 1891 and was used as a model for other tobacco warehouses in the area. This soon led to another warehouse being built in nearby Darlington.

It is believed that the plantation passed into the possession of his cousin, Fannie M. Rogers, on his death in 1945, which is also the approximate date that the plantation's acreage began to diminish as the property was subdivided and sold due to the decline in farming in the area. Fannie's brother Ellwyn also lived at the plantation house with Fannie during this time. Fannie began removing additions to the house; leaving only a two story, rear ell addition accessed from the central hall. It is likely that the second floor bathroom and anteroom were added at this time, along with alterations to the first floor kitchen (sink and pantry).

In 1953 Fannie passed the plantation to her nephew, Robert Rogers. Only forty-nine acres remained with the plantation house at this time. Just prior to this transfer, the plantation had been divided by the construction of Interstate 95. Upon Robert's possession of the plantation, the family stopped living in the plantation house. Rogers built a ranch home on the property and lived in this house. More recently, four mobile homes were placed along the avenue from the plantation house to the ranch house. One field on the east side of the road is still used to farm cotton. Tobacco is no longer produced on the plantation. In 2000, Miss Cornelia M. Rogers became the owner of the plantation, and she began collecting family memorabilia. As a tribute to her father who wanted to see the plantation house restored, she began the current renovation/restoration process of the house in 2003.

19 Prince, pp. 54 – 56.
20 Ibid., p. 63.
21 Howard, p. 1.
22 Cornelia Mandeville Rogers Interview, 5 November 2004.
23 Florence County Deed Book 156, p. 256.
24 Cornelia Mandeville Rogers Interview, 5 November 2004.
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10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property
Approximately .46 acres

UTM References
USGS 7.5 Minute Series Topographic Map. Witherspoon Island Quadrangle.
Point A: Zone 17    Easting 618390    Northing 3792493
Point B: Zone 17    Easting 618400    Northing 3792473
Point C: Zone 17    Easting 618355    Northing 3792462
Point D: Zone 17    Easting 618365    Northing 3792493

Verbal Boundary Description
See attached marked copy of the Florence County Tax Map 202 for a graphic depiction of the proposed National Register Boundary for Blooming Grove. To find this boundary start at the southeast corner of parcel 34 on Roger's Court. From this starting point continue in a straight line from this point along the right-of-way of Rogers Court for approximately 900 feet in a southerly direction to the point of beginning -- Point A -- of the proposed National Register Boundary for this property. From this point continue approximately 200’ in a southerly direction along the right-of-way line of the western side of Rogers Court to Point B. From Point B turn approximately ninety degrees to the west and continue in a westerly direction for approximately 100’ to Point C along a fence found to the rear of the plantation house. From Point C turn approximately ninety degrees to the north and continue in a northerly direction for approximately 200’ along said fence to a Point D. From Point D turn approximately ninety degrees to the east and continue for approximately 100’ in an easterly direction back to Point A on Rogers Court.

Boundary Justification
This boundary contains approximately .46 acres and is restricted to the historic house and its historic associated well.
11. Form Prepared By

Consulting Services/Technical Assistance (if applicable)  ( ) not applicable

Name/title:  Brian LaBrie, Preservation Planner  
Organization:  The Jaeger Company  
Mailing address:  119 Washington Street  
City:  Gainesville  State:  GA  Zip code:  30501  
Telephone:  (770) 534-0506  
E-mail:  brian@jaegerco.com

( ) property owner  
(X) consultant  
( ) other

Property Owner or Contact Information

Name:  Ms. Cornelia M. Rogers  
Mailing address:  3407 Rogers Court  
City:  Florence  State:  SC  Zip code:  29506
Name of Property: Blooming Grove Plantation
City or Vicinity: Florence
County: Florence
State: South Carolina
Photographer: Brian LaBrie
Negative Filed: 
Date Photographed: November 5, 2004

Description of Photograph(s):

Number of photographs: 40

1. View looking east along the former avenue to the Old Georgetown Road from the front portico.
2. View looking northeast towards avenue to Pocket Road from the front portico.
3. View looking southwest towards I-95 from the front portico.
4. View of the facade (east elevation)
5. View of the right (north) and facade (east) elevations
6. View of the rear (west) and left (south) elevations
7. View of the left (south) elevation
8. Exterior detail of the original mudsill and floor joists; note the brick piers are from the 2003–04 renovation/restoration.
9. Exterior detail of the main entrance door on the front facade accessed from the portico; note the transom, sidelights and molding surrounds.
10. View looking northeast along the new screened porch towards the new bathroom.
11. Exterior detail of the rear door of the first floor hallway.
12. Exterior detail of the rear door of the parlor.
14. View looking towards the front portico along first floor hall.
15. Interior detail of scrollwork, spindles and newel post of the staircase in first floor hall.
16. View of doorway from room the first floor hallway into the parlor.
17. View of the fireplace mantle in the parlor; this is the only room in the plantation house that has been fully restored.
18. View of the doorway from the parlor into the first floor hallway.
19. View of the doorway from the parlor to the rear screened porch.
20. Detail of typical interior window, with unique dado panel beneath window found in the parlor and bedroom #3.
21. Detail of the dado panel beneath window in the parlor.
22. Detail of dentil ceiling cornice molding in the parlor.
23. View looking north through the kitchen; note the original built in cabinet to the left of the deteriorated fireplace.
24. Detail of wainscoting in the kitchen.
25. Detail of ceiling cornice molding in the kitchen; note no dentils though it is possible that the dentils deteriorated along with the plaster that had been in this room.
26. View at the seam between the kitchen and the workroom; family lore has it that the Charleston earthquake of 1886 caused this seam.
27. View looking northwest through the work room; note the former exterior chimney from the kitchen was covered over when this part of the house was added in the early nineteenth century.

28. View looking northeast through the new first floor bathroom into the workroom.

29. View looking west through the second floor hall.

30. View looking east through the second floor hall; note the off center doorway to the second floor of the portico.

31. View of the east wall of bedroom #1; note the wainscoting without dado panels beneath the windows.

32. Detail of the dentiled ceiling cornice molding in bedroom #1.

33. View looking northwest through the second floor bathroom installed ca. 1950.

34. View of the mantle found in bedroom #2; note the dentil molding and crisp linear detailing.

35. View of the doorway from bedroom #2 into the second floor anteroom; note the change in wainscoting at the corner of the two walls. This western wall was added ca. 1950.

36. Detail of typical interior treatment of windows

37. View looking southeast through bedroom #3.

38. Detail of the wainscoting with dado panels beneath the windows in bedroom #3; note the fine graining on the wainscoting. There is only evidence of this graining in house.

39. Detail of the intersection of a ca. 1950 partition wall that extends from the chimney between bedroom #2 and bedroom #3 to the eastern wall.

40. Detail of doorway between the second floor bathroom and bedroom #3; this door was added ca. 1950.