

City of Austin, Texas

Historic Resources Survey of East Austin

September 2000

Revised December 2000

Survey Report



Prepared by
Hardy·Heck·Moore & Myers, Inc.
Austin, Texas

HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEY OF EAST AUSTIN

**SEPTEMBER 2000
REVISED DECEMBER 2000**

SURVEY REPORT

PREPARED FOR:
City of Austin, Texas
Contract #MO99300167A

PREPARED BY:
Hardy•Heck•Moore & Myers, Inc.
Austin, Texas

PRINCIPAL AUTHORS:
Terri Myers, Project Director
Richard E. Mitchell, Architectural Historian
Jennifer R. Ross, Architectural Historian
James T. Jones, Researcher

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iii
Introduction	1
Survey Methods	3
Overview	3
Previous Survey Results	7
Project Area	11
Field Investigations	12
Historical Research	15
Survey Results	21
Individual Properties	21
Historic Districts	22
Data Collection and Presentation	23
Preservation Priority Evaluation	24
Analysis of Data and Report Preparation	28
Survey Materials	29
Observations	30
Recommendations	32
Overview	32
Historic Designations	36
The National Register of Historic Places	36
Texas Historical Markers	38
Properties to Consider for Historic Designations	39
High Priority Properties	39
Proposed Historic Districts	40
Conclusions	49
Historic Overview of East Austin Project Area	53
East Austin Property Types	89
References	109
Annotated Oral Histories	117

Appendices

Historic Resources Inventory

National Register Assessments

Photographic Index

Historic Resources Survey Map

National Register Assessment Map

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Hardy·Heck·Moore & Myers, Inc. (HHM&M) appreciates the many people and organizations who contributed to the East Austin Historic Resources Survey. HHM&M personnel and subconsultants worked closely with Austin History Center staff to accomplish the survey goals. Austin History Center Director Biruta Kearl and Reading Room staff granted us extraordinary consideration in our efforts to research East Austin's history. Margaret Schlankey and Grace McElroy helped identify and collect historic photographs. Karen Riles' contributions, particularly in conducting oral histories tailored to the project, were invaluable. Sharmyn Lilly and the Friends of the Austin History Center generously supported our efforts, as well.

This project could not have been accomplished without the work of Eleanor Thompson and Eva Lindsey who served as community liaisons, conducted oral histories and historic research, arranged meetings and interviews, and publicized our efforts. Researcher Terry Jones conducted archival investigations and co-authored the historic context. Robert Ryan of Windrose Data Corporation provided mapping services.

We are especially grateful to the residents and former residents of the project area who gave generously of their time and memories in an effort to better understand and record the history of East Austin and its early residents. Formal interviews were conducted by the HHM&M project director and preservation liaisons with Willie Toliver Jr., Leonard Mann, Buster Hancock, Ora Lee Nobles, J.B. Thompson, Mabel Walker Newton, Artie Johnson, Barbara Daniels, Roger Taylor and Rev. Isaac Fontaine. Many others contributed photographs and other artifacts to the Austin History Center in conjunction with this survey. The W.H. Passon Society, a historical society established to preserve and record the history of Austin's African American citizens, provided office and meeting space along with its encouragement.

Newspaper articles contributed to community acceptance and support and we appreciate the attention of *Austin American Statesman* reporters Leah Quinn and Andy

Alford, and photographer Vernon Bryant, and *NOKOA (the Observer)* reporter and photographer, Akwasi Evans, in publicizing the project. Special thanks are extended to Dan Niendorff for granting us a tour of his home and an interview with the *Austin American Statesman*.

We are also thankful for the assistance of the City of Austin Historic Preservation Officer, Barbara Stocklin, Community Development Manager, Greg Smith, and Business Development Specialist, Jerry Freese, of the Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Department. Finally, we wish to commend past and present city council members who recognize the value of Austin's historic resources and who supported this survey.

INTRODUCTION

The East Austin Historic Resources Survey is a comprehensive inventory of buildings, structures, objects and sites built in part of East Austin before 1955. Project area boundaries follow East 14th Street on the north, Coletto Street on the east, Pennsylvania/Cotton/San Bernard/Rosewood/East 11th Street/Navasota and East 9th Street on the south, and San Marcos/Curve Street/IH-35 frontage, on the west. The City of Austin undertook the project and is solely responsible for its funding and administration. Hardy-Heck-Moore & Myers, Inc. (HHM&M), an Austin-based cultural resource management firm, conducted the survey in accordance with the guidelines and standards followed by the Texas Historical Commission (THC), and as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior. This report summarizes the findings of the survey and offers recommendations for the preservation of the city's historic resources. It identifies the properties that are most likely eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or to receive state and local historic designations. It also recommends boundaries of potential historic districts on the basis of concentrations of historic properties that retain their historic character.

The survey identified 496 historic properties estimated to have been built before 1955 within the project area boundaries. Of that total, 105 were determined to be HIGH preservation priorities, 242 were assigned MEDIUM priorities. The 149 properties designated as LOW preservation priorities include historic period resources that have been extensively altered or that are incongruous with the historic character of the area due to a combination of their age, design or type. Properties with HIGH or MEDIUM priority status possibly qualify for local, state or federal historic designations, either individually or as part of group properties such as a historic district. In addition, properties with HIGH priority assignments are recommended as being eligible for individual listing in the NRHP. While MEDIUM priority properties may not be individually eligible for listing, they are considered Contributing elements of potential or designated NRHP districts if they lie within the boundaries of such districts. Thus, they are considered eligible for listing in the

NRHP as integral features of identified districts. MEDIUM priority properties are not eligible for the NRHP if they lie outside the boundaries of historic districts but since they contribute to the historic character of East Austin they should be regarded as significant cultural resources worthy of preservation.

This report is intended as a foundation for preservation planning efforts and Section 106 review in East Austin. It includes a discussion of the survey and research methods, survey results, and recommendations for future historic designations of individual properties and historic districts. Finally, a narrative history of East Austin, with an emphasis on its African American heritage, is included to identify the area's cultural and developmental context. It contains a discussion of historic trends and demographic changes and how they affected development and redevelopment in the project area. Specific commercial districts, residential neighborhoods and individual properties are highlighted in the narrative. The narrative provides a historic context within which cultural resources may be evaluated and assessed. It also contains a discussion of historic property types found within the survey area. The narrative and property types section is followed by a list of references cited and annotated oral histories undertaken as part of the project.

SURVEY METHODS

OVERVIEW

East Austin is ambiguously identified as lying east of IH-35, which bisects the city from north to south. As Austin expanded to cover most of Travis County in the late 20th century, that description has grown to encompass a vast region of the city that stretches north to Williamson County, and south to Hays County. Historically, East Austin has been defined simply as that part of Austin lying east of East Avenue, the city's original townsite boundary, and north of the Colorado River. Northern and eastern boundaries grew as the city expanded outward from the downtown. At the turn of the century, though, Nineteenth Street, now Martin Luther King Blvd., was the city's northern boundary and therefore the limit of "East Austin".

Although it lies outside the original townsite boundaries, East Austin contains some of the city's oldest intact residential districts. This is due partly because Austin expanded into its eastern outlots with the arrival of the Houston & Texas Central (H&TC) Railroad from the east in 1871, an event that spurred commercial development along the tracks and residential construction in the adjacent blocks. Retention of historic fabric in East Austin is related to the fact that it has not benefitted as much from successive waves of economic growth since its initial development as the rest of the city. The result has been economic neglect but also a high degree of historic architectural fabric. A challenge for the city of Austin during this current period of phenomenal growth and economic opportunity will be to help East Austin share in the city's prosperity and at the same time retain its precious historic resources.

East Austin contains a large number of historic-period resources within the project area. Commercial buildings primarily front the East 11th and East 12th Street corridors and adjacent side street lots, while residential and institutional buildings such as churches and schools comprise the majority of the remaining resources in the project area. The

greatest loss of historic fabric has occurred along the area's two major commercial arterials, East 11th and East 12th streets, and in the fan-shaped residential neighborhood that lies between them, west of Navasota Street. Largely intact concentrations of historic resources lie along East 13th and East 14th streets, East 9th and E. 10th streets, San Bernard and New York streets, and the 900 block of Juniper street. Major churches including Ebenezer Baptist Church (1010 E. 10th), Metropolitan AME Church (1101 E. 10th), and Our Lady of Guadalupe Catholic Church (1206 East 9th), are clustered within a few blocks of one another on E. 10th and East 9th streets. Other historic African American congregations maintain churches in the project area including Wesley United Methodist Church (1164 San Bernard) and Simpson Memorial Baptist Church (1701 East 12th Street). Perhaps the oldest church is a small vernacular church at the northeast corner of E. 12th Street and Waller (1201 Waller/1100 East 12th Street). Originally an Episcopal and then a Catholic church that served a largely immigrant population of Irish and German residents in the area in the late-19th and early-20th centuries, it has changed use and congregations over the years as demographic patterns changed but retains a high degree of historic character.

No public schools lie within the project area although several neighborhood churches operate private kindergartens and day care centers. Historically, the area was a mecca for African Americans seeking higher education. Robertson Hill School, Olive Street School and Samuel Huston College all lay within the project area boundaries but all have been demolished. Huston-Tillotson College and Kealing Junior High lie just beyond the project area boundaries, to the east and south, respectively. During the historic period, all of these institutions contributed to the development of East Austin as the largely African American enclave it is today. While little physical evidence of their existence remains in the project area, their influence is remembered and reflected in the extant African American community that once supported these institutions.

HHM&M staff who worked on the project included Terri Myers, Project Director and Historian, David Moore, Survey Director, Associate Historians Sophie Roark and Laurie Gotcher, Architectural Historians Rick Mitchell and Jennifer Ross, and Research

Assistants Allison Holland and Karen Savic. Eleanor Thompson and Eva Lindsey participated as community liaisons under subcontract agreement with HHM&M. James T. Jones conducted historical research, provided invaluable assistance and co-authored the historic context for this project. Cartographer Robert Ryan provided mapping services.

In the late spring of 2000, HHM&M Principal and Project Director Terri Myers coordinated the initial field documentation that was undertaken by staff Architectural Historians Rick Mitchell and Jennifer Ross. Field documentation consisted of identifying, photographing and minimally documenting and assigning a preliminary preservation priority to all pre-1955 properties within the project area boundaries. This date was chosen because National Register criteria recommends that a resource be at least 50 years old or older for consideration. The time period was expanded by five years because survey dates are only approximate and although a building may appear newer, it may have been built at an earlier date. Also, expanding the time range gives the city greater flexibility in using the report for planning purposes. Planners will be able to see that while a building may not be considered for designation in 2000, it may become eligible within a few years. Adding the five year margin thus provides the city with a tool for planning efforts beyond this year.

The initial survey identified nearly 500 properties within the project area boundaries that appear to have been built before 1955. Additional properties were identified and some multi-resource sites were divided into their separate components for individual documentation so that the final tally found 496 historic properties in the project area. Of that number, 105 were given preliminary designations as HIGH preservation priorities, while 242 were determined to be MEDIUM preservation priorities. The remaining 149 historic properties are identified as LOW preservation priorities due to alterations or incompatible architectural characteristics. Initial priorities assigned in the field were revised after final field and historical assessments were made. Two detailed survey maps are included with this report. One shows all documented sites and their preservation priorities and the other identifies National Register eligibility. Both depict boundaries of recommended historic districts within the survey area.

Concurrent with survey efforts, the research team also documented the history of East Austin, focusing attention on the African American settlement that developed in the area known as Robertson Hill, north of the French Legation, during Reconstruction. The Project Director guided research efforts of staff, subconsultants and volunteers. A literature search was conducted at state and local repositories including The Center for American History at the University of Texas at Austin, the State Archives and Library, and the Austin History Center. Private collections included those of the W.H. Passon Society, an African American historical organization, and the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, an African American service organization. Primary and secondary source materials from state and local archives and private collections were used to build a brief historic context for the area. It is included in this survey report as the Historic Overview of East Austin.

Oral histories and historic photographs were collected from former and current residents to expand our understanding of the area's development and provide individual property information. Research on the area as a whole, on individual buildings, businesses, institutions and families, was collected to expand the historic context and evaluate individual resources.

Once the field work was completed and a large body of research collected, the area's cultural resources could be evaluated for both architectural merit and historic significance within their context. All resources were assigned preliminary preservation priorities in the field based almost entirely on their architectural integrity. With the survey data gathered, properties could be compared with one another and reevaluated as to their relative integrity within the project area. Historic associations factored into the evaluation process primarily in judging properties that had been severely altered or that displayed little architectural merit. In cases where resources possessed strong historic links to significant people, trends, or events in the community, such distinctions mitigated the lack or loss of architectural fabric. Using field data, photographs, and historic documentation, Terri Myers and Jennifer Ross reassessed each surveyed property, considered their relative architectural merits and historic associations and assigned final recommendations of HIGH, MEDIUM and LOW preservation priorities for each surveyed resource. Upon

completion of the priority assessments, field maps were used plot each resource by address and priority assessment or National Register eligibility.

Work products include Historic Resources Inventory forms detailing physical attributes and brief statements of significance for each surveyed property. Photographs showing at least two elevations of each property were printed. Additional photographs depicting architectural details or unique features of selected properties were taken and they are included with the survey materials. Minimal historical information for most properties is listed on Historical Information Profile cards included with the Inventory forms. Inventory forms and Historical Information Profile cards and photographs were placed in separate archival sleeves within a single archival sheet protector for each property. The individual sheets were placed in binders by address, with numbered streets preceding named streets in alphabetical order. Upon completion of the field investigations, the data was compiled and this survey report was prepared. A comprehensive inventory of surveyed properties, National Register assessments, photographic contact sheets and two project area maps, one depicting priority designations and the other identifying NRHP eligibility, are included as appendices in this report. Three copies of the work products and survey report, along with labeled diskettes containing the survey report, survey data base, and historical information, are submitted to the city to complete the project.

PREVIOUS SURVEY RESULTS

Prior to initiating the fieldwork, HHM&M staff examined reports from previous historic resource investigations in the area. This step identified resources that have been surveyed and revealed the level of documentation recorded for these properties. Although no previous comprehensive surveys have been undertaken for the entire project area, several earlier projects included resources within the current survey boundaries.

The first major cultural resources survey that included the current project area is recorded in *East Austin, An Architectural Survey*. Sponsored by the Heritage Society of Austin, the survey and report were completed by Austinites, Architect Joe Freeman and

Historian Martha Doty Freeman, between November 1979 and September 1980.

Essentially a landmark survey, the Freemans were charged with identifying and recording architecturally significant buildings in an area bounded by Martin Luther King Boulevard (Nineteenth Street) on the north, Chicon Street on the east, the Colorado River on the south, and IH-35 (formerly East Avenue) on the west. Despite the limited scope of their assignment to identify architectural landmarks, the Freemans recognized and documented many more unassuming properties such as shotgun houses, bungalows and vernacular buildings. They included properties with unique or rare physical characteristics, clusters of properties that formed cohesive groupings, and some with stronger historical associations than architectural merit.

Following the survey, a Multiple Property National Register nomination of the *Historic Resources of East Austin* (1985) was prepared that included a number of individual historic properties and three historic districts: Willow-Spence (NR 1985), Rainey Street (NR 1985) and Swedish Hill (NR 1985). A single property in the current project area, 903 East 14th Street, lies within the Swedish Hill Historic District. Several individual properties in the current project area were listed in the NRHP as a result of that effort. They are identified as such on their individual survey cards and in the National Register Assessment inventory.

In 1983-84, a comprehensive survey of Austin's cultural resources was conducted by a joint venture of two Austin firms; Bell, Klein and Hoffman, Architects and Restoration Consultants, Inc., and Hardy Heck Moore, Preservation Consultants. The survey included all of the city of Austin covered by the 1935 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, *except* the area covered by the Freeman survey. The survey team minimally documented the city's pre-1935 cultural resources and prepared a series of maps plotting their locations. Their efforts covered that part of the current project area from Chicon on the west to Coletto on the east, and East 14th Street on the north to Pennsylvania on the south.

As part of a series of revitalization and redevelopment projects launched by the City of Austin in the 1980s and continuing to the present, several environmental and

cultural resources investigations involving parts of the current project area have been completed by different consultants. They include the *Anderson/Robertson Hill Architectural Survey and Archaeological Reconnaissance, Travis County*, Espey Huston & Associates, Inc. (1993). Espey Huston's survey included many of the properties in the current project area and contained a number of properties scheduled for demolition by the Anderson Community Development Corporation.

Following the Espey Houston survey, the Anderson Community Development Corporation contracted with Hardy Heck Moore & Myers, Inc. (HHM&M) to undertake selected deed and tax record research for properties within the Espey Houston survey area. The purpose of the investigation was to determine if any pre-1870s settlement could be documented within the area slated for redevelopment along East 11th and East 12th streets and in the fan-shaped residential area that lies between them. No evidence of settlement was found in written or legal records and the results were presented to the Office of the State Archeologist.

Before undertaking the present field investigations, the HHM&M research and survey team conducted research to identify previously documented historic properties in the project area. Past surveys of selected historic properties have resulted in the official recognition of a number of significant sites within the area including national, state and local landmarks. Federally recognized properties are listed individually or as part of districts in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Properties that are significant for their roles in state history are designated as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL), for outstanding architectural merit, or commemorated with Texas State Subject Markers for historical merit. Archeological sites can be designated as State Archeological Landmarks (SAL). Local landmark status identifies and protects properties which are of exceptional importance to the history of Austin. Some properties have more than one designation. A local landmark may also be a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark and listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Generally, listing in the National Register of Historic Places confers honor but little protection against the demolition or alteration of a historic property, unless federal funding

supports projects like road improvements or urban revitalization that may affect the property. State designations vary in their ability to protect historic properties. RTHL properties are afforded the greatest degree of state oversight and properties with this designation may not be altered without state review. In most cases, local landmarks enjoy the greatest degree of protection. They are subject to design and maintenance review by the Austin Landmark Commission.

Information on National Register properties, Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks and State Marker sites are on file at the Texas Historical Commission library in Austin. Files on Austin Landmarks and previous cultural resources surveys are on file with the City Preservation Officer. A review of these files provided background information for the current project field investigations and for the historic overview contained in this report.

Other properties in the project area have been listed in the NRHP in addition to those nominated as part of the 1985 East Austin Multiple Property nomination. They include three Moonlight Towers (1200 block of East 11th Street, 1300 block of Coletto, 1700 block of Pennsylvania) (NR 1976) and, most recently, the Victory Grill (NR 1998) at 1104 East 11th Street.

Within the project area, the THC determined that several NRHP eligible historic districts lay within the project area in 1993. They include the Juniper Street Historic District, a collection of late-19th and early 20th century houses in the 900 and the north side of the 1000 blocks of Juniper Street and an adjacent property at 1166 Curve (since demolished). In 1998, under contract to Anderson Community Development Corporation (ACDC), Hardy Heck Moore & Myers, Inc., and subconsultants Volz & Associates, prepared a Stabilization and Relocation plan for four properties within the development corporation's authority. As part of the ACDC sponsored project, HHM&M began preparation of a National Register nomination for the Juniper Street Historic District. When several historic properties within the proposed Juniper Street district were lost to fire or demolition during the course of the project, ACDC was ordered to stop work. As a result, the National Register nomination was suspended. Its status remains in question.

In addition to Juniper Street, the THC determined that properties along San Bernard and adjacent lots, and the 1100 block of East 10th Street (Metropolitan Historic District) are also eligible for NRHP listing as historic districts. To date, these three areas are the only districts officially determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by the THC.

A review of the Freemans' work, along with a search of other Texas Historical Commission and City of Austin Landmark Commission files, as well as other cultural resources investigations, showed that a number of sites in the project area are also commemorated by Texas State Historical Markers (SM) and several others are Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL). Some have received City of Austin Landmark status and are subject to design review by the Austin Landmark Commission. State Marker sites include those commemorating former properties such as Samuel Huston College (SM 1996) at East 12th Street and East Avenue and the Stuart Female (SM) at 1212 East 9th Street.

Designated City of Austin landmarks include a variety of residential, commercial and institutional properties. They are further noteworthy for the diversity of ethnic and immigrant owners associated with them. They include the Limerick-Frazier House (810 East 13th Street), Haehnel (Bailetti) Store (1101 East 11th Street), Howson Community Center (1192 Angelina), the Southgate-Lewis House (1501 East 12th Street) and the Bailetti-Walker House (1006 Waller). All of these sites, with the exception of Samuel Huston College, are within the current survey boundaries. The college is included in this discussion for its proximity to the project area and its influence on African American settlement there.

PROJECT AREA

The survey area was roughly bounded by East 14th Street on the north, Coletto Street on the east, an irregular line drawn along Pennsylvania/Cotton/San Bernard/Rosewood/East 11th Street/Navasota and East 9th Street on the south, and San Marcos/Curve Street/IH-35 frontage, on the west. Boundaries were selected by the city of Austin in response to its revitalization programs within this area. Federal regulations

require that cultural resources be documented according to the standards and guidelines set forth by the Secretary of the Interior when federal monies are used in projects that may affect those resources (Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended). Since revitalization programs may involve the alteration, demolition or relocation of historic cultural resources, such resources must be identified and assessed for their potential to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Because previous cultural resources survey projects undertaken in the City of Austin are either outdated, did not include this area, or did not sufficiently document affected properties for Section 106 evaluation, the city selected the present project area boundaries to conform with applicable federal regulations.

FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

Architectural Historians Rick Mitchell and Jennifer Ross conducted the field investigations in East Austin for Hardy·Heck·Moore & Myers, Inc. (HHM&M). Intensive field investigations consisted of identifying, recording, assessing, mapping and photographing historic period (pre-1955) resources within the defined project area boundaries. A preliminary reconnaissance overview of the survey area took place on April 20, 2000, with HHM&M Project Director Terri Myers, Field Director David Moore, and Architectural Historians Rick Mitchell and Jennifer Ross attending. The team identified concentrations of historic buildings and familiarized themselves with the types of properties in the project area. They discussed project objectives and methodologies and planned the route of the block-by-block survey.

Other preliminary work included review and reproduction of City of Austin building footprint maps and Sanborn Fire Insurance Co. maps for use in the field identification of buildings and structures. Using copies of planning maps provided by the city, the field crew initially conducted a windshield survey within the project area to confirm boundaries and determine the kinds of properties located within those boundaries. This step enabled the HHM&M survey team to verify information and note any changes that had taken place since the publication of the maps. This field map subsequently served

as a base map for the preparation of the survey area maps included with this report. Following the windshield survey, the field crew systematically identified and recorded information for every extant historic resource in the delineated project boundaries.

Mr. Mitchell and Ms. Ross undertook intensive field surveys of the project area between April 25 and June 2, 2000. This field survey included:

- identifying all pre-1956 buildings, structures, and objects within the project area;
- assigning a unique site number to each resource for collection and control. An inventory of properties correlates the site numbers with street addresses in the project area.
- keying each resource to a City of Austin building footprint map
- completing survey forms for each identified resource noting address or other locational information, property type, stylistic influences when applicable, exterior materials, number of stories, estimated construction date, alterations, and initial preservation priority classification;
- photographing each identified pre-1956 resource using 35mm color print film, with at least two oblique views of each resource. In rare cases, it was possible to photograph only one view of a resource due to its obscure location or the owner's objection.

The HHM&M team divided the project area into four north-south regions: East 14th Street south to East 12th Street; East 12th Street south to Olive/Cotton/Pennsylvania Street; Olive/Cotton Street south to East 11th Street; and East 11th Street south to East 9th Street. Generally, Mr. Mitchell and Ms. Ross first surveyed all resources along east-west streets in a given region and then surveyed all resources fronting north-south streets. The team began their survey at the northwest corner of the project area, east of IH-35 at East 14th Street. The team systematically documented each resource in a block-by-block pedestrian survey, working from north to south, then east to west, within the region. All resources fronting or siding onto East 11th Street and adjacent Juniper Street were surveyed and photographed near the outset of the project to provide advance planning

information for the City of Austin's revitalization programs. Project Director Terri Myers prepared the report for the city with assistance from Rick Mitchell and Jennifer Ross.

A unique site number was assigned to each resource. In cases where more than one resource occupied an addressed site, each primary resource received a separate site number but was recorded as addressed with designations "A", "B", "1/2", or "rear" as appropriate. Significant outbuildings such as garage apartments were recorded separately from the primary resource and given their own site number. Tool sheds, simple garages and other minor resources associated with surveyed properties were not individually documented.

Each resource was plotted on the field maps and noted in the field forms. Site numbers are keyed to the factual or estimated addresses to help identify the properties on the survey map. Surveyors recorded the street address, or block number. Many of the surveyed properties did not have a visible address, and in such cases, HHM&M staff referred to the city footprint map or estimated the address as it related to other properties.

Physical information was gathered on site and recorded on field forms. The survey team noted the property type, approximate date of construction, type and extent of alterations, historic function, architectural plan type, stylistic influences when applicable, number of stories, exterior materials, and condition of each resource. The property type and subtype classifications (e.g. domestic: single family or L-plan, respectively) are used to identify the historic resource by its original or intended use. For example, a circa 1920 residence recently converted to office or retail space was recorded as a dwelling. In assigning construction dates, a limited number of buildings had markers stating an exact date. In most cases, HHM&M staff estimated the date of construction within five-year increments or used information gained from research to identify the exact date.

An initial preservation priority classification of HIGH, MEDIUM, or LOW was assigned to each documented building based on several criteria: the surveyor's professional impression of the property, how well the property maintains its original design and materials, how the property contributes to or detracts from the historic character of the

area, and its condition. All properties were reevaluated and assessed for historic significance before final designations were made.

Each surveyed property was photographed with 35 mm color print film. The team maintained a photo log and recorded roll and frame numbers for each resource. In nearly all cases, Mr. Mitchell photographed the resources at oblique angles to in order to include two elevations within a single photograph. Mr. Mitchell took additional photographs of unique or distinctive details to better illustrate and identify selected properties. All photographic and field data was entered into the HHM&M database software for organization and analysis.

Throughout the field survey, the HHM&M team met informally with interested residents. These residents often provided valuable information for possible construction dates of individual resources, as well as the overall history of the project area. Pertinent information was given to the Project Director for use in researching individual properties and in completing the historic context for the project area.

HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Historical research was conducted simultaneously with the field investigations. The Project Director planned a multi-faceted research design that involved eliciting public participation, consulting primary and secondary sources, interviewing residents and former residents of the project area and copying their historic photographs. A Research Team consisting of HHM&M staff, independent researchers, community liaisons, volunteers, and professional staff of the Austin History Center collaborated on the project.

At the outset of the survey, Project Director Terri Myers and Preservation Liaisons Eleanor Thompson and Eva Lindsey met with Austin History Center staff, including Director Biruta Kearn, Historian Karen Riles, and Photoarchivist Margaret Schlankey, to establish a mutually beneficial research strategy. Research goals for the East Austin Survey Project were both general and specific; the project sought to produce a historical overview of East Austin's development and to collect specific information regarding the area's extant historical and architecturally significant properties.

Because the survey area contains one of Austin's earliest Reconstruction era Freedman's settlements, and because much of East Austin has become identified with the city's African American citizens, project research efforts focused on these topics for the contextual development. These goals coincide with the Austin History Center's charge to augment its African American collections and resources. Thus, the Research Team and Austin History Center staff resolved to share sources and information and reduce duplication of effort. Historian Karen Riles worked closely with HHM&M staff and their subconsultants to publicize the project, identify oral history candidates, conduct interviews, and organize a Photo Heritage Day to collect and copy historic photographs associated with African American history.

Interviews collected by the HHM&M Research team will be archived at the Austin History Center. Materials and photographs identified in the research process were brought to the attention of History Center staff for follow-up. The team gathered information on individual properties, neighborhoods and commercial districts, and studied the initial settlement, development trends and demographic changes that affected the physical character of the project area.

Community leaders Eleanor Thompson and Eva Lindsey were hired as subconsultants to act as liaisons between HHM&M and area residents. Both are longtime East Austin residents who have been involved in collecting and preserving local African American history for many years. Ms. Thompson and Ms. Lindsey helped define research goals, identify oral history candidates, publicize the project through local churches and neighborhood organizations and provided HHM&M staff an entree to community resources that otherwise would not have been available to them. In addition, they conducted formal taped interviews with area residents and introduced the Project Director to many local informants for oral histories. Ms. Thompson also gathered primary and secondary research for the historic overview and assisted the Project Director in city directory and Sanborn research. She commented on the historic context and edited the draft report.

Researcher James T. (Terry) Jones, working as an independent contractor to HHM&M, identified all known cultural resources reports and published histories of the project area. He conducted specific tax and deed research for a preliminary NRHP assessment of properties on properties in sensitive redevelopment target areas, particularly along East 11th Street and adjacent Juniper Street. Mr. Jones assisted the Project Director in accurately locating existing resources on historic maps and in identifying early property owners with individual properties. Finally, he assisted in preparing a draft historic overview of the project area and is listed as co-author.

HHM&M staff Jennifer Ross, Allison Holland, Karen Savic and Sophie Roark, and independent researcher Holly Marshall assisted in gathering historical data for the survey forms and report. Research crew members began both general and site-specific research on HIGH priority resources and on properties in areas slated for imminent redevelopment, primarily on or adjacent to the East 11th and East 12th Street commercial corridors. Jennifer Ross copied and reviewed a series of fire insurance maps published by the Sanborn Fire Insurance Company of New York. These maps were extremely valuable sources because they document prominent physical characteristics of the properties. The map collection at the Library of Congress contains original, unrevised maps created for the area in 1900, 1921-22 and 1935. Revised maps reflecting changes made by 1959 were also on file at the Library of Congress. All applicable maps were copied in Washington D.C. and used in the project. Further revisions to the 1959 maps were made in 1971 and those final revisions are on microfilm at the Austin History. They were compared with the earlier maps throughout the research process.

Although the later maps presented a broader coverage of the project area, the 1900 map depicted some of the earliest resources in the city. These maps show building "footprints" which indicate the exterior shapes, construction materials, number of stories and functions of the structures, including ancillary buildings and site features. This information helps to document a building's physical evolution and also notes street name and address changes that might otherwise be difficult to determine.

Project Director Terri Myers examined five series of Sanborn maps dating from the earliest map coverage of the project area, in 1900, through the most recent, completed in 1971. She checked each property for its appearance in the 1900, 1922, 1935, and 1959 maps and recorded changes from one map to the next. She tracked each property in city directories from their earliest available listings to the end of the historic period (1952 or 1955 depending upon the resource). By comparing city directory listings with Sanborn maps made in the same year, she was able to determine dates of construction and address changes for most properties.

In the course of the project, historical information was gathered and recorded on Historical Information Profile cards included with the survey forms for nearly all historic period properties surveyed, regardless of priority. Minimal city directory information on residents and owners in selected years was recorded for as many properties as possible. Due to address discrepancies and, in some cases, relocation to the project after the end of the historic period, some properties were impossible to positively identify in city directories. Research efforts attempted to accomplish the following objectives:

- 1) Determine the exact or approximate dates of construction
- 2) Document physical changes through an examination of Sanborn maps and historic photographs
- 3) Obtain names of previous owners, occupants or uses from research materials, interviews and city directories
- 4) Analyze demographic changes from a mixed ethnic environment to a predominantly African American one
- 5) Track the social and economic status of property owners by identifying their occupations and whether they rented or owned their homes

HHM&M staff and subconsultants Eva Lindsey interviewed past and present East Austin residents including Willie Hart Toliver Jr., Ora Lee Nobles, Leonard Mann, J. B. Thompson, Roger Taylor, Rev. Isaac Fontaine, Mabel Walker Newton and Buster

Hancock. Telephone interviews were conducted with Barbara Daniels and Artie Johnson. Mr. Mann met with HHM&M staff in the field to physically identify each property in the East 11th Street corridor. Austin History Center Historian Karen Riles conducted a series of taped interviews relevant to this project. Historic Photographs were collected and copied at a Photo Heritage Day event sponsored by the Austin History Center in conjunction with this project. The research team also met with City of Austin staff Barbara Stocklin and Jerry Freese at various times throughout the project to discuss aspects of the survey and to plan research. All of these meetings were extremely valuable for identifying and assessing historic properties in East Austin.

One of the most important secondary sources obtained for historical research in East Austin was the 1907 Metropolitan African Methodist Episcopal (A.M.E.) Church commemorative booklet commissioned by Rev. C.W. Abington and compiled largely by historian W.H. Passon. *The Historical and Biographical Souvenir and Program of the 25th Anniversary of Metropolitan A.M.E. Church, Austin, Texas 1882-1907* contains dozens of photographs of African American building in East Austin. Although most are now gone, a few remain in the project area. The property types, styles and historical information in the booklet were extremely useful for research.

J. Mason Brewer's work in the 1940s and 1950s and Ada DeBlanc Simond's more recent books and articles from the 1960s through the 1980s, added immensely to our knowledge of significant African American families and businesses in Austin throughout the historic period. Brewer's guide to African American businesses in the 1950s was particularly useful in identifying and documenting commercial properties on East 11th and East 12th streets. Mrs. Simond's work highlighted the occupations and accomplishments of African Americans, many of whom lived in East Austin at the turn of the century.

The Project Director relied on Martha Freeman's 1980 cultural resources survey of East Austin for background information and specific histories of specific buildings. She also referred to Eugene Foster's 1993 Anderson/Robertson Hill Architectural Survey for Espey, Huston & Associates. It is important to note that the HHM&M field team did not use these previous reports and their recommendations until the survey was completed to

avoid bias in assessing preservation priorities and National Register recommendations. HHM&M staff used both documents to conduct field checks on the status of historic resources. Sadly, a number of important sites listed by Freeman and Foster have been demolished or altered beyond recognition since 1980 and 1993 respectively. Nevertheless, the descriptions and historical information for the remaining properties were immensely helpful in our present efforts.

The Research Team obtained important information from the Austin History Center. Other individuals and institutions are thanked for their contributions to this survey:

- The Center for American History, University of Texas, Austin
- The State Library and Archives, Austin, Texas
- Travis County Courthouse
- George Washington Carver Library and Museum

Survey Results

INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

A total of 496 properties considered to have been built before 1955 were identified within the project area boundaries. Of that number, 105 were determined to be HIGH preservation priorities due to their exceptional architectural merit, their significant historic associations, or both. Such properties are recommended as individually eligible for listing in the NR. HIGH priority properties include outstanding residential, commercial and institutional resources throughout the project area. These properties may also qualify for local, state or federal historic designations either alone or as part of a historic district. When located within eligible historic districts, they are considered Contributing elements of these districts. Sixty HIGH priority sites are found within the boundaries of recommended NRHP eligible districts, while 45 are scattered elsewhere in the project area.

In addition to the HIGH preservation priority properties, the HHM&M survey team identified 242 MEDIUM and 149 LOW priority properties for a total of 496 documented historic resources. While the majority of these properties do not individually qualify for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, MEDIUM priority properties are Contributing elements within eligible National Register districts and should themselves be considered eligible in those cases. There are 109 MEDIUM priority properties located within potential historic districts in the project area. MEDIUM properties outside eligible districts are not candidates for listing but are valuable resources adding to the area's overall character. The project area contains 133 MEDIUM priority properties which lie outside the boundaries of potential historic districts as recommended in this report.

LOW priority properties are not considered eligible for NRHP listing and 149 were identified throughout the project area. Those located within potential NRHP districts are considered Noncontributing elements of such districts.

HISTORIC DISTRICTS

The results of the survey show that more than half of the project area's historic properties retain sufficient integrity to be considered Contributing elements of a potential district. However, extensive alterations of the remaining properties, loss of building fabric through demolition and neglect, expanses of vacant land between historic resources, and new (post-1955) construction throughout the region preclude its consideration as a single district. Rather, there are several distinct, cohesive groupings of historic properties that are recommended as potentially eligible for NRHP listing as individual historic districts within the project area.

Several relatively intact concentrations of historic-period resources lie to the north of East 12th Street, east of Navasota along San Bernard and in a two-block area of New York Street, and south of East 11th Street between San Marcos and Lydia streets. These potential districts include a diverse collection of residential properties, small-scale commercial enterprises and institutional buildings, primarily neighborhood churches. Most of the HIGH and MEDIUM properties in the survey area lie within these proposed districts. They include some of the oldest and most architecturally significant of the area's resources with a few notable exceptions. It is recommended that boundaries be drawn to include as many historic properties as possible without compromising the integrity of the proposed districts. Proposed districts are outlined on two survey maps accompanying this report and discussed in the Historic Districts section of this report. Recommended historic districts are:

- Juniper Street Historic District: 900 block of Juniper Street and the adjacent half-block of 900 Olive Street
- Swedish Hill Extension: 900-1000 blocks of East 13th and 14th streets including affected properties on Olander, Waller, and Navasota
- Thirteenth Street: 1200-1400 blocks of Bob Harrison, 1200-1600 blocks and the south side of the 1700-1800 blocks of East 13th Street, inclusive of properties on north-south streets (San Bernard, Angelina, Comal, Concho, Leona, Salina and Chicon) contained within the boundaries (see maps and individual assessments).

- San Bernard Historic District: 1100 block San Bernard and adjacent properties on East 12th and Hackberry Streets (see maps and assessments)
- New York Street: parts of the 1500 and 1600 blocks of New York (see maps and individual assessments)
- East 9th and 10th Street (Metropolitan District): 1000-1100 blocks of East 9th Street, 1100 block of East 10th Street, and inclusive side streets of Waller, Lydia and San Marcos. (see maps and individual assessments.

DATA COLLECTION AND PRESENTATION

Field Director and HHM&M Principal David Moore coordinated the encoding and analysis of field data. Associate Historian Laurie Gotcher entered the survey information into a database program as the Architectural Historians collected it in the field. Field data consisted of the identification, minimal documentation, and preliminary assessment of all apparent pre-1955 properties built within the East Austin project area. Film was processed and photographs for each surveyed property were labeled and placed in individual archivally stable sheet protectors. Sheets were arranged in address order by street address and placed in three-ring binders. Numbered streets preceded named streets. Photo index sheets were produced for the photographic binders. Color "thumbnail" prints produced from the negatives serve as contact sheets.

Architectural Historians Jennifer Ross and Rick Mitchell completed survey cards created for the project by City of Austin Preservation Officer Barbara Stocklin and HHM&M staff. These Historic Resources Inventory Forms contain physical information, preservation priority, photo references and brief descriptions for each property. Project Director Terri Myers conducted individual city directory and Sanborn map research for each surveyed property. HIGH and MEDIUM preservation priorities were further investigated through oral histories and secondary sources including works by local African American historians W.H. Passon, J. Mason Brewer and Ada Simond. This information was recorded separately on Historical Information Profile cards which were placed in the individual property files along with the survey forms and photographs.

Each historic property was plotted on a field map of the survey area. Two maps were produced: one depicting HIGH, MEDIUM and LOW preservation priorities and one depicting National Register (NR) eligibility. Both maps outline recommended National Register historic districts. All HIGH priority sites are depicted as NRHP eligible, whether or not they lie within potential NRHP districts. MEDIUM priority properties within recommended historic districts are also depicted as NRHP eligible and are shown as Contributing elements of such districts. LOW priority properties, regardless of whether they are in recommended historic districts, are depicted as ineligible for NRHP listing. If they lie within an outlined district, they should be considered as Noncontributing features of such districts. In both maps, properties are identified by address. The maps are included as appendices in this report. Larger scale maps were submitted to the city as attachments.

Two complete inventories of the surveyed properties are included in appendices to this report. One is the master inventory list containing descriptive information and preservation priorities. The other depicts NRHP eligibility for each property. HIGH priority and MEDIUM priority properties within recommended historic districts are listed as NRHP eligible. MEDIUM priority properties lying outside recommended historic districts are not considered to be individually eligible for NRHP listing. LOW priority properties are universally designated ineligible for the NRHP.

PRESERVATION PRIORITY EVALUATION

After field and research teams completed their investigations, the Project Director and Architectural Historians reviewed each property and assigned final preservation priority ratings base upon current integrity and known historical associations. This evaluation reflects an assessment of each property's relative significance and is intended to provide guidance in planning decisions that may affect East Austin's surviving historic resources. The priority designations should not be considered static, but can and should be changed to reflect the evolving status of properties. As future rehabilitation efforts

successfully restore a building's historic architectural integrity, that property's preservation priority rating should be revised and updated.

Buildings were placed in the HIGH category because they contribute significantly to local history or broader historical patterns. They are considered to be outstanding, unique or good representative examples of architecture, engineering or crafted design. These buildings remain on their original sites and have undergone only minimal alterations since their construction, or they have been altered in a manner compatible with the original design, materials, scale and workmanship. They are excellent examples of common local building forms, architectural styles or plan-types, and they retain a significant amount of their original character and contextual integrity. In many cases, they meet criteria for inclusion in the National Register as individual properties. If located within a historic district, they are classified as Contributing elements of the district. They are considered to be the most significant resources in the project area.

Included in the HIGH designation category are 105 identified resources in the survey area. They are among the oldest, rarest, or best examples of building forms or architectural styles in the East Austin survey area. Some are significant as excellent local examples of widely built architectural forms popular in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Some are significant because of their associations with individuals who were important in the development and history of Austin's African American communities. Many properties are associated with other ethnic groups that made significant contributions to the area's development, particularly in the areas north of East 12th Street and south of East 11th Street. German and Swedish names appear most frequently as early residents and merchants but Irish and Italian names figure prominently, as well. The Fiegel-Campbell House (1610-1618 Pennsylvania, German and African American), the Carlson-Jarl House (903 East 14th Street, Swedish), the Limerick-Frazier House (810 East 13th Street, Irish and African American) and Bailetti House (1006 Waller, Italian) are stellar examples of HIGH priority sites that are associated with all of the area's major ethnic groups.

Still, other properties are outstanding examples of relatively rare architectural forms known to occur only in East Austin. Among the most noteworthy is the cross hipped roof L-plan type houses found throughout the project area. Those at 902 and 904 Juniper Street are excellent examples of the distinctive type and are assessed as HIGH preservation priorities rendering them eligible for the NRHP.

In some cases, buildings that have been altered with major changes in scale or materials also have been included in the HIGH category because the buildings were associated with individuals or events of exceptional importance to East Austin's history. Examples include the Herman Schieffer House at 1154 Lydia which has had its porch altered and original exterior materials obscured by stucco. However, the building retains its definitive plan type, form, roof form and pitch and, more importantly, has strong historic, developmental and cultural associations with the East Austin project area. The Herman Schieffer family established a business on the adjacent lot at 1122-24 East 11th Street about 1903, and continued to operate a grocery and meat market through the 1940s. They redeveloped lots on the east side of Lydia for rental property and built several homes for family members on Juniper and Lydia streets. Although their house is altered, it is the best example of a property that reflects the Schieffer's longstanding ties with the community. In addition, the house served as the office of the Negro Agricultural Extension Agency from 1950, shortly after the service was established for African Americans in Travis county, to 1960. It was a significant statewide agency and its presence in East Austin was considered important to the African American community.

The 242 buildings in the survey area designated as MEDIUM preservation priorities were identified as contributing moderately to local history or broader historical patterns. They display fewer character-defining architectural elements than those in the HIGH category. Although less developed in their architectural treatments than buildings in the HIGH priority group, the MEDIUM category includes buildings that are representative of building forms, architectural treatments or plan-types common in Austin and other Central Texas cities, and reflective of popular trends. They are unlikely to meet eligibility criteria for National Register listing on an individual basis, but may qualify for a

state or local designation. However, since little historical information was gathered on these properties, more research may be needed before a final assessment can be made. Consequently, buildings in the MEDIUM category may be upgraded to HIGH if research reveals important historical associations. When located within a historic district, they are classified as Contributing and are considered eligible for listing in the NRHP.

The MEDIUM priority category includes those buildings that have been altered or deteriorated such as to diminish their architectural integrity. However, they must retain sufficient architectural fabric and integrity as to be recognizable to their period of significance. This category also includes those historically or architecturally significant buildings which, except for incompatible alterations, would have been designated HIGH priorities. An example of modifications that have resulted in reclassification from the HIGH to MEDIUM property designation can be found in the Schieffer Store at 1122-24 East 11th Street. While the property has significant historic associations with the historic commercial development on East 11th Street, the exterior materials and appearance have been so altered that its value as a representative architectural form has been compromised. The designation of an altered historic property as a MEDIUM preservation priority depends on the level, severity and irreversibility of alterations. Therefore they should be evaluated on an individual basis

The 149 buildings in the project area classified as LOW preservation priorities generally typify more recent common local building forms, architectural styles or plan-types, with no known historical significance. In some cases, they have been altered so extensively that they have lost their salient, character-defining architectural features and are no longer recognizable as historic buildings. Thus, they are designated as LOW priorities for preservation. Buildings in the LOW priority classification also are examples of distinctive building forms, architectural styles or plan-types that are of minor historical significance or are moderately to severely altered using inappropriate methods, materials or scale, or are deteriorated.

Typically, because of lack of historical associations or limited integrity, such buildings do not meet the eligibility criteria for National Register listing on an individual

basis. Although architectural integrity is often a problem for these properties, more historical research may be required before a final assessment can be made. When located in a historic district, the severity of alterations or lack of compatible character may render the property a Noncontributing feature of the district. An example of a severely altered, but well-maintained building in the LOW category can be seen at 1206 (rear) East 9th Street. This ca. 1900 building has been so completely altered by the enclosure of its porch and front additions that it is unrecognizable to its historic period.

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND REPORT PREPARATION

When the research phase was completed, the Ms. Myers and Ms. Ross composed succinct statements detailing the condition and alterations of surveyed properties. These statements summarized the architectural merits and historical data of each resource. Each statement was entered into the survey database and appears on the Survey Data Form or Historical Information Profile form, as appropriate. A historic name was derived for as many of the MEDIUM and HIGH priority sites as could be identified. In most cases, the historic name is that of the original owner, or that of the most locally known occupant before 1955. However, in some cases, the historic name also includes a subsequent family, business or institution with a significant long-term occupancy or association with the property.

Surveyors also encountered some difficulty determining the ages of resources due to successive or extensive alterations, particularly in the oldest areas of the Project Area. Sanborn fire insurance maps proved useful to more accurately assess building age and changes in the building footprints over the years. In addition, the area's preponderance of vernacular building forms challenged the staff's ability to categorize, date and define property types. The city's 19th and 20th century historic resources exhibit a blend of different vernacular traditions spanning nearly 100 years, from Reconstruction era properties dating to the 1870s into the Cold War period of the 1950s.

The final step of the project was the preparation of the survey report. The data was analyzed by the Project Director. Some properties were reassessed and assigned

different preservation priorities after they were compared with the overall historic building stock in the East Austin survey area. Information gleaned from oral histories and secondary sources indicating that they possessed significant historic associations raised the status of some properties. Discussions of the survey scope, methodology, data, findings and recommendations were developed and the historic overview was edited and finalized.

SURVEY MATERIALS

Once the field work and the research were completed, historic and physical descriptive materials were entered into a computerized database program, and the survey materials were processed and finalized. Each identified historic property received a unique site number that was used to plot the location of the resource on two Project Area survey maps. One map depicts properties by preservation priority while the other depicts properties as either eligible or ineligible for National Register listing. Both maps indicate boundaries of proposed historic districts. They are included in the appendix.

Survey materials include Historic Resources Inventory forms and Historical Information Profile forms for each property. Inventory cards were completed for all sites on forms developed HHM&M staff and the City of Austin Historic Preservation Officer. They are organized in address order beginning with numbered streets and followed by named streets in alphabetical order. Each form has descriptive information and a detailed section on alterations and their severity. Research data is presented on the Historic Resources Inventory forms with additional notes containing basic information on early residents and owners, their ethnicity and occupations presented separately on Historical Information Profile cards. This information was collected for as many sites as possible. Discrepancies in addresses over the years, particularly for the oldest properties, along with the relocation of some historic properties to the area in more recent time, made it difficult to associate every resource with an individual. In those cases, only the most recent information was included. Research notes are recorded on Historical Information Profile cards and inserted behind the Historic Resources Inventory forms for each property.

Other work products include multiple color 35mm exposures and digitally generated color contact sheets for each surveyed property. Color photographs taken with 35mm film were processed for all properties regardless of priority assessment. All photographs for an individual property were placed in archival sleeves along with its survey and historical information cards. The archival sheets are organized in seven binders (see below). Indices to the photographed properties are filed at the front of the binders and are cross-referenced by site number and address. The photo index sheets indicate multiple exposures for sites photographed more than once. Three sets of color contact sheets are provided to the City of Austin as part of the report. Negatives that correspond to the contact sheets are placed in protective sleeves. Only one set of negatives is provided and this set should be properly archived.

Survey, research and photographic materials were placed in individual archival sheets divided into upper and lower sleeves. Survey and research information cards were placed in the upper sleeve and photographs in the lower sleeve of each sheet. The individual sheets were then placed in seven binders organized by property address. Work products are presented separately from the survey report in three sets of seven binders organized numerically and alphabetically by street address. Three complete sets of survey materials are presented to the city. Oral history tapes and transcripts, and historic photographs and other artifacts collected during this project will be archived at the Austin History Center. A synopsis of the formal interviews is included in the References section of this survey report.

OBSERVATIONS

Today, the greatest threats to East Austin's historic resources are redevelopment and demolition by neglect. Many of the city's most significant historic and architectural resources have been abandoned and are subject to vandalism and deterioration simply because they are not occupied and maintained. In fact, many of the project area's most significant, HIGH priority sites are vacant. Among the most important abandoned city landmarks and unique architectural resources are properties at 900, 904 and 1002 Juniper

Street, the Detrick-Hamilton House (912 East 11th Street), the Connolly-Yerwood House (1115 East 12th Street), the Lawsha House (1117 East 12th Street), the D.R. Woodard House (1301 East 12th) Street, the Salvatore Bailetti House (1006 Waller), the Herman Schieffer House (1154 Lydia) and Store (1122-1124 East 11th Street), and Arnold's Bakery (1010 E. 11th Street). All of these are recognized as significant historic properties, yet they remain abandoned and decrepit. Lesser known but architecturally interesting and/or rare properties exist in similar states of neglect throughout the project area.

Equally alarming is the rate at which historic properties are disappearing in East Austin. Important historic landmarks, either determined eligible for listing in the NRHP or recognized and commemorated by local residents, have been demolished before efforts could be made to save them. These include the Charles W. Barnes House (1105 East 12th Street), the People's Business College (1118-1120 East 12th Street) and two NRHP eligible Shotgun houses (1006 and 1008 Juniper Street). Several historic properties on New York Street were razed during the course of the field investigations which began in April 2000.

RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERVIEW

The East Austin Cultural Resources Survey has the potential to serve as the basis for future historic preservation planning for the area. Its usefulness as a planning tool will depend upon the City's willingness to support subsequent preservation programs to manage important historic properties and districts. An important factor in the city's success will be its ability to enlist public support for these programs. Effective preservation programs can result in substantial economic and infrastructural benefits for older neighborhoods and historic commercial districts through heritage tourism, adaptive use of historic building stock, increased rental and retail potential, and incentives for capital reinvestment and improvements in the central city. It is crucial that the city articulate these benefits to its citizens and encourage their participation to implement a meaningful preservation program.

Less tangible, but equally important goals include resource conservation and a renewed sense of identity and purpose for the East Austin and its residents. The key to this effort by the public and private sectors will be to identify, prioritize, and implement programs to follow this survey. These essential activities include:

Planning & Development

- Support of the city preservation officer
- Computerization of the survey data
- Development and adoption of a preservation plan
- Adoption of a design manual to serve as a guide for owners of local landmarks or properties lying in designated historic districts
- Integration of survey information into overall city planning procedures such as demolition permits or expenditure of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds

- Incentives such as limited property tax abatement for renovation of designated local landmarks when done in accordance with adopted design guidelines.

Utilizing State & Federal Programs

- Investigate participating in the Certified Local Government (CLG) program through the Texas Historical Commission (THC)
- Nominate HIGH priority properties to the National Register
- Nominate eligible districts to the National Register
- Encourage owners of National Register eligible properties to pursue federal tax credits for rehabilitation of income-producing (rental or commercial) properties
- Obtain THC markers for other historic buildings and sites
- Investigate rehabilitation funds available through the THC for the restoration of significant properties.

Research & Education

- Provide copies of survey data to public and private groups, libraries, and other repositories
- Develop materials for promotion of local history and school curriculums, such as driving tours, slide shows or video tape productions, using existing survey materials
- Create a slide show from the survey products for broadcast on the Public Access channel
- Continue research and discussion on inventoried properties

All survey materials should be reviewed by local historians and city officials. Any data to be added or corrected, such as historical information, changes of condition or preservation priority, should be systematically recorded and incorporated into the survey materials, database and revised reports. Following the initial corrections or changes, the original documents should be carefully maintained under archivally stable conditions. An

archivist should be consulted to determine the most appropriate way to store, conserve and reproduce the survey materials. A designated copy of the documents, including the data file, should be overseen by a specified person or group and used as the "marking copy" for long-term changes. New information should be dated and identified by source for future reference.

Research materials should be copied and originals stored in a safe place. The survey binders contain sleeves that allow for the insertion of additional materials gathered during subsequent research efforts. This system will allow for supplemental historical information to be easily integrated with already completed research. This information can then be easily accessed for National Register, State Historical Marker nominations or local landmark applications.

Copies or portions of the survey report should be distributed to Austin History Center, the Carver Museum and Library and possibly the Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin. Interested history and genealogy groups and individuals should be able to obtain the survey report for a nominal fee, perhaps the cost of reproduction.

As soon as possible, survey results should become a part of the city planning process. For all city programs that affect changes in land use, such as construction or demolition permits, Community Development Block Grant funded programs, or that affect the built landscape in any way, the survey sites should be cross-referenced with other city records. Properties that are included in the survey could be coded on city records as a method of reviewing permit applications. At the very least, the HIGH and MEDIUM priority sites should receive an automatic review when changes affecting such properties are imminent. Since the priority ratings are based principally on the current level of integrity of documented properties, additional research should be undertaken before any decision is made regarding the fate of any historic resource. This is particularly important for MEDIUM priority properties because little is known about the histories of these buildings.

Part of the city's preservation plan should include the establishment of local historic districts, based on the results of this survey and existing National Register nominations. Recommended City Landmark properties are those designated as HIGH priorities in the inventory. Local designations can be accomplished in conjunction with nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. National Register Historic District nominations can serve as the basis for establishing local historic districts with overlay zoning status. The Austin Landmark Commission, using a guidebook based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Historic Preservation, should review all proposed design changes, demolitions and new construction within designated local historic districts or to local historic landmarks.

Effective preservation is inclusive rather than exclusive and an effort should be made to involve as many residents in the program as possible. The city is encouraged to continue the oral history and photo heritage day programs begun in this project. Ongoing educational programs can be established to inform citizens about the importance of preserving historic architectural resources and about the incentives and proper procedures for doing so. The survey photos and research data can be used to create displays, exhibits and supplement lectures on the physical development and history of East Austin. East Austin's rich architectural heritage and contributions to the city's history can be promoted with brochures, pamphlets and tour directories that could be distributed at city offices, restaurants and tourist attractions or inserted in city mailings. Video and slide presentations can be prepared using photos and data from the survey for loan to schools, civic and service groups or to be presented by a speakers bureau. Selected survey materials should be incorporated into activities celebrating local history such as on-site studies of architecture, historical events, important individuals or families, industry, commerce and other relevant topics and at local or regional celebrations.

Rather than an end, this project should be considered the beginning of an ongoing effort to catalog and understand East Austin's invaluable and irreplaceable historic properties. Supplemental photographic documentation, architectural evaluation and historical research should continue on all surveyed sites. Local historians, students from

the high school and middle schools and especially Huston-Tillotson College, civic volunteers and members of historical or service groups should be encouraged to perform in-depth research such as examination of county records, tax rolls, and Sanborn maps, as well as conducting oral histories and examining local newspaper files. Owners of historic properties, previous owners, or their descendants should be made aware of the survey results and encouraged to investigate family documents and photographs. Questionnaires prepared by the city could be utilized as an information gathering tool. Historic photographs from private and public collections should be photocopied and added to the survey files. Updated photographs should be taken of significant sites, especially if changes are imminent or demolition is pending. Important unaltered interiors should be documented and photographed.

By undertaking these activities, the commitment and investment the city has made will be realized. It is important to note that this survey and the materials produced from it are intended to be working, non-static documents because the survey is the city's primary tool for future cultural resource management.

HISTORIC DESIGNATIONS

The National Register of Historic Places

A primary goal of this investigation was the identification of individual properties and historic districts that could be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The NRHP is maintained by the National Park Service within the U.S. Department of the Interior and serves as an official list of the nation's most significant historical and cultural properties. The NRHP program is a federal undertaking and is administered in all states and territories of the United States. In Texas, the Texas Historical Commission is responsible for overseeing the NRHP program, which is separate from and independent of the Texas State Marker and Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks programs. The NRHP includes buildings, sites, structures or objects at least 50 years old that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship AND are important for at least one of the following: associations with significant events or trends;

association with significant individuals; architectural, artistic or design merits; or historic or pre-historic archeology.

Following receipt of this survey report, the City of Austin should consider nominating several historic districts and numerous individual properties scattered throughout the project area to the NRHP under the umbrella of the existing East Austin Multiple Property nomination. Although a Multiple-Property NRHP Nomination has been prepared for East Austin (Freeman, 1985), it should be supplemented to include a fully developed Historic Context that explores themes such as Reconstruction-era settlement of African Americans, the influx of European immigrant groups including early Swedish, Irish, Italian and German settlers in the area and the relationship of these groups to one another.

An expanded Historic Context will explore the contributions of these groups to the development of East 11th and East 12th streets as commercial and entertainment corridors. More specifically, it should discuss the influence of the jazz and blues clubs on East 11th Street. It would also explore demographic changes in the area, from pockets of distinctive African American and immigrant settlements in the mid-to late-19th century, to a racially mixed commercial and neighborhood setting in the early 20th century, to an almost exclusively African American neighborhood from the early- to mid-20th century and, finally, the advent of Mexicans and Mexican Americans in the area. The context should also investigate the impact of desegregation on institutions, particularly schools, and its corresponding effect on the area's cultural resources.

The Property Types section, another important component of the Multiple-Property nomination, should expand the analysis of architectural trends and patterns in the project area. Immigrant, African American and Hispanic influence on vernacular building traditions in the area should be further investigated in the Property Types section. Please note that Historic Context and Property Type sections can be supplemented in the future. Moreover, properties other than those currently recommended can and should be added to the Multiple-Property Nomination as more research is undertaken and successful

restoration projects are completed. A thorough discussion of NRHP criteria and nomination process is detailed in an appendix.

Properties and districts within the survey area that should be considered for the NRHP are discussed in the following section, *Properties to Consider for Historic Designation*. Individual National Register recommendations are listed in a separate inventory *National Register Assessments*. HIGH and MEDIUM preservation priorities identify the individual properties in the current project area that presently appear to be the strongest candidates for inclusion in the NRHP, either individually (HIGH priorities) or as part of a historic district (HIGH and MEDIUM priorities). Areas with good concentrations of HIGH and MEDIUM priority properties are strong candidates for historic district designations and boundary recommendations for such districts follow the list of MEDIUM priorities.

Texas Historical Markers

The Texas Historical Commission, besides coordinating National Register efforts in Texas, also oversees a state marker program whereby medallions are placed at a site or on a building that is considered historic. These medallions represent the Texas Historical Commission's most visible and widely recognized program and are administered by the Local History Programs department. The two types of medallions are 1) subject markers that acknowledge the contributions of a locally important individual, event or trend in history or commemorate cemeteries, or 2) Recorded Texas Historic Landmark markers which are placed on buildings and structures that are at least 50 years old that possess architectural significance and integrity. More detailed information about the program can be obtained from the Texas Historical Commission's Local History Programs department. It is important to emphasize that the NRHP and State Marker programs are administered by two different departments, each utilizing their own criteria for evaluation.

More research is needed before a definitive list of potential medallion properties can be determined, but as a general guide, the most likely candidates for participation in the state marker program will come from the HIGH priority individual properties that

appears in the appendix *National Register Assessments*. This list is based upon known historical data associated with the property and/or its present condition. As subsequent research yields more information or if restoration projects recover once-lost architectural significance, additional properties may be considered for such designation.

The Travis County Historical Commission should identify individual East Austin area properties for State Historical Marker designations. Several HIGH priority sites may possess significant architectural qualities and be eligible for designation as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL). In some cases, the commission wishes to commemorate gravesites, historic events or locations of former properties which have since been demolished or moved. In such instances, or where a historic property no longer retains its architectural integrity, state subject markers (SM) may be appropriate.

PROPERTIES TO CONSIDER FOR DESIGNATIONS

Individual Properties: High Priorities

All properties classified in the HIGH preservation priority category (See *Historic Resources Inventory*) are recommended for individual listing in the NRHP. They are designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP in the *National Register Assessments* in the appendix. Resources included as HIGH preservation priorities in the Inventory are regarded as noteworthy because of their relative historical and/or architectural significance. Although some of the structures designated as HIGH priority are altered, they retain their character and architectural integrity from the period in which they achieved their significance.

Properties considered for historic designation because of their architectural significance can either be an outstanding example of a unique or common architectural style or form, or exhibit particularly noteworthy craftsmanship or design qualities. These structures must retain a high level of integrity. The replacement, removal, or covering over of structural or decorative features will diminish a notable property's opportunity for historic architectural designation. Other properties may be considered HIGH priorities because they are associated with significant historic trends or people. The property must

still retain sufficient architectural integrity to be recognizable to their period of significance.

The appendices *Historic Resources Inventory* and *National Register Assessments* following this report contain assessments of each surveyed property. The inventory identifies properties by preservation priority (HIGH, MEDIUM and LOW), while the assessments recommend properties as eligible or ineligible for listing in the NRHP. HIGH priority properties and MEDIUM priority properties within historic districts are considered the strongest candidates for historic designations at the present time. The evaluations are based upon known historical associations and/or architectural integrity and significance. Properties were considered in their current condition and did not take into consideration planned, anticipated or on-going restoration projects. Supplemental research is also needed before a final determination can be made. Many of these individual properties are in areas with a high concentration of relatively intact historic resources that are recommended as historic districts in the following section.

Historic Districts

Most historic district designations in Texas are initiated with their listing in the NRHP. The process used for the NRHP is often more refined, broader in scope, and has less impact on private ownership than, for instance, local historic zoning ordinances. Many cities extract NRHP criteria for their own district legislation and often add other binding components, as well as limited tax abatements. It is the recommendation of this report that the city pursue local historic district status for the areas determined eligible for listing in the NRHP.

State markers for historic areas (usually subject markers) are also placed in neighborhoods after they have been listed in the NRHP as historic districts. For this reason, the procedures for identifying state markers is intentionally aligned with federal guidelines for the NRHP.

The National Park Service requires that several conditions be met before a historic district can be considered for listing in the NRHP. The district must convey a strong sense

of the past and possess a high concentration of relatively unaltered historic properties within a well-defined area. At least 50 percent of the total number of buildings should be classified as "Contributing" to the historic character of the district. Moreover, the boundaries must be determined logically and avoid gerrymandering to achieve the required, 50-percent, contributing threshold.

The NRHP defines a "Contributing" property as a building, site, structure or object that "adds to the historic architectural qualities, historic associations, or archeological values for which a property is significant because: a) it was present during the period of significance and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time or is capable of yielding important information about the period, or b) it independently meets the NRHP criteria" (McLelland 1986:42). Thus, they must contribute to or enhance the district's ability to evoke a sense of the past, most often to a specific period of time. Contributing buildings are at least 50 years old and are either unaltered or have had relatively minor and reversible nonhistoric changes.

A property that detracts from the district's historic character is classified as "Noncontributing" and includes a building, site, structure or object that "does not add to the historic architectural qualities, historic associations, or archeological values for which a property is significant because: a) it was not present during the period of significance, b) due to alterations, disturbances, additions, or other changes, it no longer possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time or is incapable of yielding important information about that period, or c) it does not independently meet the NRHP criteria" (McLelland 1986:42). In other words, properties built less than 50 years ago or historic structures that have been changed within the last 50 years to such an extent that they no longer resemble their original and/or historic appearance are considered "Noncontributing."

After a careful analysis of noteworthy concentrations of historic structures, the East Austin residential areas noted below are recommended for consideration as NRHP historic districts. Maps accompanying this report identify the concentrations of historic properties that constitute the following proposed historic districts:

- Juniper Street Historic District: 900 block of Juniper Street and adjacent half block of 900 Olive Street
- Swedish Hill Extension: 900-1000 blocks of East 13th and 14th streets
- Thirteenth Street: 1200-1400 blocks of Bob Harrison, 1200-1600 blocks and the south side of the 1700-1800 blocks of East 13th Street, inclusive of properties on north-south streets (San Bernard, Angelina, Comal, Concho, Leona, Salina and Chicon) within the district.
- San Bernard Historic District: 1100 block San Bernard and adjacent properties on East 12th and Hackberry Streets
- New York Street: part of the 1500 and 1600 blocks of New York
- East 9th and 10th Street (Metropolitan District): 1000-1100 blocks of East 9th Street, 1100 block of East 10th Street, and inclusive side streets (Waller, Lydia and San Marcos)

Juniper Street Historic District

A large, central section of the project area, between and including East 11th and East 12th streets, has suffered extensive loss of historic fabric from demolition and/or redevelopment. The 900 block of Juniper Street and houses in the adjacent 900 block of Olive Street constitute the last relatively intact concentration of related historic properties in what was once a densely-populated, exclusively African American enclave between East 11th and 12th Streets.

In 1993, the Texas Historical Commission determined that properties in the 900 block and the north side of the 1000 block of Juniper Street, including an adjacent property at 1166 Curve Street (since demolished), to be eligible for listing in the NRHP as a historic district. An NRHP nomination was initiated for the district but halted pending the outcome of a dispute between Anderson Community Development Corporation (ACDC) and the City of Austin. Since it was determined eligible, five of the fifteen properties in the potential district have been lost to demolition or fire (906, 1004, 1006

and 1008 Juniper and 1166 Curve). Although 1004 Juniper was determined ineligible by the THC, it would now meet age criteria as a Contributing property.

As a result of these losses, only two historic properties remain on the north side of the 1000 block of Juniper, and they are separated by three vacant lots. Thus, it is the recommendation of this report that the 1000 block of Juniper no longer meets eligibility for inclusion in the historic district. However, other properties should be considered for inclusion in addition to those already determined Contributing to the district by the THC. They include houses in the 900 block of Olive Street which is adjacent to Juniper Street and shares its historic associations with the earliest African American settlement in the project area. The house at 902 Olive has been determined individually eligible for NR by the THC. The other properties in the block were assessed as MEDIUM priority properties in this survey, making them Contributing elements of the district. Therefore, it is recommended that the 900 block of Juniper Street and the adjacent half-block of the 900 block of Olive Street should now constitute the Juniper-Olive Street Historic District.

In addition to changes in the proposed historic district, further research and reassessment indicates that two properties previously determined ineligible for NR listing should be upgraded for their historic and/or architectural significance. Recent research indicates that the house at 1012 Juniper (Eliza Bell House) is of pivotal historic significance to the African American settlement of the area. The house has been designated a High preservation priority in this survey and is recommended individually eligible for NRHP listing. Likewise, the house at 1009 Juniper Street has been reassessed as significant for architectural merit and historic associations with the early development of this African American Reconstruction Era community and should also be considered individually eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Under current conditions, it is the recommendation of this report that a historic district still exists in the 900 block of Juniper Street. Furthermore, the 900 block of Olive Street, by virtue of its concentration of related historic properties and adjacent location, warrant its inclusion in a joint Juniper-Olive Street Historic District. However, any further loss of historic building fabric will threaten the district's integrity. Intentions to move

historic buildings into the street's vacant lots from elsewhere in the project area, along with plans for new construction, further jeopardize the district's status. To protect its eligibility and that of High priority properties in the 1000 block of Juniper, redevelopment plans should be closely coordinated with THC staff.

San Bernard Historic District

Architecturally, San Bernard Street contains the finest, most intact properties of the project area's potential historic districts. In 1993, the THC determined the three block length of San Bernard Street and several adjacent properties on Hackberry, Cotton and East Twelfth Street, eligible for listing in the NRHP. Although our survey area did not include all of the east side of San Bernard, our maps recognize that it should be included in the potential historic district. It is our recommendation that 1152 to 1198 San Bernard Street and adjacent properties at 1301 East 12th Street and 1208 Hackberry, is a good candidate for both local and National Register recognition as a historic district.

It is primarily residential but contains a large, influential church (Wesley Chapel M.E Church) and a neighborhood store (outside the survey area, approximately 1161 San Bernard). Two distinct periods of historic construction are represented in the district. The earliest houses are late 19th/early 20th century L-plan and Modified L-plan dwellings, some with Classical Revival or Queen Anne ornamentation. They were originally associated with white residents, primarily German merchants. The second period is characterized by Craftsman or Tudor influenced bungalows and most of these were built at a time when African Americans were predominant in the neighborhood. San Bernard is recognized within the African American community as a neighborhood of professionals including doctors and teachers. Most of the houses are larger, more substantial dwellings than those found in concentrations elsewhere in the project area. They share uniform setback and landscape features. There are few intrusions or vacant lots in the district and nearly all of the houses are well-maintained.

Ninth-Tenth Street Historic District (Metropolitan Historic District)

In 1993, the Texas Historical Commission determined that the 1100 block of East Tenth Street constituted a historic district they termed the Metropolitan Historic District for Metropolitan African Methodist Episcopal Church which lies within the district.

HHM&M survey results indicate that the 1000 block of East Tenth Street lacks sufficient historic fabric for inclusion but that the 1000-1100 blocks of East 9th Street possess equally intact, historic properties as East 10th Street and should be included in the Metropolitan Historic District. While Ebenezer Baptist Church, which is individually eligible for NR, lies within the 1000 block of East 10th Street, the remainder of the block includes a variety of new construction and altered historic properties that lack the architectural characteristics exhibited by houses in located in the 1100 block of East 10th and in the 1000-1100 block of East 9th Street.

Properties in the proposed Metropolitan Historic District include a variety of late 19th and early 20th century dwellings, principally L-plan and Modified L-plan houses with ornamental wood porch and window treatments and early Classical Revival and/or Craftsman influenced bungalows. Most pre-date the presence of Metropolitan A.M.E. and were originally owned by white families, many of whom had German surnames. With the construction of Metropolitan A.M.E. Church in 1923 and the adoption of a city plan to relocate African Americans from central neighborhoods to the Austin's east side in 1929, more African Americans moved into the area. They purchased homes along East 10th and East 9th streets within a block of Ebenezer Baptist and Metropolitan A.M.E., two of the city's most influential African American churches.

Hispanic families moved to the area during the early- to mid-20th century, as well. Our Lady of Guadalupe Catholic Church, established about 1935 at 901 Lydia (intersection with East 9th Street) was both a reflection of Hispanic settlement in East Austin and an attraction to further Hispanic growth, primarily to the east of Lydia Street. The present Our Lady of Guadalupe Church was built in 1953 and lies outside the proposed Metropolitan Historic District.

Although the south side of East Ninth is outside the project area, a reconnaissance survey of the street shows that most would be considered Contributing elements of a potential district and thus NR eligible. Some are already City of Austin Landmarks and/or listed in the National Register. Therefore, it is the recommendation of this report that the Metropolitan Historic District encompass the 1100 block of East 10th Street, between Waller and Lydia Streets, the 1000-1100 blocks of East 9th Street between San Marcos and Waller Streets, and properties fronting side streets within these boundaries. These areas constitute distinct residential grouping with historically and architecturally related properties. It should be noted that similar properties to lie on streets to the south, outside the survey area. Further research would be needed to determine the southern boundaries of the Metropolitan Historic District.

Thirteenth Street Historic District

Large numbers of HIGH and MEDIUM priority properties are scattered along the entire lengths of east-west oriented East 13th, East 14th and Bob Harrison streets, and on the intersecting north-west side streets within the project area. Almost exclusively residential, the entire region north of the more commercial East 12th Street was analyzed for its potential as a single historic district. However, new construction, severely altered or deteriorated houses and numerous vacant lots interspersed among the historic properties present intrusions that interrupt the area's historic composition and detract from its character. Along East 13th Street, in particular, excellent concentrations of historic properties -- primarily Craftsman influenced bungalows -- are interrupted by expanses of nonhistoric or severely altered properties and vacant lots.

Historic associations present another impediment to forming a single, cohesive district in the area north of East 12th Street. Swedish immigrants largely settled the western portion of the area, west of Navasota to East Avenue, now IH-35. With some notable exceptions, Swedes maintained their presence in that area well into the mid-20th century. The eastern stretches of East 13th, 14th and Bob Harrison streets, east of Navasota Street and Beth Israel/Oakwood Cemetery, however, were occupied almost

exclusively by African Americans by the turn of the century and throughout the 20th century. Therefore, the western section containing the 900-1000 blocks of East 13th and 14th streets, is recommended for inclusion in the existing Swedish Hill Historic District while a new district is recommended for the concentrations of historic properties along East 13th, Bob Harrison and related portions of intersecting north-south streets. East 14th Street, east of Navasota, is discontinued at Oakwood Cemetery for several blocks and its eastern extension (1500-2100 blocks) does not share the concentration and pattern of residential development apparent in East 13th Street and Bob Harrison. Therefore it is not included as part of the proposed Thirteenth Street historic district.

The proposed Thirteenth Street historic district contains good concentrations of largely residential properties that have traditionally been associated with African American homeowners and residents. A particularly intact section of the proposed district is found in the 1500-1600 block of East 13th Street, between Angelina and Leona streets and including the 1300 block of Concho (west side). Good concentrations of architecturally and historically related properties are found on the south side of the 1200 block and on both sides of the 1300 block of East 13th Street. Although the analogous blocks of Bob Harrison Street are not as intact as the 1500-1600 block of East 13th Street, they contain a high percentage of Contributing buildings and follow the early 20th century patterns established on East 13th Street. With the exception of a handful of late-19th century farmhouses, streets within the proposed district appear to have been developed about the same time and share similar property types and residential construction patterns such as uniform set back, lot size, orientation and landscaping. Together they impart a strong sense of place as an early 20th century, middle-class African American neighborhood.

The proposed district's southern boundary follows the northern property lines of 1200-1800 East 12th Street, from Navasota to Chicon. The western boundary of the proposed Thirteenth Street district follows Navasota Street, a north-south thoroughfare through the community that historically separated the early Swedish settlement to the west from the somewhat later African American community that developed to the east. The northern boundary follows the alley behind Bob Harrison Street which defines Oakwood

Cemetery from Navasota to Comal, where Bob Harrison ends. From Comal, the line jogs south to include the both sides of the 1500-1600 blocks of East 13th Street and adjacent properties fronting Comal, Concho and Leona streets. Due to severe integrity loss, the north side of the 1700-1800 blocks of East 13th Street are excluded from the proposed district which ends at Chicon Street. As discussed earlier, integrity loss and development patterns in the analogous blocks of East 14th Street render it incompatible with the rest of the district and therefore these blocks are not included.

Although good examples of shotgun houses, bungalows and other historic residential properties exist in the blocks of East 13th Street further east, the Thirteenth Street district loses its cohesiveness beyond Chicon Street. Vacant lots and incompatible intrusions on both sides of the street detract from integrity of the district east of Chicon and Chicon Street itself, a busy north-south thoroughfare, forms a physical barrier to pedestrian traffic between the two sections. Chicon Street, thus determines the easternmost boundary of the proposed Thirteenth Historic District.

Swedish Hill Historic District Extension

The north side of the 900-1000 blocks of East 14th Street is already listed in the NRHP as part of the Swedish Hill Historic District (NR 1985). A single house on the south side of the street, 903 East 14th Street, is included in the listed district. Survey results and research indicate that the boundaries of the Swedish Hill Historic District should be extended to include all of the properties on south side of 900-1000 East 14th Street and the adjacent blocks of East 13th Street (north and south sides). While not as architecturally cohesive as the existing Swedish Hill Historic District, these properties exhibit similar characteristics and share its historic associations with Austin's Swedish immigrant population.

New York Historic District

A distinct, cohesive collection of late-19th and early 20th century properties exists along a single, long block (1500-1600) of New York Street and is recommended as

eligible for listing in the NRHP. Specifically, the New York Historic District begins in the middle of the 1500 block (1504) of New York Street (north side), extends through the 1600 block and includes two houses on the south side of the street, at 1607 and 1617 New York and two houses in adjacent lots on Leona Street.

Although the boundaries may appear gerrymandered from the verbal description, they encompass architecturally and historically similar properties. The street is entirely residential in use but the east end of New York was completely redeveloped in the 1960s, apparently as a planned unit since the new houses are contemporaries in age and design. Historic houses were removed and replaced with new brick and frame Ranch style houses. Beginning with 1504 New York on the north and 1607 New York on the south, however, the remaining houses date from the 1890s through the early 1920s and have architectural characteristics associated with Queen Anne, Classical Revival and Craftsman styles of that period. Most retain their architectural fabric and integrity to a high degree and are well-maintained. In the 1700 block, the cohesiveness breaks down with only a few related properties. The eastern boundary, is therefore recommended as Leona Street. Two houses on Leona, one attached to 1612 New York at 1190 Leona, are included in the New York District.

Some of the most prominent early African American residents of East Austin lived on New York Street by 1907 when Metropolitan A.M.E. Church published a booklet on the history of the church. By 1920, the street was occupied almost entirely of African Americans and has remained an intact residential mainstay of the community throughout the century.

CONCLUSIONS

Between April 19, 2000 and September 19, 2000, the HHM&M survey and research teams identified and minimally documented 496 historic properties within the East Austin project area boundaries. Of those, 105 were designated HIGH preservation priorities and 242 were determined to be of MEDIUM priority. LOW preservation priorities were assigned to 149 properties throughout the project area. The 105 HIGH

priority sites are considered good candidates for nomination to the NRHP while all of the HIGH and MEDIUM priorities would be considered Contributing elements of designated historic districts.

The project area in its entirety does not qualify as a potential historic district due to new or incongruous infill construction, loss of historic building stock and severe alteration of historic resources. However, several separate potential districts have been identified during the course of the survey. These areas are comprised of related properties that together form a distinct, coherent grouping imbued with a sense of historic place. Districts almost always contain a majority of Contributing to Noncontributing elements. Properties assessed as HIGH and MEDIUM preservation priorities in this survey generally qualify as Contributing features within historic districts. Thus, areas with concentrations of HIGH and MEDIUM priority properties are good candidates for designation as local or NRHP districts.

Potential districts in the survey area are identified as the Juniper Street Historic District, the San Bernard Historic District, New York Historic District, 9th and 10th Street Historic District (Metropolitan Historic District), and the Thirteenth Street Historic District. The Swedish Hill Historic District has already been listed in the NRHP but includes only one property (903 East 14th Street) on the south side of East 14th Street. It is recommended that the district be extended to include all of the south side of the 900-1000 blocks of East 14th and the 900-1000 blocks of East 13th Street.

Although the THC determined in 1993 that properties in the 900-1000 block of Juniper Street are eligible for listing as a historic district, loss of historic fabric since that assessment and the imminent construction of new properties within the potential district render its future uncertain. The 1000 block of Juniper Street, in particular, has suffered the loss of three of its five historic properties since 1997. As a result, it is the recommendation of this report that the 1000 block of Juniper is no longer eligible for inclusion in the proposed historic district. However, reassessment of individual properties in that block indicates that 1012 and 1009 Juniper Street are High preservation priorities and are eligible for individual listing in the National Register. In addition, the number of

Medium priority properties in the adjacent 900 block of Olive Street indicates that a portion of that street should be included in a joint Juniper-Olive Street Historic District. Care should be taken to preserve the remaining historic properties in the proposed district to ensure that new construction and/or relocation of historic properties into the district are compatible with its historic character. Likewise, historic properties in the 1000 block should be protected and preserved for their enduring historical and cultural value.

HIGH and MEDIUM priority sites, regardless NR eligibility, should be carefully evaluated for historic, architectural and cultural significance when being considered for demolition, alteration or relocation from the survey area. Destruction or removal of individual character-defining properties such as these diminishes the historic setting of the entire area. Within the context of potential or designated historic districts, the loss of a single Contributing property adversely affects the identity and integrity of the district. Their incremental loss can be devastating to a district, resulting in its removal from NRHP eligibility.

East Austin has already suffered huge losses of its historic fabric, particularly along the traditional commercial corridors on East 11th and East 12th streets and in the wedge of residential property that lies between them. In those areas, which constitute the core of African American settlement in East Austin, recognizable historic resources are the exception rather than the rule. Vacant lots, derelict and abandoned buildings, and new or incongruous infill, construction now define this significant region to a greater extent than does its historic fabric.

However, individual historic buildings and potential historic districts still exist throughout the entire survey area, even within the most blighted segments. It is vital that steps be taken immediately to stabilize these properties and neighborhoods to prevent their further deterioration and loss. Identification and assessment of East Austin's historic properties and districts is the initial step in their preservation and revitalization. Historic designations and planning programs should follow this survey to educate property owners and residents to the significance and benefits of preserving their cultural resources.

East Austin has many individually historic properties but it also contains some of the city's oldest, relatively intact historic neighborhoods. They have survived largely because East Austin has not shared in the city's past economic growth and corresponding development and redevelopment. Paradoxically, as East Austin's historic significance is finally being recognized, its value for redevelopment has increased as the desire for central city housing and commercial venues outstrips available land. Long neglected, East Austin has become the focus of economic revitalization and redevelopment efforts that threaten to remove or greatly alter the character of some of its most significant historic properties and neighborhoods. The city will be challenged to meet the area's need for good, affordable housing and increased economic opportunities while stewarding its irreplaceable cultural resources. It is the objective of this survey to identify and prioritize those resources to further their preservation.

HISTORIC OVERVIEW OF EAST AUSTIN PROJECT AREA

Introduction

At the end of the Civil War, the area now known as East Austin lay outside the city's eastern boundary, drawn along East Avenue, now IH-35. Only a few scattered farmsteads lay in the vicinity of the project area to the east of the city limits. The most notable of these was the J. W. and Lydia Robertson property, formerly the French Legation. Alphonse Dubois de Saligny, French charge d'affaires to the Republic of Texas, had purchased twenty-one acres of land encompassing Outlot 1, Division B, from Anson Jones in 1841. There he built what must have been one of Austin's finest homes, now known as the French Legation. Saligny's "plantation", later sold to Dr. J.W. Robertson, played a pivotal role in the development of central East Austin in the late-19th century. This is particularly true for African Americans who purchased property from Robertson and his son, George, in the years following Emancipation.

Although city history primarily recounts the activities of East Austin's white residents in the 19th century, African Americans lived in the region since its earliest agricultural settlement. In the antebellum period, large slave owners such as Aaron Burleson established plantations in the more productive eastern section of Travis County where their bondsmen farmed corn and cotton on the blackland prairie. Indeed, slaves were probably responsible for the construction of the oldest extant buildings in eastern Travis County and what is now East Austin. The J. W. Robertson family moved to the French Legation with their slaves in 1848 (HHMM 1997:15). Doubtless, the Robertson slaves did most of the manual labor, including construction, on the plantation.

After the Civil War, Dr. Robertson fell seriously ill and began selling some of his outlying property to ensure his family's future. His son George continued to sell property after his death. Robertson's plantation in the Saligny Survey and in adjacent holdings to the north, in Outlot 55, became known as Robertson Hill. Robertson Hill formed the core of an early Reconstruction-era enclave of freed slaves that extended from East 10th Street

(then Mulberry) north to Catalpa, south of East 12th Street (College), and from East Avenue to about Waller Street. There is no physical evidence, and only the slightest anecdotal and recorded indication, of occupancy in the area before 1869 when Dr. Joseph W. Robertson sold the first lots in the area later subdivided by his son, George. However, descendants of the Bell family who were servants and possibly emancipated slaves on the Robertson plantation, claimed to have lived on what is now Juniper Street as early as 1848, when the Robertsons purchased the former French Legation and surrounding property. Some Robertson family papers record the construction of slave quarters on the northern part of their estate but the exact location is not known.

In fact, the first known lot Dr. Robertson sold out of Outlot 55, Division B, was to an African American, a freedman named Malick Wilson, on December 26, 1869 (HHMM 1997: 17). Tax records show a large increase in the property's value, from \$100 in 1871 to \$400 in 1872, an indication that Wilson had built a house on his lot, possibly the first one east of East Avenue on Mesquite (East 11th Street). Koch's 1873 Bird's Eye View map of the area shows a dwelling in the vicinity of Wilson's lot which is in the middle of the block between Curve and Waller, at approximately 1006 East 11th Street. The house has since been demolished.

The arrival of railroad in 1871 brought even more people to Austin and Robertson's son George had the northern part of the family homestead subdivided for housing. Land development on the East side primarily occurred along and near the railroad lines, particularly along East 5th, 6th and 7th streets, in the early 1870s. Exceptions were East 11th and 12th streets, which were among the first defined roads in East Austin. They follow the survey lines of Outlot 55, Division B, the George L. Robertson Subdivision. Although the two roads may not pre-date Robertson's earliest development efforts, they were probably cut shortly after 1869, possibly around 1871, when the arrival of the first railroad spawned wholesale land speculation and development beyond Austin's original townsite boundaries.

In fact, East 11th and 12th streets (then known as Mesquite Street and College Avenue, respectively), are among the few roadways shown on Koch's 1873 Bird's Eye View map that extend beyond the city's original eastern boundaries at East Avenue, north of the Robertson family home, the French Legation (between East 7th and 8th streets). Koch's map depicts a distinct grouping of fairly isolated dwellings clustered around East 11th Street at that time. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps of the city do not detail the Eastside neighborhoods bounded by East 11th and 12th streets until 1921, but even the earliest of these maps clearly delineate the two streets as early as 1884.

As Austin expanded with the railroad and housing lots became scarce within the city, much of the Robertson property and other central East Side parcels were sold for new construction. The location was ideal. It was close to the city and the railroad lines but beyond the noise, dirt and smells of the industrial and commercial enterprises that were springing up near the tracks. Although African Americans were among the first to settle the area north of the French Legation, immigrant families also moved to East Austin in large numbers during the 1870s. Many new homes were built on East 8th, East 9th and East 10th streets, in an around the former Robertson plantation, in the 1880s and 1890s. Most of these belonged to white residents, many of whom were of German descent. Swedes settled in a close-knit area called Swedish Hill roughly between East 13th and East 15th streets, although they also built houses on East 12th Street and throughout the area in the 1880s. Several substantial dwellings and stores are attributed to Irish and Italian residents of the area dating to the as early as the 1870s and early 1880s. German families moved to East Austin during the late 19th century, particularly in the 1880s and 1890s. Many became local grocers for the surrounding neighborhoods.

By 1887, when Koch drew a second Bird's Eye View Map of the City, the area north of the French Legation, including the fan-shaped George L. Robertson Subdivision neighborhood nestled between East 11th and 12th streets, is almost fully developed. Among the most noteworthy Eastside features shown on the map are the historic African American institutions Ebenezer Baptist Church and Robertson Hill School. Both the

church and school lay in the northern part of the Saligny Survey which contained the French Legation, the Robertson family estate. The Saligny Survey lay adjacent to and south of the George L. Robertson Subdivision. Their depiction signifies the presence of a large established African American community in the area by 1887.

By the turn of the century, central East Austin, west of Navasota, was largely residential with scattered stores, churches and schools. Although some streets were racially mixed, particularly along East 11th and East 12th streets, ethnic enclaves formed throughout the area. Swedes remained clustered on Swedish Hill while Germans tended to live east of Navasota, along San Bernard, and south of East 10th Street. African Americans almost exclusively occupied the region between East 11th and East 12th streets (Juniper, Olive, Catalpa and Myrtle), the 800-900 blocks of East 11th Street and the 900-1000 blocks of East 10th Street. These enclaves represent some of the area's earliest development and the birthplace of many of the city's oldest African American institutions including churches, schools and lodges. Successful businesses had been established primarily in the 1000-1100 blocks of East 11th Street but a few existed on East 12th Street, particularly between Navasota and Comal. Most of them were owned and operated by people of Italian, Irish and German descent at the turn of the century.

At the same time, East 11th and 12th streets were developing as major thoroughfares through the neighborhoods that lay to the east of the city's historic boundaries. A variety of domestic, commercial and institutional buildings lined the streets. East 12th Street, though largely occupied by white residents at the turn of the century, was becoming racially mixed. Samuel Huston College for Colored Children, as it was then known, lay on the south side of East 12th Street, just east of East Avenue. Due to the presence of African American institutions such as Ebenezer Baptist Church (Curve and Catalpa) about 1885, Olive Street School (1909) and Samuel Huston College (1900), the triangle of land wedged between East 11th and 12th streets was fully developed and occupied almost exclusively by African Americans by the turn of the century and East 12th Street demographics would change in the following two decades. At the turn of the

century, however, East 12th Street remained a predominantly white, business and working class residential street.

In the 1920s, however, the East 12th Street demographic composition changed. Austin city officials had begun a program of "red-lining", a common strategy for racial segregation in southern cities, that resulted in the almost complete segregation of African Americans to the east side of town and whites to the central and west side residential areas. Notable exceptions were the Clarksville and Wheatville neighborhoods on the city's west and northwest sides, respectively. East Austin, between East 7th and East 12th streets, was already largely identified as an African American neighborhood, with two significant African American colleges and numerous churches, schools and businesses. When the red-lining process began in earnest in the 1920s, it reinforced the perception of the east side as largely African American, precipitated "white flight" from the racially mixed areas, and set the stage for the further development of the east side as the exclusive domain of African Americans and later, Mexican Americans.

By the end of the 1920s, nearly all of East 12th Street, from East Avenue to the city limits, was occupied by African Americans, many of whom owned their homes. Formerly white churches and businesses along East 12th Street changed hands. The demographic evolution of the community can be traced through the changing congregation of a little church at 1000 East 12th, now 1100 East 12th Street (also addressed as 1201 Waller). The church had served a number of different white congregations from its construction, about 1895, through the first decades of the 20th century. It was organized as St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, an adjunct to St. David's Episcopal Church, one of the city's oldest congregations. Sanborn maps at the turn of the century label it as a Roman Catholic Church but that could have been an error based on its identification with a saint. The 1906 city directory listed it as the "Mission of the Good Shepherd Episcopal Church". By 1920, church affiliation changed but the building continued to serve a white congregation as the "East Austin Presbyterian Church". A few years later, however, the 1924 city directory denoted the renamed "Twelfth Street

Christian Church" as a "colored" church. The building was labeled a "Colored Presbyterian Church" on the 1935 Sanborn Map of the area and it has continued to serve African American congregations throughout the century.

East 12th Street's transformation from a white residential street to a racially mixed -- and later, predominately African American -- multi-use residential and commercial corridor, may be attributed in large part to the establishment and success of Samuel Huston College. In the quarter century before the college was established on the six-acre campus between East 11th and 12th streets, East 12th Street was settled and occupied primarily by whites, many of whom bore German surnames. In 1900, Samuel Huston College built a three-story classroom and dormitory complex fronting onto the south side of East 12th Street, between East Avenue and Branch. The college consolidated its presence on the street with a girls' dormitory on the north side of East 12th Street. The college's success attracted more African Americans to the area north of East 12th Street and they began to buy homes formerly owned by members of other ethnic groups including those of Swedish, German and Irish descent, along East 12th, East 13th and East 14th streets. Bob Harrison Street, an extension of East 14th Street beyond Navasota, developed as an entirely African American residential street by 1920.

Demographic changes in the early 20th century can be represented by a single block along East 12th Street. In 1901, when Michael Connelly (also spelled Connolly) built the house at 1115 East 12th Street for his family of six, his immediate neighbors were primarily working-class whites, including several of German descent, judging from their surnames -- Schwartz, Shafer and Huebotter. Connelly's house lay across the street from the 12th Street Christian (St. Stephen's Church, above). Edward Schwartz was a painter, John W. Shafer was a stone cutter and Michael Connelly was a stone mason and bricklayer who also owned the Silver King Saloon at 307 East 6th Street. Renters and homeowners alike occupied the houses on these streets.

By the mid-1920s, the community served by Samuel Huston College and St. Peter's M.E. (Methodist Episcopal) Church (at the northwest corner of Curve and

Catalpa), two major east-side African American institutions, had grown considerably since the turn of the century. African Americans occupied most of the residences from Samuel Huston College, just east of East Street, through the 1800 block of East 12th Street. Only a few white families such as the Huebotters (1105 East 12th) and the Connelly's remained.

In 1926, the Connellys sold their house to Dr. Charles Yerwood, an African American physician. The Connellys were among the last white families to reside on East 12th Street and the sale of their house to the Yerwoods represents the completion of the demographic change for much of East Austin. Although some white owners continued to live in their family homes, particularly in the Swedish Hill area, city planning efforts to remove African Americans to East Austin from the central city, and a nationwide intensification of racial prejudice in the 1920s, led to the area's identification as an African American neighborhood. By the 1930s, many Hispanic families had also moved into the area, for many of the same reasons.

By the 1930s, more African Americans lived in the East Austin project area than white, non-Hispanic residents. Swedish American families continued to live in the 900-1000 blocks of East 13th and 14th streets, and a handful of German American families owned houses and businesses in the area, through World War II. Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, Mexican American families began moving into the areas south of East 11th Street, in the vicinity of Our Lady of Guadalupe Catholic Church, in greater numbers. By 1950, at the end of the historic period, the East Austin survey area was largely identified as a "minority" community populated by African American and Hispanic families. This identification has remained constant throughout the latter half of the 20th century despite gentrification trends in recent years. As Austin real estate increases in value with the current economic boom and growth projections, demographic patterns in near East Austin may shift once again to include larger numbers of relatively affluent white residents who desire older homes in a central location.

Early Settlement of Austin

General Houston became the first elected president of Texas. The Texas Constitution dictated that he could not succeed himself and the second election made Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar president. Using Washington, D.C. as his model, he favored a site where a new capital city could be planned and built from scratch. Coming to the juncture of Shoal Creek with the Colorado River on a buffalo hunt in the fall of 1838, Lamar and his entourage saw a tiny settlement calling itself Waterloo (Graham 1938:55). The village had been incorporated only a year earlier by General Edward Burleson (Jenkins and Kesselus 1990:160). The first residents were Jacob Harrell and his family, who had first settled at Hornsby's Bend on the Colorado River (Terrell 1910:113; Scarbrough 1973:123). The new President and his ranger escort camped at the Harrell cabin and Lamar was enchanted by the natural beauty of the location (Malone 1958:7). He is quoted as saying, "This should be the seat of future empire" (Terrell 1910:117).

Edwin Waller laid out the plan of the new city, which President Lamar named after Stephen F. Austin. Waller based his design on that of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Its well-spaced grid of streets ran north from the Colorado River for fifteen blocks and from Shoal Creek in the west to Waller Creek in the east. Of course, the city did not at first resemble Waller's neat street map. A visitor to the town in the autumn of 1839 wrote, "My visit to Austin, in October of 1839, where I found a town very much in the woods, with five or six hundred people, in cabins and shanties and camps, I well remember" (Red 1914:285). Waller supervised the construction of government buildings and the home of the President. Comanches continued to threaten the safety of Austin's earliest settlers and some of Waller's crew were killed and scalped during the course of their work. Waller found it necessary to fortify the first capital buildings with a wooden palisade (Peareson 1900:47).

For many years after the new capital was chosen, doubts persisted about the viability of the new town, isolated as it was in the middle of a vast unsettled frontier dominated by Comanches. Nonetheless, people moved their families to the new town and

locally a sense of optimism prevailed. Many believed that as the seat of government, Austin would soon become a thriving metropolis (Winkler 1907:220). Almost a thousand people moved to Austin in its first year. Early in January of 1840 a census taken by Cumberland Presbyterian minister Amos Roark reported on the population of the new town and the occupations of its citizens:

Seventy-five families, population eight hundred and fifty-six, of which seven hundred and eleven were whites and one hundred and forty-five blacks--five hundred and fifty grown men, sixty-one ladies, one hundred children, seventy-seven of which are large enough to go to school; seventy-three professors of religion--seventeen Methodists, twelve Presbyterians, five Cumberland Presbyterians, eleven Episcopalians, ten Baptists and ten Roman Catholics; two organized churches--one Methodist and one Presbyterian; two Methodist preachers, one Cumberland Presbyterian and one Baptist preacher; one Sabbath school, one week day school, thirty-five mechanics, four lawyers, six doctors, six inns, nine stores, nine groceries, one billiard table, six faro banks, twenty gamblers, two silversmith shops, two printing offices and two tailor shops (Gray 1872:11).

Lamar's vision had created Austin, but he bankrupted the Texas treasury with his building schemes and Indian wars. Houston won the next election and was again president of the young Republic. Sam Houston had never favored the location of Austin as the "seat of future empire." He removed the government to Houston, but Austinites prevented the removal of the archives by force of arms, which may have saved the town's future (Baker 1875:142-143).

Two Mexican raids on San Antonio in 1842 spurred a mass exodus from Austin. James Webb wrote to ex-President Lamar, "we have but a small population now and are living under great privations" (Webb to Lamar 1843 in Gullick 1928 (I):20). After Houston's second term the government returned to Austin, where it was when President Anson Jones raised the flag of the United States at the Texas capitol in 1846. In the end, Mirabeau Lamar's dream of a capital on the banks of the Colorado came true. As one of Texas' first Anglo-American historians wrote, "The location was there made with a view

of drawing to the west a population that would protect the frontier from the common enemy, and such was the happy effect" (Yoakum 1855:273). In 1853, J. D. B. DeBow, wrote:

The roving tendency of our people is incident to the peculiar condition of their country, and each succeeding Census will prove it is diminishing. When the fertile plains of the West shall have been filled up, and men of scanty means cannot by a mere change of location acquire a homestead, the inhabitants of each State will become comparatively stationary, and our countrymen will exhibit that attachment to the homes of their childhood, the want of which is sometimes cited as an unfavorable trait in our national character (U.S. Census Bureau 1853b:15).

Austin remained fairly isolated until the arrival of the railroad in 1871; however, the city's future as the seat of government was assured by a state-wide referendum in 1850. With the question of Austin's survival as the capital city resolved at last, the road net improved substantially during the 1850s. By 1860, Austin was linked to the state's major population centers by a system of established roadways, although travel to and from the capital continued to be an arduous undertaking.

The Preston Road stretched from Austin to Preston on the Red River through Georgetown, Waco, and Dallas. Three roads went from Austin to Gillespie and Mason Counties. These roads merged at Brady, forming the Upper California Road through El Paso. Other roads reached from Austin to LaGrange, Bastrop, Brenham, Hempstead, and Columbus. The roads were rough and travel was slow. Stagecoaches ran from Austin to LaGrange to Columbus, and from Austin to Brenham, where the train could be taken to Houston (Gage 1960:436-437).

On the eve of the Civil War, Travis County was one of the handful of Texas counties to vote against secession. Unionists were in the minority, however. Texas entered the fray as a Confederate State and Sam Houston, who opposed secession, was deposed as governor. Fifty thousand Texans enlisted in the Confederate army and a quarter of those saw action east of the Mississippi River (Ramsdell 1910:22). Plans for a railroad that would link Austin with both coasts, funded by millions of U. S. dollars, were

sacrificed when Texas voted for secession in 1861. Austin's development was curtailed for a decade as a result of the war and the Reconstruction period that followed; however, African Americans emerged from the Civil War as free citizens with a spirit of hope and enterprise.

The Houston and Texas Central Railroad came to Austin at the end of 1871. The initial result was that Austin became, for a short time, a major rail terminus, attracting farmers from the hinterlands who could now ship cash crops from Austin to eastern markets. With the arrival of the railroad, local monopolies for building materials and many other elements of Austin's material culture unraveled as competition from eastern factories drove down prices of many goods. The stores filled with products that had previously been expensive luxury items due to the difficulty of shipping by water and then by wagon. Such fragile items as window glass could be shipped much more safely by rail and elegant houses with expensive furnishings proliferated as a result. As an author of the period wrote:

The greatest needs of the State at the present time are more people, and improvement along the lines of travel. The coarse cookery, and villainous liquor-drinking which one now finds in remote towns will vanish when people and manufactures and inducements to ease and elegance come in (King 1874:423).

African Americans in Austin

By 1850, the population of Travis County had grown to 3,138. The county's free population numbered 2,347, with 791 listed as slaves. Of the free population, only eleven were African Americans, one of whom resided in Austin (U.S. Census Bureau 1853a:504). This compared to 397 freedmen in all of Texas (DeBow 1854:63). Statewide, a little more than twenty-seven percent of the population lived in bondage in 1850 (DeBow 1854:86). Free African Americans made up just under two percent of the population of Texas. Only Iowa, New Hampshire and Mississippi had smaller percentages (DeBow 1854:65-66). The largest identified sub-set of the population was composed of

European immigrants. In 1850, forty-three percent of all United States immigrants were from Ireland and twenty-five percent were from Prussia and other German states (U.S. Census Bureau 1853a:14).

A handful of people owned the great majority of slaves; there were 57 slave owners in Travis County (U.S. Census Bureau 1850b). By 1860 the number of slave owners had increased to 175. Between them, they owned 499 families (U.S. Census Bureau 1860b). Only about fifteen percent of local slave owners were farmers but between twenty and forty percent of the slaves in Austin spent at least some time in the fields near the city. By 1851, as many as half of the slaves in Austin hired themselves out, usually splitting some of their earnings with their owners (*Austin City Gazette* July 9, September 13, 1851). Brick making was a principal occupation for slaves in southwestern cities in the 1860s (Lack 1973:39, 45) and Austin was probably no exception.

Following the Civil War, many former Confederates abandoned their homes in the south and moved to Texas which had survived relatively undamaged from the war. The state's population increased greatly in the postwar period and between 1860 and 1870, Travis County grew from 8,080 to 13,153 residents. The county's African American population increased from 3,149 to 4,647 during the same period. (U.S. Census Bureau 1871:94-95). By 1870 Austin's population had risen to 4,428. Of that number, 3,812 were Anglo-Americans born in the United States. Foreign born residents numbered 616 while 1,615 African Americans lived within the city limits (U.S. Census Bureau 1871:346).

Austin attracted large numbers of Freedmen who sought safety in the aftermath of the Civil War. Violence against African Americans in Reconstruction Texas was harsh in rural areas away from the protection of federal garrisons. From mid-1865 through 1866, authorities in Texas issued more than five hundred indictments for the murder of blacks by whites. African Texans were not allowed to sit on juries or to give testimony against whites and no convictions were won in these cases. Many well known murderers were not even indicted. Some white men continued their pre-war depredations on black women

under their control and the Freedmens' Bureau was swamped with complaints of rape, all of which went unanswered (Smallwood 1981:33).

In 1868, General Reynolds reported to his superiors in Washington that, "The murder of negroes is so common [in Texas] as to render it impossible to keep accurate account of them" (Hornsby 1973:409). A Republican newspaper in Austin that year lamented the excesses of the Ku Klux Klan in the area. These outrages were never reported in the Democrats' newspapers, but these examples from a Republican newspaper of the period are typical:

We learn through the Houston papers that there has been a fearful slaughtering of the colored people around Millican, on the fifteenth and sixteenth. The number killed is variously estimated from fifteen to fifty. (*Daily Austin Republican* July 20, 1868).

Crime

Our State continues to be the scene of the foulest crimes that have ever disgraced any age...The negroes are being killed at a fearful rate. On Friday last one freedman was killed in Bastrop County, and on Wednesday two more were murdered. Even loyal Travis men have been visited by the Ku Klux Klan, and on Saturday morning last a freedman was foully murdered within three miles of Austin (*Daily Austin Republican* August 17, 1868).

J. Mason Brewer, an African American historian, wrote, "Although the ex-slave was now a freedman he was still confronted with problems. One of the gravest of these problems was the nightriders organization, composed of white men who threatened to harm negro landowners of rich and large tracts of land if they did not move out of the community (Brewer 1940:18). Between the end of the Civil War and June, 1868, 373 freedmen were known to have been killed by whites in Texas, whereas freedmen were known to have killed ten whites in that period (Galloway n.d.:273).

African Americans who moved to Austin in large numbers during Reconstruction sought education and economic opportunities as well as the protection of federal troops. For a time they were a political force in the new Texas government, but this representation

would be short-lived. Reconstruction ended in Texas late in 1873, when E. J. Davis lost the governorship to Richard Coke in a bitter election campaign. Democrats took control of the reins of government in Texas in early 1874 (Wheeler 1920:56).

A special 1875 Austin census recorded 3,497 African Americans residing in the city. The census taker admitted that he did not record an estimated 2700 people whom he referred to as the "floating or unknown population." Because of the temporary nature of much of the housing constructed by African Americans in Austin in the decade following the Civil War, it is reasonable to assume, as did the census taker, that a large part of that "floating population" was African American. But even if those 2700 people are not taken into account, thirty-four per cent of the population of Austin in 1875 was African American, representing an increase of just over one hundred per cent in Austin's first thirty years (Costa 1875).

Although the United States enjoyed general prosperity during the period, the latter half of the 1880s was a period of decline in Austin. A prolonged drought plagued the region and the days of open range cattle drew to an end (Southwell 1949:7). The great blizzard of January, 1886 dealt a crushing blow to cattlemen (Wheeler 1991:415-418). Many local fortunes were lost including the one amassed by Jesse Driskill, whose Driskill Hotel opened during the Christmas season in 1886. Despite its difficulties, the population of Austin rose from 11,013 to 14,575 from 1880 to 1890 (U.S. Census Bureau 1890:25).

A dam on the Colorado River was completed in 1893. Lake McDonald was to bring Austin cheap water and electrical power, but the "gay nineties" ended on April 7, 1900. About 11:00 a.m., an eleven-foot tall wall of water swept the dam away, falling like an avalanche on the power house and drowning five workers and three young boys in an instant. The wall of water continued downstream to Austin, where it did considerable damage. There was no power, no water, no light. Overnight, Austin was plunged backwards a decade in its economic development (Humphrey 1985:153-154; Sevcik 1992:235).

Between 1890 and 1900 the population of Travis County rose from 36,322 to 47,386 (U.S. Census Bureau 1904:172). The loss of the dam with its water supply and its hydroelectric power meant that the city had a host of old problems to solve all over again. In 1909, A. P. Wooldridge was elected mayor of Austin. Upon being elected, he commented that "For a variety of reasons, east Austin had not had her share of good things, not because of discrimination, but because it just happened so" (*Austin American Statesman*, November 11, 1909). Most East Austin residents would have agreed with the first part of that statement.

In 1915, Wooldridge pushed through a \$750,000 bond package to make improvements to the city, including the establishment of Brackenridge Hospital, but the sewers and city parks he had promised for East Austin did not materialize. While the new city hospital was being built, other Austin landmarks were being closed down. Guy Town, the city's infamous forty-year-old red light district, was suppressed and an old Austin tradition was scattered to less conspicuous and less concentrated locations around town. A second dam was begun by a private firm, but was damaged by floods in 1915. The company went bankrupt and the dam remained something of a glorified waterfall until it was rebuilt as the Tom Miller Dam at the end of the 1930s (Humphrey 1985:167).

African-Americans still made up a significant percentage of the farm laborers in Travis County in 1915. In that year, 414 farmers interviewed in southern Travis County reported hiring a 3,756 laborers of whom 1,820 were African-Americans, 1,595 were either Mexican nationals or Mexican-Americans, and 341 were Anglo-Americans (Watkins 1916:130). Many of these people lived in East Austin and commuted to the fields in rural Travis County during the working seasons (personal communication, Simon Ybarra, June 1993).

In 1919 Wooldridge stepped down as mayor. His successors were no more sympathetic to the desires of African Americans than he or his predecessors. When the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's white secretary, John R. Shilladay, came to Austin that year, locals including county judge David Pickle and a

constable, beat him severely in front of the Driskill Hotel where Shilladay was staying. After the beating Shilladay returned to his room, where the mayor provided him with belated police protection until he could board a train. Judge Pickle said that they had given him "a good thrashing on general principles." According to Pickle, Shilladay's crime was that he "was advocating the doing away of all Jim Crow laws." Governor Hobby publicly condoned the attack and no one was arrested (Humphrey 1985:167).

In 1921 Capital Clan No. 81 was organized in Austin and within a year it could boast a membership of 1,500. Five hundred klansmen marched up Congress Avenue to the capital in 1921 (Humphrey 1985:174). In November of that year a Travis County Grand jury investigating the Austin clan found among its members or supporters the County Sheriff, one of his deputies, the Police Commissioner, the Chief of Police, and one of his detectives (Kraus 1973:147). Two weeks after the march down Congress Avenue, as many as 6,000 Austinites of all races attended a parade on East Avenue to commemorate the centennial of Mexican independence from Spain (Humphrey 1985:179).

In 1925, Mexicans and Mexican-Americans were concentrated in three main areas of Austin. The westernmost of these was bounded by the Colorado River to the south, Congress Avenue to the east, Sixth Street to the north, and Rio Grande Street to the west. A second cluster of Hispanic population was found on the east side of Congress Avenue. Most people in this second group lived in an area bordered by Fourteenth Street on the north, Trinity Street on the west, Sixth Street on the south, and East Avenue on the east. The third enclave of Hispanics resided in East Austin (Connell 1925:1-2).

In 1927 the city of Austin commissioned the Dallas consulting firm of Koch and Fowler to develop a city plan for Austin, which for the first time would include a comprehensive zoning ordinance and outline other desirable improvements to the city. Their report was published in 1928. Among their recommendations was a plan to reinforced patterns of racial segregation in Austin. Though couched in fairly innocuous language, it is plain that the authors were aiming at nothing short of establishing a

permanent black ghetto in East Austin and, to the extent possible by law, to remove blacks living in other areas of the city to that area, as this excerpt demonstrates.

There has been considerable talk in Austin, as well as in other cities, in regard to the race segregation problem. This problem cannot be solved legally under any zoning law known to us at present. Practically all attempts of such have proven unconstitutional. In our studies in Austin we have found that the negroes are present in small numbers, in practically all sections of the city, excepting the area just east of East Avenue and south of the City Cemetery. This area seems to be all negro population. It is our recommendation that the nearest approach to the solution of the race segregation problem will be the recommendation of this district as a negro district; and that all the facilities and conveniences be provided the negroes in this district, as an incentive to draw the negro population to this area. This will eliminate the necessity of duplication of white and black schools, white and black parks, and other duplicate facilities for this area. We are recommending that sufficient area be acquired adjoining the negro high school to provide adequate space for a complete negro play-field in connection with the negro high school. We further recommend that the negro schools in this area be provided with ample and adequate play ground space and facilities similar to the white schools of the city (Koch and Fowler 1928).

This plan was accepted by the city council and reprinted in 1957 by the Austin Department of Planning as a guide to future development. In 1929, the city established the Rosewood Avenue Park and Playground for Colored in East Austin in accordance with that plan. In 1931 the Mexican Playground and Park was also located on the east side (Kraus 1973:150-54). These were the only city parks where Hispanics and African Americans were allowed to recreate.

In the decade that followed the Austin City Plan, public schools for African Americans were relocated to the east side of Austin and city utilities were denied to African American enclaves elsewhere in the city. Segregation was strengthened as a result. By 1940 only one of eight public schools for African Americans in Austin, Clarksville Elementary, was not located on the east side of town (Brewer 1940:38). A Reconstruction era village settled by freed slaves, Clarksville was a well-established but

somewhat sequestered African American enclave on the city's far west side. Outside the central city, Clarksville did not attract redevelopment interests until much later in the century and thus was spared the "slum clearance" and "blight removal" efforts that occurred elsewhere to the west of East Avenue. Ultimately, East Austin did become the "negro district," as over the years deed restrictions prevented minorities from buying property in most other neighborhoods in the city.

When the Great Depression struck the country in the 1930s, African Americans were still at the bottom of the economic ladder in the United States and nationwide unemployment hit them harder than anyone else. In Austin, where African Americans formed eighteen and a half percent of the population, they made up 35.6% of unemployed workers in 1931-32 and 33.5% of the relief cases in 1935 (Barr 1973:154). By 1940, twenty percent of the population of Austin was African American, amounting to 20,000 people, almost all of them living in East Austin or Clarksville. Despite economic inequity, seventy-five percent of Austin's African American families owned their own homes in 1940, according to historian J. Mason Brewer. Half of them owned cars. African American salaries averaged eighty dollars per month. (Brewer 1940:67).

Tom Miller was elected mayor in 1933. He is remembered most for the dam that was named after him. The dam was rebuilt by the newly created Lower Colorado River Authority on September 1, 1938. Lyndon Johnson's influence was pivotal in the financing of the project. By March 4, 1940, the new lake was full and Austin once again had inexpensive power and water. In addition to this, flood control was made much more likely by the completion of the much larger Mansfield Dam upstream from Lake Austin, which was completed in 1941. The lake thus created was called Lake Travis and it held a hundred times more water than Lake Austin. The dam, three times as high as Tom Miller Dam, generated five times the amount of electricity. Austin's economic future seemed assured (Humphrey 1985:194-197).

In the twentieth century other issues besides dam water and power crowded Austin's cultural landscape and one of these issues was racial intolerance. African

Americans and Hispanic Americans continued to endure the control of Austin's white leadership. This was the case throughout most of Texas so it was a shock to white supremacists when a black man was almost elected to the Houston city council. As a result of that close call, Austin changed its city council representation from districts to an at-large basis, which guaranteed control of all seats by the white majority, in 1951 (Barr 1973:182). After two black men were elected to the Austin city council in the 1880s, no other African American served in that body until the 1970s.

Inequities characterized educational opportunities for African Americans in Austin, as well. The University of Texas remained closed to African Americans for half of the twentieth century. One of the first black students to enroll there, in the summer of 1950, was Edna Humphries Rhambo, a descendant of one of the early residents of the project area, Perry C. Rhambo (*Daily Texan* August 26, 1987; *On Campus* September 7, 1987; *U.T. News* August 20, 1987).

African American Businessmen in Austin During Reconstruction

While most African Americans were restricted to menial jobs in early Austin, there were some who became entrepreneurs. The 1872 Austin city directory lists E. H. Carrington's store at the corner of Pecan (6th) and Red River Streets (Gray and Moore 1872:37). In addition to fresh and canned foods, the Carringtons sold clothes, hardware, and farm supplies. Behind the store, Edward's brother, Albert ran an ice house and blacksmith shop. In 1883, Albert Carrington ran for the city council and became the alderman representing the Seventh Ward. He was defeated when he ran again in 1885 (*Austin Daily Statesman* February 16, 1979). It would be almost a century before another African American would sit on the city council.

Gabriel Holder had a grocery store on Red River Street between Seventh and Eighth streets. African American blacksmiths who ran their own shops in Austin included Peter Bratton and John Hemphill who had a shop on Colorado Street between Third and Fourth streets. John Hughes operated a smithy on Guadalupe Street between Eighteenth

and Nineteenth and lived next door. Allen Mitchell was on the southwest corner of Fifth and Colorado Streets. J. Pollard was on Fourteenth Street between Red River and Sabine. Louis Ranson had a shop in block 138. William. E. Risher and his sons were blacksmiths for decades in Austin. Risher's shop was on Sixth Street between Sabine and East Avenue and he lived on Seventh Street near East Avenue.

African Americans who owned barber shops in Austin in 1872 included Buckner and Robinson on Sixth Street between Colorado and Congress, Thomas Hancock, on Colorado Street between Seventh and Eighth, Harry Hawkins on Colorado between Sixth and Seventh, John Holland on Sixth Street between Colorado and Congress Avenue, Duke Mitchell in Dohme's building at the corner of Ninth and Colorado, Ed Wilkerson on Brazos Street between Fourteenth and Fifteenth, and Milton Wallace on Sixth Street between Congress and Brazos. Wallace lived on East Avenue.

African-American cobblers included R. Johnson, William Keys who had a shop on Red River between Seventh and Eighth, Henry Madison on Sixth Street between Colorado and Congress, Tom Plumber on Thirteenth Street between Red River and Sabine, and H. B. Willis on Sixth Street between Congress and Brazos. Willis lived in Wheatsville, another Reconstruction era Freedmans village, on Thirteenth Street between Nueces and San Antonio.

Stonemasons included the Mason family, who developed Masontown during Reconstruction, Charles Madison who lived on the corner of Fourteenth and Neches Streets, and Dowell Phillips on Colorado Street between Seventeenth and Eighteenth Streets. J. W. Gray was a confectioner on Colorado Street between Fifth and Sixth. Claiborne Lewis was a poultry and vegetable peddler at the southeast corner of Eighth and Sabine Streets. Joe Carter owned a restaurant on Sixth Street between Colorado and Congress Avenue. Harrison & Carruthers made wagons on Sixteenth Street between Guadalupe and Lavaca Streets. Alex Hamilton was a well digger who lived on Fifteenth Street between Trinity and Neches (Gray and Moore 1872).

Early African American Neighborhoods in Austin

During the era of slavery in Austin (1839-1865), tiny one and two room dwellings were built close to the alleys behind many properties as residences for household slaves. After Emancipation this housing pattern persisted as many Freedmen continuing to live in these dwellings and work as domestic servants for the Anglo American families who lived in the main houses on these properties (Manaster 1986:55).

Although this arrangement would continue into the early twentieth century, it was not long before many of Austin's African Americans began to buy property of their own. They were might be able to reside as domestics in shacks behind Anglo houses in the center of the city, or rent or own a modest house along flood-prone Waller or Shoal Creek, but they could not buy property in many of areas of the city. At first, this was by mutual agreement of white land owners; later it was codified by the introduction of restrictive deed covenants.

For example, by 1895 more than fifty homes had been built in Hyde Park, a new, suburban development on the city's north side (Humphrey 1985:144-145). The developer, M. M. Shipe, ran ads in the local press that featured lots for one to two hundred dollars that could be financed with payments as low as two dollars per month. Shipe reminded everyone in print that "it is stricly [*sic.*] for white people" (*Daily Tribune* 29 April 1898).

This restrictive situation led to the establishment of distinctive black neighborhoods, beginning during Reconstruction. In 1868 an African American newspaper published in Austin urged African Americans to purchase property and build their own homes (*Weekly Free Man's Press*, August 1, 1868). Early African American neighborhoods in Austin included Masontown, Wheatsville, Clarksville, and Robertson Hill, also called Pleasant Hill.

The development of Masontown, the first African American subdivision in Austin, was begun in 1867 by Rayford and Sam Mason Jr. Their father, Sam Mason Sr., owned his own house at the southwest corner of Trinity and First Streets as early as 1867 (Harrison 1867). They were a family of stonemasons. Masontown was bounded by

Chicon Street, Waller Creek, East Sixth Street and the East Third Street (Manaster 1986:90).

Wheatsville, sometimes called Wheatville, lay in the area of Austin now called West Campus. The neighborhood was named after James Wheat, who bought land a mile northwest of the capitol in 1869. Wheatsville was bordered by Twenty-Fourth and Twenty-Sixth Streets, Shoal Creek, and Rio Grande Street (Humphrey 1987:70). It was there that Jacob Fontaine opened Austin's first black grocery store and where he published an early black newspaper, the *Gold Dollar* (Fontaine 1983:56-59). This African American neighborhood succumbed to real estate development pressures associated with the ever-growing University of Texas and no longer exists. Today most of the area is rental property and the majority of residents are students.

Clarksville, on early Austin's west side, got its start when ex-Governor Pease gave land west of Shoal Creek to his ex-slaves. Charles Clark, for whom the neighborhood was named, built his house on what is now West 10th Street in 1871 (Humphrey 1985:12). At the time that Clark constructed his cabin there, much of what would become Clarksville was a tangle of cane breaks and juniper. It developed into a black community that has endured for a century in spite of serious pressure to redevelop the area into a wealthy Anglo neighborhood.

Little is known or written about the early African American residential settlement on Robertson Hill, in the area between East 10th Street and East 12th Street, east of East Avenue. The property was part of the J.W. Robertson estate and is associated with the Robertson home known as the French Legation.

Early African American Churches in Austin

African American churches were established in Austin soon after Emancipation. As early as 1864, a few African American Baptists met in a barber shop. Their pastor was Jacob Fontaine. In 1867, Fontaine founded the First Baptist Church (colored) at the corner of West Ninth Street and Guadalupe, where the Austin History Center is now

housed in the old Austin Public Library building (*Austin American Statesman*, February 13, 1984). That same year Fontaine convened the first meeting of the St. John Missionary Baptist Association under the branches of Treaty Oak, and went on to found the Sweet Home Baptist Church in Clarksville in 1877, the New Hope Baptist Church in Wheatsville in 1887 (*Daily Texan*, February 16, 1989), as well as many rural churches in Travis and adjacent counties..

Metropolitan A. M. E. Church was formed in the home of Mrs. Tempie Washington on Seventh Street. They held their first services at Smith's Opera House. The first pastor was Frank Green (Brewer 1950:18). The congregation built a church on Ninth Street, just west of the First Baptist Church (Koch 1887). The Wesley Chapel M. E. Church was founded on March 4, 1866, in the basement of the Tenth Street A. M. E. Church South, an Anglo church. African American workers erected a limestone edifice measuring 40 by 60 feet. Later, this building was sold to the Austin School Board and the congregation built a larger church (Brewer 1940:35).

The Ebenezer (Third) Baptist Church was organized in 1875 in the home of Mrs. Eliza Hawkins, on the corner of Ninth and Colorado Streets. It was called this because it was the house of worship for the third Baptist congregation organized in Austin. Brewer lists seven charter members, Eliza Hawkins, Robert Burditt, Isabella Johnson, Martha Pollard, Martha Carrington, Maggie Buckner, and Betsy Johnson (Brewer 1940:35). Craig lists the above as well as Queen Shaw, Ellen Johnson, Martha Egleston, Louanna Harrison, Lucy Jackson, John Saunders, Betsy Madison, Margaret Pollard, Henrietta Willis, Elizabeth Glasgow, Nelly Brewster, and John Spence (Craig 1976:2).

Shortly after the church was organized, the congregation held services in a small house at the corner of Catalpa and Curve Streets in East Austin. Preaching there were the Reverends E. S. Corn and C. Ward. From 1876 until 1884, the pastor of the church was the Reverend Andrew Herbert. In 1884, the pastor was Chester Anderson. On November 10, 1885, a new brick church was completed on the northeast corner of East 10th and San Marcos Streets, behind the Robertson Hill School which fronted onto East 11th Street.

The old church site on Catalpa and Curve was sold to a Methodist congregation. From 1886 until 1889, the pastor was Reverend C. P. Hughes, who was succeeded by the Reverend A.W. Moss, pastor through 1891. In 1892, the church building was renovated at a cost of 1,300 dollars. The church also got a new pastor, Reverend Lewis L. Campbell, who would serve for thirty-five years (Craig 1976:2-3). A new sanctuary was built in 1953.

Early African American Schools in Austin

African Americans in Austin began educating themselves immediately after emancipation. As early as October, 1865, the local press was scoffing at the opening of a Sunday School for African American children in Austin's Third Ward (*Southern Intelligencer*, October 26, 1865). On November 6, 1867 this ad appeared in a local newspaper, the *Daily Austin Republican*:

Wanted: A Teacher to take charge of a Republican School.

*H. C. Hunt, Treasurer
School Committee, Austin*

Joseph Welch, the superintendent of the Freedmen's Bureau in Texas, wrote at the end of 1868 that a new school had been recently constructed in Austin on a lot donated by the city council (Hornsby 1973:409). This article about the dedication of the school appeared in the local Republican newspaper a year before Welch wrote his report:

The first negro school was built by voluntary contributions of the colored people. Lead by the Post Band (playing our animated march) over a hundred children of both sexes marched down the avenue to take possession of the new school house...It is to the credit of the colored citizens of our town that they have, unaided, built the third school-house erected within its limits (*Daily Austin Republican*, November 6, 1867).

An Austin newspaper noted the colored school examinations in the summer of 1869 (*Austin Record*, July 2, 1869). The school was being taught by a single Anglo

teacher, Miss Evans, in 1871. This may have been the woman listed in the 1872 city directory as Mrs. S. J. Evans, who lived on Third Street between San Antonio and Guadalupe (Gray and Moore 1872:48). A local newspaper noted the end of the Spring semester in 1871:

The Colored School - The closing exercises of Miss Evans' school, at the Hall of Representatives last Friday night, resulted to the entire satisfaction of all concerned, and reflected great credit upon teacher and pupils (*Daily State Journal*, July 2, 1871).

The 1872 city directory lists among Austin's public schools, the Boy's school (colored), P. William Kramer, principal, and the Girl's school (colored), Fred Rogers, Principal, Miss Julie O'Connor, Assistant. The location of the residences of Rogers and O'Connor are not listed in the directory. Kramer boarded with Mrs. Lucy Bishop on East Eighth Street between Neches and Red River (Gray and Moore 1872:19, 69).

This school remained in operation until some time after 1877, when, according to historian Mary Starr Barkley, the Travis County Court forced Austin Schools to use excess money from the building fund of District Six (North Austin) to build two schools for African Americans. The schools were constructed in Wheatsville and on Robertson Hill (Barkley 1968:175). The Seventh Ward Public School was in the Third Baptist (Ebenezer) Church building at the corner of Curve and Catalpa no later than 1883 (Edwards & Churches 1883:37). From the beginning, the church and school were closely associated. When the church moved to its new sanctuary on Block 8, present East 10th Street, the school was moved into a new building behind it on East 11th Street. Both are evident on Koch's 1887 Birds Eye View Map of Austin.

Robertson Hill Public School, which later became Austin's first high school for African Americans, opened for classes by 1884. The school stood at the southeast corner of East 11th and San Marcos Streets, behind the Ebenezer Third Baptist Church (Koch 1887; Barkley 1968:182). An Austin Public Schools report published in 1954 stated that "the first location of a school for Negro children in East Austin was on San Marcos and 11th Streets. A part of the original building is still standing. This school was known as

the Robinson [sic] Hill School and was established in 1884" (Austin Public Schools 1954 Volume II:7). Tax records indicate that the school owned Lots 1-5 of Block 8 by 1885 (Austin City Lot Register 1885:130). This description of the Robertson Hill School by superintendent of Austin Public Schools A. P. Wooldridge was published in the *Austin Daily Statesman* in 1887:

Our Public Schools: Their Condition and Their Wants

I said in my former article that the state of the colored schools "was a condition rather than a progress." This is in part an exact truth, for while we have a frame building on Robinson Hill neatly furnished, the house is not painted on the interior, and the grounds are unfenced; this is the only colored school building in really good condition.....Exactly the same state of affairs (children crowded onto backless benches) exists in Miss Beulah Gibbs room on Robertson Hill. In these rooms the children are rather packed or penned than seated, to the great detriment of health as well as manners..... A. P. Woolridge (*Austin Daily Statesman*, June 2, 1887).

In 1896, the school had an enrollment of 84 students. By 1904, this number had risen to 177 (Brewer 1940:33). According to Barkley, the school operated at its 11th Street location until 1909, but a Sanborn Fire Insurance map drawn in 1900 labels the building "old and vacant" (Sanborn 1900). Another source suggests that the school was moved to its new location on the northwest corner of Curve and Olive Streets, immediately south of the former Third Baptist Church site at Curve and Catalpa, in 1907. It also states that was the year that the name of the school was changed to Anderson High School, in honor of Texas educator E.C. Anderson, brother of the principal, L.C. Anderson (Delta Sigma Theta Sorority 1972:22). The building included secondary only until 1913, when a separate high school was constructed on the present Kealing Junior High School site. Afterward, the school was known as Olive Street School and it served the East Austin African American neighborhood for nearly four decades. The school burned in 1947 (*Austin Public Schools* 1954, Volume II:7). The site is now a neighborhood park known as Lott Park.

African Americans from throughout the state were drawn to Austin for its higher education opportunities in the period following the Civil War. The Tillotson Institute had its beginnings in 1875. According to Shackles, "A small school taught by Mrs. Garland had been partially sustained by the American Missionary Association in Austin, which proved to be a stepping-stone to the Institution" (Shackles 1973:3). After the Civil War, Reverend George Jeffrey Tillotson of the American Missionary Association of Congregational Churches determined to organize a school of higher education for African Americans in the capital of Texas. Tillotson was a pastor in Connecticut and his friend and colleague, Reverend William E. Brooks, who had been pastor of the Congregational Church in Westhaven, Connecticut, was the first president of the college Williams (1997:285).

Tillotson purchased land east of the State Cemetery and planned the campus of what would be the first African American College in the southwest, the Tillotson Collegiate and Normal Institute. Tillotson Institute opened its doors in 1881. The first faculty and staff were Anglos like Mrs. Elizabeth Garland. Later many African American teachers taught there. Some of them, like Mattie Durden, were graduates of the Institute (Shackles 1973:20). Mattie Durden, a native of Refugio, was the first student to receive a college degree from the Institute. After teaching at the school for eight years, Mrs. Durden taught home economics at Anderson High School for more than twenty years (Brewer 1940:56).

Elizabeth Garland was born in Wales in 1840 (U.S. Census Bureau 1880). Mrs. Garland's School for Colored Children, at the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church, was in existence by June 29, 1878, when her students gave a public exhibition of their work (*Daily Democratic Statesman*, June 30, 1878). In 1880 she was taking donations to furnish the student housing at the Tillotson Institute, where she later taught grammar (*Daily Democratic Statesman*, September 15, 1880, February 14, 1882). Elizabeth Garland was a school principal at the First Ward Primary Public School by 1885 (Morrison & Fourmy 1885:110).

C. T. Garland was a native of New Hampshire (U.S. Census Bureau 1880). He addressed a crowd of 3000 people at the 1878 Juneteenth celebration at Wheeler's Grove and Governor Davis shared the podium with him that day. The newspaper referred to him as Judge Garland (*Daily Democratic Statesman*, June 20, 1878). Between the years 1883 and 1895, C. T. Garland was an attorney and U.S. commissioner. The couple lived at 1609 East 9th Street in the Blackshear neighborhood near the Tillotsen Institute until C. T. Garland's death in 1895 (Morrison & Fourmy 1895:145).

The Institute was a success and 250 students, mostly from the Austin area, enrolled the first year. New buildings appeared on the campus regularly. Allen Hall was completed in 1881, Beard Hall in 1894, Evans Industrial Hall in 1912, and the Administration Building in 1914. At first, the school had to teach its students the elementary skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic, as African Americans were prohibited from obtaining an education under slavery. By 1888, the school was offering a four year college course. It was accredited as a junior college in 1925 by the Texas Department of Education and in 1926, the school briefly became a women's college. The high school at the Institute was closed in 1930 and the school's accreditation was upgraded to senior college level. The school became co-educational again in 1935. In 1952 the school merged with Samuel Huston College to become Huston-Tillotson College (Williams 1997:287-88).

Samuel Huston College was founded in Dallas Texas in 1876 in the basement of the Saint Paul Methodist Episcopal Church, although it would not be known by that name until 1883. The Reverend George W. Richardson was its first president. The church and school were burned down that year by white supremacists. In 1878, the school moved to the more tolerant city of Austin and opened in the Wesley Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church. The college struggled for a long time, but in 1883 Samuel Huston of Marengo, Iowa, gave the school \$9,000 and six acres were purchased adjacent to East Avenue in Austin. The school was renamed for its benefactor. By 1906 it boasted an enrollment of 517 (Williams 1997:300-308). In 1952, the school merged with Tillotson Institute.

The Samuel Huston College campus, sited between East 11th Street and East 12th Street east of East Avenue, was a major attraction for African American residential development in the East Austin after the turn of the 20th Century. Many of its early teachers owned houses in the 800 and 900 blocks of East 11th Street, a strip known as Faculty Row. Others bought houses built by Swedish and Irish immigrants on East 12th, East Thirteenth and East Fourteenth Streets, immediately north of the main building. Samuel Huston's development and success, along with the presence of the Robertson Hill and Olive Street schools, as well as the establishment of major churches, spurred the popularity and growth of East Austin for African Americans.

Robertson Hill and the Settlement of East Austin

The residential development of Robertson Hill and the surrounding area popularly known as East Austin began during Reconstruction in the late 1860s. This settlement resulted in the establishment of an area which is primarily African American in its ethnic and cultural traditions; however, East Austin has never been completely African-American in its racial make-up. Many Swedes and Germans once lived in there, as well as other European immigrants such as Irish and Italians. There has always been a Hispanic presence in the area as well, primarily to the south East 11th Street.

In the latter twentieth century the explosive growth of the University of Texas destroyed entire residential neighborhoods on East Austin's western edge and increasing numbers of students rented houses in East Austin, a process which continues today. As real estate prices have soared, many Anglo families have bought houses there and this, combined with a steady influx of Hispanic residents beginning in the early twentieth century during the Mexican Revolution, has altered the racial make-up of old East Austin. Today it is probably closer demographically to the kind of integrated community that it was in its early developmental years than it has been since the self-conscious move toward neighborhood segregation that began in earnest in the late 1920s.

During Reconstruction, as Wheatsville and Clarksville were developing on Austin's west side, Masontown and Robertson Hill were being established on the city's east side. The settlement of Robertson Hill began with a French diplomatic mission to the Republic of Texas. On September 15, 1840, French charge d' affairs Alphonse Dubois De Saligny purchased just over twenty-one acres of land on a hill east of Waller Creek, a short distance east of the town of Austin. Today that parcel is bordered by Interstate 35, San Marcos, Seventh and 11th Streets (Travis County Deed Book Q:561-64).

There Saligny built the house known as the French Legation, which still stands today. Saligny's brief stay and his involvement in the "Pig War," which may have cost the Republic of Texas a French loan, have been well documented (Barker 1971). After Saligny left town some of his staff continued to live there for a short time. When William Bollaert came through Austin in 1843, he noted that the legation was abandoned, its doors open and its wooden shutters broken (Bollaert 195-96).

Dr. Joseph W. Robertson bought the French Legation in 1848 and the hill on which it was located became known as Robertson Hill (Hafertepe 1989:26). Robertson first came to Texas in 1836. He moved his family to Austin in 1840 and opened a drug store on Congress Avenue. His wife Ann and his daughter Elizabeth died in 1841, leaving him with only his son, Jack. In 1842 he married Lydia Lee, the daughter of Judge Joseph Lee. The couple had ten children (Hafertepe 1989:24-25). In 1843 and 1844, Robertson was the mayor of Austin (Brown 1902 Chapter 11:17).

Joseph Robertson began to sell lots and larger parcels on in 1869. After he died of tuberculosis in August, 1870, more of the family's East Austin property was sold by his wife, Lydia, and his son, George (Travis County Deed Records Index). George Robertson opened a grocery and feed store at the northeast corner of East Avenue and Seventh Street by 1872, just after the arrival of the H&TC Railroad ensured the area's commercial future. He also had a wagon yard there (Gray & Moore 1872:). A clerk, H. Grooms Lee, who lived on the property, would later become Austin's city marshal (Morrison & Fourmy 1885:80). This store was one of the earliest in East Austin.

The Robertsons sold individual lots as well as larger parcels which were then subdivided by their new owners. Both white and African Americans purchased property in the area between East 11th Street and East 12th Street. Whites tended to buy parcels on speculation and remained absentee property owners while African Americans generally purchased lots for resale to other African Americans as homesites. They typically bought parcels of an acre or two and subdivided them for sale to family or friends, particularly fellow church members, keeping a building lot for construction of their own home (HHM&M 1998).

Disaster may have encouraged African American settlement in Robertson Hill in the 1870s. Many African Americans moved to Austin from rural areas looking for opportunity and protection during this period and some bought residential lots on Robertson Hill. Disaster may have been an impetus to African American settlement in Robertson Hill, as well. A large number of African Americans lived along the banks of Waller Creek at the southeast end of downtown Austin and a major flood in 1869 left many of these residents homeless (*Austin Record*, July 9, 1869). Robertson Hill was high above the flood plain and must have looked very attractive to black residents who had lost their homes and possessions to the waters of Waller Creek and the Colorado River.

The first lot in Robertson Hill sold to Malick Wilson, an African American, in December 1869, a few months after the flood. Wilson's property lay in the 1000 block of East 11th and is now a vacant lot. Dozens of other lot sales followed in the early 1870s. The arrival of the H&TC Railroad in 1871 further spurred growth in the area, both to homeowners and speculators, both white and black. One of the earliest African American landowners on Robertson Hill was Eliza Bell who obtained a parcel of property from her employers, the Robertsons, and built a two-room house on the site. She sold surrounding parcels to other African Americans. Her house, modified to its present L-plan configuration in the 1950s, still stands at 1012 Juniper Street (Johnson interview, 2000).

East Austin was depicted on Augustus Koch's first birds' eye view of Austin, published in 1873. Koch portrayed most of the area east of East Avenue as a dense

juniper thicket with a few scattered residences along its western fringes. The French Legation was there as well as small clusters of modest houses to the north in the neighborhood that today lies between East 9th and East 12th Streets and between Interstate 35 and Waller Streets. There were also houses in Masontown to the south (Koch 1873). Over the next fourteen years this residential core expanded, merging with Masontown and other neighborhoods to the south, extending to Huston Tillotson College to the east, and reaching north to a point southeast of the University of Texas (Koch 1887).

The establishment of the Tillotson Institute and Samuel Huston College marked a renaissance on Austin's east side. By the early twentieth century, these two colleges, operating in close proximity to one another, gave East Austin an edge over similar ethnic neighborhoods in the Texas. At a time when public universities were restricted to whites, East Austin was an educational haven for African American families. African American children living in East Austin had neighborhood elementary schools, a public high school and two colleges in their midst at the turn of the century. Some rural families boarded their children in the houses of East Austin families so they could have the benefit of a high school education.

East Austin Businesses

One of the most important twentieth century developments in East Austin has been the establishment of a largely African American business district there. By the early 1880s, there was a mixture of homes, businesses, and public buildings along East 11th Street and it soon developed into the commercial heart of East Austin. The first businesses along the street on Robertson Hill were three corner groceries opened in the 1880s. They were owned and operated, not by African Americans, but by European immigrants.

As early as 1881, John Cherico from New Orleans owned a grocery store and residence at 1100 East 11th Street. By 1883, his widow, Catherine, known as Kate,

owned the store, advertising dry goods, groceries and country produce. Living with her and working as a clerk in the store in 1885 was her son, Felix. By 1887, Felix owned the store and John Cherico Jr. was a clerk there (Morrison & Fourmy 1881:66; 1885:85; 1887:88; Edwards & Churches 1883:61). Across 11th Street from the Robertson Hill School was Patrick McNamara's grocery and dry goods store, opened by 1883. The McNamaras, an Irish family, lived next door to their business (Edwards & Churches 1883). A later addition to the building, heavily altered, still stands at 1002 E. 11th Street.

By 1883, Italian immigrant Salvatore Bailetti owned a store at 1001 East 11th Street (1101), advertising groceries, beer and firearms for sale. Having tried his hand earlier with a grocery store at Nueces and 10th Streets in 1879 and operating a lunch room on the west side of Congress Avenue in 1881, he bought a two lots from George Robertson on May 12, 1881. Bailetti and his family lived in the same building at first, but by 1885, he had built a house on Waller Street (1006 Waller) across from the store (Morrison & Fourmy 1879:41; 1881:50; 1885:65; Edwards & Churches 1883:47).

In 1893, Simon and Hattie Chiappero lived with the Bailettis. Simon tended bar for Salvatore at the store and Hattie was a dressmaker. In 1895, Bailetti sold his store to German immigrant Carl Haehnel and opened The Orient Saloon at 701 Congress Avenue. Having advertised himself as a wine manufacturer in earlier directories, Salvatore was now an agent for the Italian Swiss Agricultural Colony in Asti, Sonoma County, California, producers of Italian-Swiss Colony brand wines and brandies. Chiappero opened his own grocery store at 301 West Sixth Street that year, but still lived in the neighborhood, at 1210 East 10th Street. The Bailettis continued to live at 1006 Waller Street into the twentieth century. Salvatore's widow, Cora, continued to live in the house after his death and still owned the property in 1903 (Morrison & Fourmy 1887:65; 1889:64; 1891:73; 1893:113; 1895:81; 1898:75; 1900:51; Austin City Lot Register 1903:191). On the north side of the street, Richard Arnold opened a German bakery across the street by 1891.

At the same time Italian and German immigrants owned and operated commercial enterprises on East 11th Street, African American institutions were established on the

same street. In 1884, the Robertson Hill School opened near the southeast corner of East 11th and San Marcos Streets and the new Ebenezer Baptist Church stood behind it on 10th Street. By 1891 the Wisemen's Hall, an African American fraternal lodge, was located east of the school on the same block, across from Arnold's Bakery. A newer building erected in 1949 still occupies the site today.

In 1905 all three of the corner stores opened in the 1880s, as well as the Arnold Bakery, were still in operation. Both the McNamara store and the Arnold Bakery were still owned by those families, but Carl Haehnel owned the Bailetti Store and his family would operate a store at that location into the 1950s. Louis Courreges owned the Cherico Store. Reflecting the city's expansion to the east, by 1905 three new businesses had opened in the 1100 block of East 11th Street, including Louis Scott's saloon, Herman Schieffer's Meat Market, and A. J. Raif's grocery and saloon. None of these businesses were operated by African Americans (Stephenson 1905:51).

Herman Schieffer owned a meat market and grocery at present 1122-1124 East 11th Street by the turn of the century. Schieffer built a home behind his store at present 1154 Lydia (formerly addressed as 1106 and 1105 Lydia) about the same time. Later, he purchased the land across the street that had been occupied by the Children's Home for Orphans until 1921 and built several bungalows as rental property.

East Austin was thriving after the end of World War I. In the 1920s and 1930s, scores of bungalows were built within the project area. Some were modest in scale and others were impressive. City water service came to East Austin between 1895 and 1902, but other city services lagged behind. Sewerage service came to most of the area by 1931. This service was not extended to Wheatsville and Clarksville on the west side until much later, another indication that the 1928 city plan was in full effect, denying city basic services to black neighborhoods outside of East Austin (Kraus 1973:150). There were many businesses along Sixth and 11th Streets and small corner stores scattered throughout the area. Most of these businesses were still owned by Anglos and more recent European immigrants, but some were owned by African Americans.

On East 11th Street in 1922, the Succetti brothers owned the McNamara Store, McNamara having sold it to Isaac Charles in 1910. The Bailetti Store was still owned by the Haehnel family and the Cherico store was now the J. T. Cagle Grocery. Richard Arnold still operated his bakery and Herman Schieffer his meat market, but the saloons were gone. The orphanage located in the 1200 block of East 11th between Lydia and Navasota Streets was designated for black children in 1922. The white orphanage had moved to a new building on East 38th Street, in Hyde Park, the previous year and the old building transferred for use as an African

During the 1920s and 1930s, more African Americans opened businesses in East Austin. As automobiles became common, service stations and automotive repair shops appeared. Murray Owens opened the Owens Garage on Bob Harrison Street in 1926 (Brewer 1950:23). Franklin's Barber Shop opened in 1932 at 1014 East 11th Street, in a small shop next door to the old bakery. By 1935, J. C. Stark operated a service station and grocery store at 1201 East 11th Street (Morrison & Fourmy 1935:617).

In 1936 African American businesses in Austin included five tire shops, nine tailors, a creamery, two furniture repair shops, two boarding houses, two meat markets, a beauty college, six service stations, Mosby and Lott's Lumberyard, two blacksmiths, sixteen cafes, seventeen grocery stores, a fish market, a theater, three drug stores, a print shop, three funeral homes, three shoe shops, seven garages, eight wood yards, three vegetable stands, ten beauty shops, a loan agency, and a hotel. In addition to African American school teachers, there were three physicians, ten insurance agents, two real estate agents, two policemen, and two mail carriers. In 1939, Theodore and Jewel Youngblood opened Jewel's Lunch Room (Brewer 1940:58, 63, 75).

By the early 1950s, African American businesses had proliferated in the area. On East 11th Street, now decidedly commercial in nature, was Fowler Electric Company, owned by the first licensed African American electrician in Austin. The Street Construction Company was there, as well as a coin laundry, the Modern Radio Laboratory, the Modern Building and Design Company, the Hollins Shoe Hospital, L. S.

Stewart's service station, Ross's Photography Studio, and C. H. Gaut's grocery store. There was the 11th Street Tavern, Harold Gregg's Recreation Club, the East Side Cleaners and the Montgomery-Robinson Cleaners, the Harlem Cab Company and the 11th Street Cab Company.

Johnny Holmes and his wife operated the Victory Cafe, a popular restaurant and nightclub. There was the Southern Dinette, owned by Jimmie Owens, Deacon Jones's Barbecue, owned by Walter Jones, and the Holiday Inn Restaurant, owned by F. G. Cain. Other restaurants included the East Austin Sandwich Shop, the 11th Street Cafe, the Steamboat Inn, the Hot Shot Inn, the Black Cat Drive In, the Burger Cafe No. 2, and Carlin's Place. The Hillside Drug Store, owned by U. S. Young, advertised itself as "Austin's only Negro prescription drug store." Barber shops included Franklin's, Everybody's, and the Southern. Jewell's Parisienne Beauty Shop, owned by Jewell Warren, as well as Florence's Rainbow, Josephine Edmondson's, and the Hilltop (Brewer 1950:21-23; Morrison & Fourmy 1952:783), operated during this period as well.

EAST AUSTIN PROPERTY TYPES

The Historic Resources Survey of East Austin identified a wide range of building styles, types, and forms, all of which reflect the area's rich and colorful history. In order to facilitate the evaluation and assessment of such a wide variety of properties, these resources, based on their original and/or current function, were grouped into categories or broad property types. These property types include: *Domestic; Religious; Commercial; Civic; Landscaping; Infrastructure; Commemorative; and Recreational.*

DOMESTIC BUILDINGS

The vast majority of buildings found in the project area are single-or multiple-family residences dating from the 1870s to the end of the survey period in the 1950s. These buildings cover a wide variety of forms, styles, and degrees of sophistication, reflecting both the range of socioeconomic backgrounds in the project area and the changes over 150 years of building evolution. To further aid in the review and analysis of these resources, they have been divided into several subtypes based upon their plan.

Linear Plans

One-Room

The simplest house subtype is the single-pen or one-room house. As a unit, it forms the basis for many of the other, more complex plan types. at its most basic level, the one-room dwelling is a rectangular- or square-plan building, one story in height, usually with a side facing gable roofline. The main entry is usually centered in the middle of the long side of the building, with a chimney, if present, at the end of the gable. Windows, if present, were few in number and small in size. This simple plan is most closely associated with very early settlement of the region, reflecting the residents' lower economic status and lack of available resources. As an initial building type, one-room houses were usually

constructed using locally available materials. In Texas, log construction was common, particularly in east and north Texas. Examples using native stone or other local materials were built in western, central, and southern parts of the state.

In the project area, there is one example of the one-room subtype (1706 E. 12th Street, rear). This dwelling is a wood-frame, side-gabled dwelling with a central door and fixed 4-light windows. Exteriors are clad with wood siding. The house has been severely altered with the addition of a shed-roof side extension. The building was constructed c. 1940 and most likely functioned as a rental property to the rear of the larger dwelling at 1706 E. 12th Street. Currently the building is used as a storage space.

Two-Room

The hall-and-parlor or two-room house was a dominant type of folk housing across the Southern United States during the second half of the 19th century. Construction of the type remained common through the first two decades of the 20th century. The form's name is derived from its linear plan, two rooms wide and one room deep. Typically, the two rooms are of unequal size, with the larger room originally serving as the public space for gatherings and meals, and the smaller room reserved for sleeping quarters. The roof is side-gabled. If a chimney is present, it is located centrally or at one or both gable ends. The primary entry door may be slightly asymmetrical, entering into the larger public room. Common variations include prominent front porches and rear gabled-roof or shed-roof extensions that provide additional space. A common subtype of the hall-and-parlor is the "Cumberland" house, with two front entries each entering a separate room.

The hall-and-parlor houses found in the project area reflect the type's defining features. These houses all follow a linear, rectangular plan with a side-gabled (1801 E. 13th Street) or hipped roof (813 E. 13th Street). The houses have a single asymmetrical entry or fall into the Cumberland-plan dual-entry subtype (1201 Short Hackberry). Most examples have full-width or prominent partial-width shed-roof porches extending across the front elevation of the house. With one exception ornamentation and decoration is

nonexistent. The exception, 900 Juniper, displays Queen Anne inspired detailing such as turned porch posts and decorative wood brackets.

The hall-and-parlor house, as originally built, offered little room for its residents. Additions and alterations are therefore quite common. These additions may have been constructed to accommodate additional family members, or may have been built when an increase in personal wealth allowed for the expansion. Rear additions dating to the early and mid-20th century are found on the majority of two-room dwellings in the project area. Finish materials vary from house to house. Original board-and-batten or bevel-wood siding is found on some examples (905 Olive, 1306 Chicon), while cement-asbestos shingle siding, brick veneer, or vinyl siding covers other houses. Roofing materials, doors, and windows follow a similar pattern.

Center Passage

Another common type of folk housing in 19th century Texas was the center-passage type. Like the hall-and-parlor, the center-passage house follows a linear, rectangular plan, usually with a side-gabled roof, full-width shed-roof porch, and gable-end chimneys. The center-passage house, however, inserts a central hallway between the two primary rooms, affording additional privacy between the public and private rooms of the house. The entry door is therefore symmetrically placed on the center-passage house, rather than the typical asymmetrical door placement on the hall-and-parlor. Usually the center-passage house is made of frame construction, although masonry examples are not uncommon.

There are a number of center-passage dwellings dispersed throughout the project area. These dwellings follow a rectangular plan and all have side-gabled roofs. Primary facades are typically symmetrical with full- or partial-width, shed-roof porches (907 E. 13th Street, 901 E. 12th Street). Due to the limited amount of space the center passage offers, shed-roof rear additions are prevalent throughout the project area. Exterior

cladding ranges from original bevel-wood or board-and-batten siding to later synthetic siding materials including aluminum, asbestos shingles and vinyl.

I-House

Basically, the I-house is a two-story counterpart of the center-passage subtype. The type was most commonly constructed in the midwestern United States, but is occasionally found in Texas. Like the center-passage type, the I-house typically has a linear plan, symmetrical entry, central hallway, and gable end chimneys. The I-house, with its two stories of height and grander appearance than other folk housing types, often indicated the wealth or standing of its residents.

The project area contains only one example of an I-house (810 E. 13th). This house follows the prototypical I-house plan, with a two-story linear plan, bevel wood siding, and brick gable-end chimney. A full-width two-story, Classically inspired gallery offers a typically Southern addition to a midwestern house type. This dwelling, much like the one story center-passage and two-room subtypes, has a rear shed-roof addition. This addition is two stories in height and one room deep with a lower, one-story addition attached to its rear.

Shotgun House

Although there is much debate as to the exact origins of this plan subtype's name, it is generally believed that the shotgun house plan originated from a traditional African house form transported to the Caribbean by African slaves. In the early *** this form first appeared in the US in the Southern river deltas. This simple folk plan was constructed in Texas between the late 19th century through the 1940s and is generally associated with African-American urban areas. In plan, the shotgun is similar to the two-room and center-passage subtypes in that it follows a linear, rectangular, one-story profile. The shotgun, however, is always a single room in width and varies from two to four rooms in depth. The roof is almost always front-gabled and chimneys, if present, are centrally located.

There are a total of nine shotgun houses in the project area. These dwellings generally follow the typical rectangular one room wide, three-to four-room deep shotgun house plan (1208 Angelina). Porches, if present, are partial or full width with shed or gabled roofs. All roofs, with one exception, are front-gabled. The exception, 1903 E. 13th, has a hipped roof. Most have board-and batten wood siding, although asbestos shingles and vinyl siding are also present. The most common alteration is the addition of a rear shed-roof wing.

Irregular Plans

During the last quarter of the 19th century, house forms in Texas began to depart from the symmetry and regularity of rectangular and square folk plans. The Victorian-era desire for irregular and "picturesque" forms, combined with advancing balloon-frame construction techniques, allowed for a variety of irregular house shapes. Common devices to achieve asymmetry included placement of projecting wings at one or more ends of the house, to break the flat plane of the main facade. Rooflines became more complex, as intersecting gables were used to accommodate the main mass of the house and the various projecting wings.

The irregular-plan house often allowed for greater space than was possible with a linear plan, with extra rooms and porch frontage from the projecting wings. The irregular-plan house, with little or no ornamentation, could be adapted from use by tenant or small landowning farmers. On the other hand, the form and style of the irregular-plan house could be elaborated to the level of a Victorian mansion, with substantial detailing and sophistication.

L-plan

The L-plan is derived by adding an offset front-facing gable to the basic side-gabled center-passage house type. The two intersecting gables form an ell, with the offset gabled wing extending forward. The off-center front-facing gable may continue towards

the rear of the building as well. A shed-roof porch often extends across one or both sides of the ell. The L-plan is usually one or one-and-one-half stories in height. The primary door is typically located at the center of the side gable, with entry into a central hall.

Original use of interior spaces mirrored that of the center-passage, with the projecting front room usually acting as the most important public space, connected to the kitchen or dining area. Sleeping areas were usually located on the opposite side of the central hall. Construction of L-plan houses remained popular into the early decades of the 20th century, particularly in rural areas. Typically, L-plan houses are of wood-frame construction with wood siding. Although some L-plan houses may lack any stylistic detailing, many 19th-century examples feature elaborate Victorian ornamentation along porches and gable ends.

There are a number of extant L-plan houses in the project area with estimated construction dates ranging from 1890 to 1935. They are generally one-story examples, with steeply pitched intersecting-gabled roofs. In order to provide for extra interior space, many have rear gabled-roof extensions or lower, shed-roof rear additions. Though the vast majority of these resources lack decorative detailing, several examples display Queen-Anne stylistic elements such as chamfered porch posts, decorative spindlework, jigsawn porch column brackets, and/or turned-wood porch columns and balustrades. Others feature Classical Revival elements such as eave returns and classical column porch supports. Exterior cladding ranges from ordinal bevel or board-and batten siding to later materials such as synthetic siding and brick veneer,

An interesting variation of this subtype within the project area is the hipped-roof L-plan. Though these dwellings display the same floor plan as the gabled roof L-plan, they differ in that their roof is either cross hipped (2100 E. 12th) or hipped with a front-gabled wing (1208 Short Hackberry) rather than cross gabled. As is the case with the cross-gabled L-plans, a number hipped-roof L-plans display modest Queen Anne or Classical Revival (1171 1/2 San Bernard) influences. The majority retain their original wood board-and-batten or beveled-wood exterior cladding.

Modified L-plan (Hipped-with-Cross-Gables)

The modified L-plan is an elaboration of the cross-gabled L-plan form. The modified L-plan adds an enlarged central section to the house form, covered by a steeply pitched hipped roof. The lower intersecting gables, typical of the L-plan, extend from this main hipped roofline. This typical roofline provides another common name for this form: "hipped-with-cross-gable". Popular between about 1890 and 1910, the modified L-plan type continued the popular trend towards asymmetrical form. Even more so than the simple L-plan, the modified L-plan could vary in ornateness, ranging from a simple one-story example lacking stylistic influences to an ornate two-story mansion with abundant frills and details. Often, the more ornate modified L-plan houses are associated with the Queen Anne style. The irregular roofline and overall asymmetry of the plan lent itself to features such as circular corner towers, cutaway bay windows, jigsawed spindlework detailing, prominent dormers, and decorative shinglework in the gable ends. This exuberance was most pronounced in the earlier examples of the type, constructed prior to 1900. The early 20th-century modified L-plan houses often follow "free classic" Queen Anne styling, with classically-influenced detailing such as Doric or Tuscan porch columns and a more centered primary entry door flanked by a transom and sidelights.

One of the finest modified L-plan houses in the project area fall within the latter category of the type, displaying relatively restrained ornamentation and limited asymmetry in overall form. With its hipped-with-cross-gables roof, 1119 E. 11th falls within the modified L-plan type. This c. 1910 house incorporates free classic Queen Anne stylistic elements, such as Doric column porch supports, a centered entry door flanked by a transom and sidelights, and pent roofs and decorative shingles in gable ends. Although this house shows noteworthy decorative detailing, its overall asymmetry is limited by its centrally located entry door, inset partial-width porch, and lack of wings projecting past the main facade.

1170 San Bernard is a good example of the prototypical form of the modified L-plan, with its central hipped roof and intersecting gables that project from the main

building mass. The house also features a wraparound porch across the modified ell, turned wood porch posts and balustrade, and decorative jigsawn brackets.

Other Irregular Plans (T-Plan, U-Plan)

The L-plan and Modified L-plan were the two most notable irregular-plan residential types found in Texas. However, the use of balloon framing and pre-cut lumber allowed for a wide variety of irregular floor plans and roof shapes. Consequently, a number of less common irregular-plan variants were constructed in the late 1800s, with a few examples still extant in the project area. The T-plan (1154 Lydia and 1600-10 Pennsylvania) basically follows the L-plan, with intersecting gables meeting at one end of the house. With the T-plan, though, the front-facing gable generally continues past the gable intersection to the rear of the house. In some cases, the side-facing gable also projects slightly past the intersection to form a more cross-axial plan. The U-plan (1192 San Bernard) consists of a main side gable with two projecting front gables, one on each end of the house. A porch often extends between these front-facing gables. When these front-facing gables continue towards the rear of the house, an H-plan (1107 Myrtle) can be identified. Like the other late 19th-century house types in the project area, the irregular-plan variants in the project area feature a wide range of ornamentation.

Massed Plans

By the 1910s, residential buildings were moving away from the asymmetrical plans favored for the previous three decades. The renewed use of classically inspired detailing on otherwise irregular house forms during the 1890s and 1900s may have marked the start of this trend. In addition, houses began to show more symmetry in plan after 1900. The typical massed-plan house gave even more usable interior space and porch space to its residents.

Pyramidal/Hipped Cottage (One-Story Pyramidal)

The Pyramidal or Hipped Cottage is a one- or one-and-one-half-story vernacular house type that stylistically anticipates the bungalows that succeeded it. Generally associated with the South, these dwellings were built in rural settings, in small towns, and in large cities between 1900 and 1925. The square or nearly square-plan gives the house has a distinctly boxy appearance. The typical Pyramidal/Hipped Cottage contains four unequally sized rooms that, like the bungalow, connect directly to each other without hallways. A wood frame wall and roof structure rests on a pier-and-beam foundation. Weatherboard siding is the most commonly used exterior material. Windows are typically coupled double-hung units, with a one-over-one light sash configuration. A porch leads to the entry on the principal facade. The porch is typically sheltered by the main roof but may have an independent roof. Ornamentation on the Pyramidal/Hipped Cottage is limited to the porch supports and railing, which are often Classically inspired. The pyramidal roof, which gives the style its name, is steeply pitched, with boxed eaves. Hipped or gabled roof dormers and chimneys are also important character-defining features of the style.

All Pyramidal/Hipped Cottages in the project area square or nearly square in plan, of wood-frame construction, with a pier-and-beam foundation. Porch variations include partial-width inset porches (1188 Coletto) and full-width porches (1907 New York Avenue). Detailing ranges from classically inspired columns (1180 Navasota), to box columns (1909 New York), to Eastlake (1604 New York) and Queen Anne ornamentation (1506 New York). Exterior cladding varies and included synthetic siding, wood board-and-batten and weatherboard siding, and stone veneer Composition shingles, and corrugated metal panels have replaced wood shingles as the roofing material of choice. A common alteration to the Pyramidal/Hipped Cottage is a rear addition, either shed-roofed or integrated into the original roofline or a shed-roof side addition.

Two-Story Pyramidal/Hipped House

The two-story Pyramidal House is contemporaneous with, and shares many character-defining features with the Pyramidal Cottage. Two stories in height, the Two-Story Pyramidal/Hipped House has a rectangular plan with a moderate or steeply pitched pyramidal or nearly pyramidal hipped roof. Two-Story Pyramidals with a symmetrical square plan are also known as Four-Square houses. Hipped roof dormers are a characteristic feature of this type. Construction is wood frame, resting on a pier-and-beam foundation. Exterior walls are typically covered with weatherboard siding, although stucco, wood shingles, or face brick were also used. Typical fenestration consists of one-over-one-light wood sash, double-hung windows arranged singly, or in groups. The main entry is usually offset to one corner of the front facade. Independently roofed porches usually extend the full width of the principal facades. The hipped roof is generally simple in design, relying on dormers and chimneys for interest. Composition shingles, corrugated or crimped sheet metal, and cement-asbestos shingles are common roofing replacements for the original wood shingles. Detailing is sometimes classically inspired, with the Doric order often used for porch supports. The overall form and roofline of Two-Story Pyramidals, particularly the Four-Square subtype, lend themselves well to modest application of Prairie Style detailing. Typical Prairie Style features found on even vernacular examples include low-pitched hipped roofs, overhanging eaves, full-width porches, and hipped-roof dormers. However, most vernacular Two-Story Pyramidals lack the ribboned windows, geometric patterning and heavy horizontal emphasis that typifies true high-style Prairie Style architecture.

Three Two-Story Pyramidal houses (1204-C Salina, 1618 Pennsylvania, 1706 E. 12th) are found in the project area. All have a basically rectangular footprint, although 1706 E. 12th appears to have a substantial alterations that disguise its basic proportions. Each has a nearly pyramidal hipped roof, although all lack the character-defining roof dormers and chimneys. 1618 Pennsylvania and 1706 E. 12th have porches that extend the full width of the main facade. However, 1706 E. 12th's porch has been completely

enclosed. Exterior cladding includes wood weatherboard siding, stucco finish, brick veneer, and beveled wood siding. Windows on all examples are one-over-one-light double-hung.

20TH-Century Popular House Types

Bungalow

The bungalow represents the most common house type of the early 20th-century house types. The bungalow first gained acceptance in California between 1900 and 1910, and quickly reached a peak of popularity throughout the United States between 1910 and 1930. The “bungalow” was used by many writers and designers of the age to describe any small dwelling with infinite variations in form and style, making it a vague and confusing term. As a general building type, bungalows are usually one story in height with low-pitched roofs, broad overhanging eaves, and prominent porches. Bungalow roof forms vary considerably. Front-gabled and cross-gabled examples predominated during the 1910s and 1920s, particularly in the South and Southwest United States. Side-gabled bungalows became more common in the late 1920s and 1930s. Hipped roofs were also occasionally applied to the bungalow type.

The interior of the bungalow marked a major shift in room placement and spatial arrangements. Most commonly, the bungalow was billed as a comfortable middle-class dwelling with a modern appearance and efficient layout. In response to improving technology and a new “informality” of living in the home, bungalows often had smaller kitchens and a combined living and dining area. Hallway space was kept at a minimum, with rooms opening directly from one to another. The defined public parlor vanished as a separate room. Typically, the bungalow had two rows of rooms running from the front of the house to the back, with a substantial front porch that could be used for entertaining or leisure time.

The bungalow is often associated with the Craftsman style, with its exposed rafter tails, decorative eave brackets, and battered porch columns and piers. Ironically, the

Craftsman style had its roots in the Arts and Crafts Movement, which championed the use of handcrafts in interior and exterior decoration. However, the bungalow was well suited for large-scale mass production. Buyers could order house plans and drawings from mail-order catalogs and journals, while some companies offered fully pre-cut house kits that could be delivered to the closest railway stop to the house site. Although the majority of styled bungalows followed Craftsman influences, a variety of other styles and decorative elements could be attached to the general bungalow form. Some bungalows employed Prairie Style or even Classical influences, while many later bungalows incorporated various attributes of the Period Revival styles, such as Tudor Revival and Spanish Colonial Revival, and Mission Revival. By the late 1920s and 1930s, fewer bungalows received the typical Craftsman decorative ornamentation, and the previously prominent porches began to lose importance in the overall plan. Entries began to be centered on the long side of the side-gabled bungalow, giving a more symmetrical and classically oriented appearance. The use of Classical or Colonial Revival details was revived, while the overall open-plan bungalow interior was incorporated into succeeding building types and styles.

The infinitely malleable bungalow could be adapted to a variety of sizes and complexities, to fit nearly any budget or stylistic desire. Many bungalows, particularly those located in rural areas or associated with less-affluent residents, had few decorative or stylistic influences beyond the overall form of the house. In some cases, older Victorian-era farmhouses received a renovation with Craftsman decorative elements, to more closely resemble the typical “modern” bungalow.

The project area reflects the variety of bungalow forms and styles. The majority of the area’s bungalows have front-gabled rooflines (1904 Pennsylvania), with more complex examples having intersecting gabled roofs (1206 Salina, 1308 Navasota) and clipped “jerkinhead” gables (1509 and 1505 E. 13th). A number of side-gabled bungalows (2103 E. 12th, 1005 E. 14th) are also present. An early hipped or pyramidal roof bungalow form (1002 Juniper) is also present in large numbers throughout the project area. This form,

which most likely represents a transition from the four-room hipped and pyramidal roof cottages to the bungalow plan.

Nearly all bungalows with unaltered exterior finishes have wood weatherboard siding, although wood board-and batten siding is also present. Most of the identified bungalows either lack stylistic ornamentation beyond the overall formal influence, or have only modest Craftsman detailing. Common Craftsman-style details observed on many of these bungalows include projecting partial-width front-gabled porches, exposed rafter tails, and triangular eave brackets. 1106 Myrtle and 1201 E. 12th provide good examples of the typical simple front-gabled bungalows with limited Craftsman influences. In some cases (1205 E. 12th, 903 E. 12th), battered wood columns or brick piers are present as porch supports. 1900 Pennsylvania and 1206 Bob Harrison are examples of a more vernacular front-gabled bungalow with little or no Craftsman stylistic influences. Much like the pyramidal and hipped roof cottage, the pyramidal and hipped roof bungalow tends to display a Classical influence when decoration is present. These influences are usually limited to Classical box column porch supports. Where present, original windows are generally one-over-one-light wood-sash.

Typical unstyled or Craftsman-style examples comprise most bungalows in the project area. However, a number of Bungalows are distinguished as more ornate or unique examples of the type. 903 E. 14th is likely the finest example of a Craftsman-influenced bungalow in the project area. The building is highlighted by its complex cross-gabled main house mass, with full-width front-gabled porch with battered wood box columns on brick piers.

The project area contains one gabled-roof bungalow that has some Classical Revival influences (1607 New York). This c. 1920 bungalow, with its front-gabled main mass and lower front-gabled, partial width porch, follows the typical Craftsman-influenced, front-gabled bungalow form. However, decorative details such as box column porch supports and a front facade entry flanked by sidelights and a transom give this

bungalow a unique Classical flavor. Tudor Revival influenced bungalows (806 1/2 E. 12th, 1108 Olive) are also present.

As with the other pre-World War II residential housing types, alterations and modifications are evident on a majority of the bungalows in the project area. Many bungalows still feature a range of Craftsman details, but have suffered major modifications, such as installation of non-original exterior siding, porch supports, windows, eave enclosures, or porch enclosures. Additions to the original gabled form are also present in some cases.

Inter-War Rectangular Minimal Traditional/Ranch

Following the Great Depression and World War II, new housing construction boomed as a result of years of pent-up demand, newfound economic prosperity, and legislation that favored new construction. The bulk of this residential construction took place on the peripheries of cities such as Austin and San Antonio. However, new houses were also constructed in rural areas, even as these regions were losing population through agricultural modernization.

The bulk of houses built in the major housing boom of the late 1940s and 1950s, as well as those constructed just prior to World War II as the Depression waned, magnified the architectural trends noted in later Bungalow houses. Many houses, particularly those built after World War II, were quite simple in both form and style. Reasons for this simplicity included: increasing standardization and prefabrication in building materials; a desire for inexpensive and quickly built housing; and the trends towards reduced ornamentation and eclecticism in architecture. Houses tended to have lower-pitched side-gabled rooflines, sometimes with an equally low-pitched front-gabled wing. Particularly after 1950, automobile garages were attached as an integral part of the house. The porch continued to wane in importance, often relegated to a small overhang at the main entry. Decoration was increasingly restrained and often reflected a more "traditional" motif. Exterior materials for postwar houses varied widely. Wood drop siding was often used for

wall cladding, as were brick or stone veneers. By the end of the historic period, synthetic materials such as cement-asbestos shingles, simulated stone veneer, and vinyl siding began to be used as original exterior finishes. On the interior, post-World War II houses generally continued the open-plan informality adopted by the earlier bungalows.

The Minimal Traditional style, popular from the late 1930s into the early 1950s, loosely adapted Colonial Revival details to immediate prewar and postwar houses, although even these influences were often limited to application of fixed non-functional shutters or use of multiple-pane windows. Eaves were enclosed and brought close to the house, in contrast to the open eaves of Craftsman-style bungalows. The Ranch style, more prevalent after 1950, placed more emphasis on the low-slung roofline, with a long side-gabled or hipped roof designed to elongate and flatten the house's appearance in relation to its surroundings.

Only a few houses of this type were identified in the project area. Most follow the typical rectangular plan, side-gabled roof profile (1207 Leona, 1305 Salina, 1203 Cotton). 1400 Cotton constructed c. 1955 is the only identified example of the Ranch style, with its low side-gabled roof and sprawling rectangular-plan appearance. The house, like other post-World War II residences in the project area, has undergone a series of later non-historic modifications.

COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

The project area contains a variety of historic commercial buildings, dating from the 1880s through the 1950s. These properties are primarily located along E. 11th and 12th Street commercial corridors with a small number on Chicon Street and one on the corner of San Bernard and E. 13th Street. Though these commercial properties display a range of plans, roof-forms, construction techniques, and exterior cladding, the majority of buildings within the project area can be grouped into broad subtypes based upon their principal physical attributes. These categories include One-Part Commercial Block; Two-Part Commercial Block; and Gas Station.

One-Part Commercial Block

Generally, the One-Part Commercial Block is a one-story, free standing or adjacent grouping of buildings consisting of a prominent plate-glass display window topped by a transom. Roofs are typically flat with a parapet. Decorative features typically include corbeled brick, ornamental panels, pressed-metal cornices, and cast stone copings. Though the majority of One-Part Commercial Blocks within the project area conform to this definition to the extent that they are flat roofed, one story structures with parapets, they tend to deviate from this definition in that they generally lack decorative ornamentation (1215 Chicon). Transoms, if present, have been obscured by unsympathetic alterations (1806 E. 12th, 1131-1133 E. 11th, 1000-1002 E 11th). Once prominent plate glass windows and doors have been replaced with smaller windows and solid-core wood or metal doors. In some cases the original primary facade has been completely replaced with a later more "modern" facade. The buildings located at 1806, 1808, and 1812 E. 12th Street are example of this trend. In each case the original facade has been encased by a later, almost severe stone veneer facade. Exterior materials include glazed tile, concrete block, scored concrete stone veneer, stucco, and brick.

Two-Part Commercial Block

The Two-Part Commercial Block is generally a two-to-four story commercial building in which the first story facade consists of a commercial storefront similar to that of the One-Part Commercial Block while the upper stories exterior openings are limited to smaller windows in varying patterns. Within the project area there are two resources that fall into this subtype. These two flat roof resources, 1814 and 1816-1818 E 12th Street, have been heavily altered by the application of a whitewashed scored-concrete finish over the original buff brick exteriors. Any decorative features or transoms have been obscured. Original first floor window and door openings have been severely altered as well.

Gas Station

Three pre-1958 vehicle service stations were identified with the project area. All three of these buildings have some relation to the service of automobiles in the early and mid-20th century. The Gas Stations at 1213 Chicon, 1614 E. 12th, and 1720 E. 12th are similar in form reflecting typical plans and appearances for service stations of the post-World War II era. These buildings are composed of a flat-roofed rectangular-plan mass, clearly divided into an office area and an adjacent two or three bay service area. A fixed flat-roof canopy extends across the former fuel island. Exterior cladding materials include concrete block wood siding, and enameled metal panels.

RELIGIOUS BUILDINGS

Sanctuaries

There are a total of seven pre-1956 churches in the project area. All are primarily front- gabled rectangular structures and all but one utilize brick exterior cladding. Adjacent side or rear wings or detached structures house administrative and or educational functions. Stylistic influences include Gothic Revival (1201 Waller, 1010 E. 10th, 1101 E. 10th, 1164 San Bernard), Colonial Revival (1701 E. 12th) and Greek Revival/Romanesque (1206 E. 9th). The oldest church, 1201 Waller, is unique in that is a rare surviving example of a late 19th century, Carpenter Gothic frame church. Character defining details include fishscale shingles, pointed-arch windows, Classically inspired gabled-roof entry porch, symmetrical facade, and steeply-pitched roofline. The other six churches were built in the 1940s and 1950s and display a less vernacular profile. The Gothic Revival churches display distinctive elements such as buttresses, rose windows, broad-screen facades, pointed arched windows, and cast concrete and stone spires. 1701 E. 12th, the Colonial Revival Church, with its Classically inspired front-facade portico presents a more symmetrical temple-front appearance. 1206 E. 9th, much like 1701 E. 12th, presents a symmetrical, temple-front appearance but displays a distinctly Romanesque flavor in its rounded arched windows and decorative brickwork.

Administrative/Educational

The administrative/educational buildings, as previously mentioned, are either adjacent or detached structures built to house the day-to-day administrative or educational functions of their associated churches. In two cases (1105 E. 10th and 1162 San Bernard), these buildings are detached former single-family dwellings converted house the administrative functions of the associated churches. 1206 E. 9th, rear is a substantially altered early rectangular building that formerly functioned as a monastery. The other resources of this subtype are later rear or side additions (1186 Chicon, rear; 1010 E. 10th, rear). Exterior cladding materials vary and include stone veneer, brick, synthetic siding, and wood siding.

CIVIC BUILDINGS

The buildings within the project area that fit into this type are those structures designed to house institutional or public functions. There are three buildings within the project area that fit into this category (1017 E. 11th, 1192 Angelina, 1174 San Bernard). 1017 E. 11th was constructed in 1949 as a Masonic Temple. It currently functions as a police station. This rectangular plan building, with its symmetrical facade and prominent two-story Doric portico, displays a distinct Greek Revival temple-front appearance. Exteriors are clad with brick veneer. 1192 Angelina, constructed c. 1930, is a rectangular plan structure with Spanish Colonial Stylistic influences. Character defining features include flat roof with parapet, rounded arched entry porch, and stucco exterior finish. A slight Craftsman influence is displayed in this building's decorative window screens. The third building in this category, 1174 San Bernard, was constructed as a medical clinic in 1941. The building currently functions as a single-family dwelling. This building is rectangular in plan and has a cross-hipped roof. Exterior materials include brick and

stucco and windows are 6/6 wood sash. Exterior ornamentation is limited to a decorative entry porch with a stucco exterior finish.

LANDSCAPING

Properties in this category are those structures built for the enhancement of the natural environment. Two resources, the stone and concrete steps 911 E 11th and the median at the 1300 block of Angelina, fit into this category. The property at 911 E. 11th originally functioned as a staircase for the house (now gone) at the same address. The median is a grassy plot of land surrounded by concrete curbing. In the middle of this median is a young live-oak tree.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Resources in the Infrastructure category include the structures that provide underlying support for the day-to-day operation of the city. Included in this category are several moonlight towers and a concrete culvert. The moonlight towers, located on E. 11th Street, Pennsylvania, and Colteto are steel structures built by the City of Austin in 1895 to provide nighttime illumination. The culvert, located in the 2000 block of E. 12th was constructed c. 1955 as a replacement for an earlier wood bridge.

COMMEMORATIVE PROPERTIES

The Commemorative category includes resources constructed to mark an important event, person, site, etc. There is one historic resource, located in the 1000 block of E. 9th, that falls within this category. This resource, a Texas Historical Commission site plaque, marks the former site of a female seminary. The site currently is the location of the Guadalupe Church educational facility. The structure consists of a metal plaque mounted on a steel pole.

RECREATIONAL PROPERTIES

Resources in this category include those properties within the project area related to entertainment and recreational activities. There are two properties in the project area, Swedish Hill Park and Lott Park, that are in this category. Swedish Hill Park, located at 907 E. 14th is a grassy lot with numerous live-oak trees. The park was dedicated in early 2000 and was the former site of a number of historic homes related to the Swedish Hill community. Lott Park, located in the 900 block of Olive Street, is the former site of the Olive Street School. Currently, the site is a grassy lot with recreational equipment and outdoor park furniture.

REFERENCES

Austin American Statesman

- 1979 February 16 issue of the newspaper, Austin.
1984 February 13 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

Austin City Gazette

- 1851 July 9 issue of the newspaper, Austin.
September 22 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

Austin Daily Statesman

- 1887 June 2 issue of the newspaper.

Austin Public Schools

- 1954 *Seventy-three Vital Years: Public Education in Austin 1881-1954*. Austin.

Austin Record

- 1869 July 9 issue of the newspaper, Austin.
July 2 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

Baker, D. W. C.

- 1875 *A Texas Scrapbook*. A. S. Barnes and Company, New York.

Barker, Nancy N.

- 1971 *The French Legation in Texas, Volume I*. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Barr, Alwyn

- 1973 *Black Texans: A History of Negroes in Texas 1528-1971*. Jenkins Publishing Company, Austin.

Bollaert, William

- 1956 *Bollaert's Texas*. edited by W. Eugene Hollon and Ruth L. Butler. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Bolton, Herbert E.

- 1915 *Texas in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century: Studies in Spanish Colonial Administration*. 1970 Texas History Paperback Reprint, University of Texas Press and the Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Brewer, J. Mason

1940 *An Historical Outline of the Negro in Travis County*. Samuel Huston College, Austin.

1950 *A Pictorial and Historical Souvenir of Negro Life in Austin, Texas 1950-51*. Austin.

Brown, Frank

ca. 1902 "Annals of Travis County and the City of Austin from the Earliest Times to the Close of 1875."

Connell, Earl Monroe

1925 *The Mexican Population of Austin, Texas*. Master of Arts Thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Costa, Joe A.

1875 *Census of Austin Texas*, 5 volumes, Austin History Center.

Daily Austin Republican

1867 November 6 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

1868 July 20 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

August 17 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

December 1 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

Daily Democratic Statesman

1878 June 20 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

June 30 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

1880 September 15 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

1882 February 14, 1882 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

Daily State Journal

1871 July 2 issue of the newspaper.

Daily Texan

1987 August 26 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

1989 February 16 issue of the newspaper.

Daily Tribune

1898 April 29 issue of the newspaper.

DeBow, J. D. B.

1854 *Compendium of the Seventh Census*. A.O.P. Nicholson, Public Printer.
Washington.

Delta Sigma Theta Sorority

1972 *A Pictorial History of Austin, Travis County, Texas 1839-1920*. Huston-
Tillotson College, Austin.

Edwards and Churches

1883 *Edwards and Churches General Directory of the City of Austin For 1883-
84*. E.W. Swindells, Austin.

Fontaine, Jacob III with Gene Burd

1983 *Jacob Fontaine: From Slavery to the Greatness of the Pulpit, Press, and
Public Service*. Eakin Press, Austin.

Foster, William C.

1995 *Spanish Expeditions Into Texas 1689-1768*. University of Texas Press,
Austin.

Gage, Larry Jay

1960 "The City of Austin on the Eve of the Civil War." *Southwestern Historical
Quarterly*, Volume LXIII (3) January:428-438. Texas State Historical
Association, Austin.

General Land Office

1830 Spanish Collection Volume XVI, Empresario Contracts:131-133.

Graham, Phillip

1938 *The Life and Poems of Mirabeau B. Lamar*. University of North Carolina
Press, Chapel Hill.

Gray, Judge George H.

1872 Outline History of Austin. In the 1872 Austin City Directory, Austin
History Center.

Gray, S. A. and W. D. Moore

1872 *Mercantile and General Directory of Austin, Texas 1872-73*. S. A. Gray
Book and Job Printer, Austin.

Gonzales, Anibal

1982 *Sayersville Historical Association Bulletin*.

Gullick, Charles A., editor-in-chief

1928 *The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*. Six Volumes, Texas State Library, Austin.

Hafertepe, Kenneth

1989 *A History of the French Legation in Texas*. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Harrison, William

1867 "Crazy Billy Map of Austin Texas," Austin History Center.

Hornsby, Alton Jr.

1973 "The Freedmen's Bureau in Texas 1865-1870." *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Volume LXXVI(1), April. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Humphrey, David C.

1985 *Austin: An Illustrated History*. Windsor Publications, Austin.

Jenkins, John H. and Kenneth Kesselus

1990 *Edward Burleson, Texas Frontier Leader*. Jenkins Publishing Company, Austin.

King, Edward

1874 "Glimpses of Texas." *Scribner's Monthly*, Volume VII November, 1873 to April, 1874. Scribner's and Company, New York.

Koch, Augustus

1873 *Birdseye View of the City of Austin, Texas*.

1887 *Austin: State Capital of Texas*.

Koch and Fowler, Consulting Engineers

1928 *A City Plan For Austin, Texas*. Koch and Fowler Consulting Engineers, Inc., Dallas.

Kraus, Steven Joseph

1973 *Water, Sewers and Streets: The Acquisition of Public Utilities in Austin, Texas 1875-1930*. Thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Lack, Paul Dean

1973 *Urban Slavery in the Southwest*. Dissertation, Texas Tech University, Lubbock.

Malone, Billy Charles

- 1958 *An Early History of Austin, Texas 1839-1861*. Thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Manaster, Jane

- 1986 *The Ethnic Geography of Austin, Texas 1875-1910*. Thesis, University of Texas, Austin.

Masson, Marilyn, Terry Jones, Mike Myers, and Dana Anthony

- 1993 *Cultural Resources Survey and Assessment for the Proposed Reuse of Bergstrom Air Force Base and Adjoining Areas, Travis County, Texas*. Hicks & Company Archeology Series Number 28, Hicks & Company, Austin.

Morrison, C. D. and Company

- 1879 *C.D. Morrison and Company's General Directory of the City of Austin For 1879-80*. Jennings Brothers Publishing Company, Marshall, Texas.

Morrison & Fourmy

- 1881 *Morrison and Fourmy's General Directory For the City of Austin For 1881-82*. E. W. Swindells, Austin.
- 1885 *Morrison and Fourmy's General Directory For the City of Austin For 1885-86*. Morrison and Fourmy General Publishers, Galveston.
- 1887 *Morrison and Fourmy's General Directory For the City of Austin For 1887-88*. Clarke and Courts, Galveston.
- 1889 *Morrison and Fourmy's General Directory For the City of Austin For 1889-90*. Clarke and Courts, Galveston.
- 1891 *Morrison and Fourmy's General Directory For the City of Austin For 1891-92*. Clarke and Courts, Galveston.
- 1893 *Morrison and Fourmy's General Directory For the City of Austin For 1893-94*. Clarke and Courts, Galveston.
- 1895 *Morrison and Fourmy's General Directory For the City of Austin For 1895-96*. Clarke and Courts, Galveston.
- 1898 *Morrison and Fourmy's General Directory For the City of Austin For 1898-99*. Ben C. Jones Company, Printers, Austin.

- 1900 *Morrison and Fourmy's General Directory For the City of Austin For 1900-1901*. Morrison and Fourmy General Publishers, Galveston.

On Campus

- 1987 September 7 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

Peareson, P. E.

- 1900 "Reminiscences of Judge Edwin Waller." *Texas State Historical Association Quarterly*, Volume IV July:33-53. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Ramsdell, Charles William

- 1910 *Reconstruction in Texas*. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Red, William S.

- 1913 Allen's Reminiscences of Texas 1838-1842. *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Volume XVII (1) January:43-60. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Salinas, Martin

- 1986 *Historic Indian Populations of the Rio Grande Delta, Their Role in the History of Southern Texas and Northeastern Mexico*. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Map Company

- 1900 Fire Insurance Maps of Austin, Texas.

Scarborough, Clara Stearns

- 1973 *Land of Good Water (Takachue Pouetsu): A Williamson County History*. Williamson County Sun Publishers, Georgetown.

Sevcik, Edward A.

- 1992 "Selling the Austin Dam: A Disastrous Experiment in Encouraging Growth." *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*. Volume XCVI (3) October:215-240. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Shackles, Christine I.

- 1963 *Reminiscences of Huston-Tillotson College*. Austin.

Smallwood, James M.

- 1981 *Time of Hope - Time of Despair: Black Texans During Reconstruction*. National University Press, Kennicat Press, Point Washington, New York.

Southern Intelligencer

1865 October 26 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

Southwell, Sam Beall

1949 "A Social and Literary History of Austin From 1881 to 1896." Thesis, University of Texas, Austin.

Stephenson, J.B.

1905 *City Directory of Austin*. J. B. Stephenson, Printer, Austin.

Terrell, Alex W.

1910 "The City of Austin From 1839 To 1865." *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, Volume XIV:114-128, October. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Thrall, Homer S.

1879 *A Pictorial History of Texas From the Earliest Visits of the European Adventurers to A.D. 1879*. N. D. Thompson and Company, Publishers, St. Louis.

United States Bureau of the Census

1850 Slave Schedule of the Seventh Census: Travis County, Texas. Government Printing Office, Washington.

1853a *The Seventh Census: Population and Social Statistics*. Robert Armstrong, Printer, Washington.

1853b *The Seventh Census: Report of the Superintendent of the Census For December 1, 1852 to which is appended the Report For December 1, 1851*. Robert Armstrong, Printer, Washington.

1860 Slave Schedule of the Eighth Census: Travis County, Texas. Government Printing Office, Washington.

1880 Population Schedule of the Tenth Census: Travis County, Texas. Government Printing Office, Washington.

1904 *The Twelfth Census: Population*. United States Census Office. Washington.

U. T. News

1987 August 20 issue of the newspaper.

Weddle, Robert S.

1964 *The San Saba Mission, Spanish Pivot in Texas*. University of Texas Press, Austin.

Weekly Free Man's Press

1868 August 1 issue of the newspaper, Austin.

Wheeler, T. B.

1920 "Reminiscences of Reconstruction in Texas." *Texas Historical Association Quarterly*. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Williams, David A.

1997 *Bricks Without Straw: A Comprehensive History of African Americans in Texas*. Eakin Press, Austin.

Winkler, Ernest William

1907 "The Seat of Government in Texas." *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association*, Volume X (3) January:185-245. Texas State Historical Association, Austin.

Ybarra, Simon

1993 Personal communication to James T. Jones and Marilyn Masson.

Yoakum, Henderson K.

1855 *History of Texas from its First Settlement in 1685 to Its Annexation to the United States in 1846*. Volume II, Redfield Publishing Company, New York.

Interviews: See Annotations at the end of References Section

Daniels, Barbara with Terri Myers, August 3, 2000

Hancock, Buster with Eleanor Thompson and Terri Myers June 2, 2000

ANNOTATED ORAL HISTORIES: EAST AUSTIN HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEY

The following annotations are taken from oral histories conducted by project director Terri Myers and preservation liaisons Eva Lindsey and Eleanor Thompson as part of the East Austin Architectural and Historical Survey project. An earlier interview that Ms. Myers conducted with Mrs. Mabel Hancock Walker Newton is included for its relevance to the project area and to African American history in East Austin. Other informal interviews took place during the course of the project but those included in this report are directly related to the developmental history of the East Austin survey area.

Barbara Daniels: Interview with Terri Myers, August 3, 2000

Mrs. Daniels is the former historian for Simpson United Methodist Church. She said the congregation formed from Wesley Chapel. The Sunday School organized in 1879 and met in a school near present Blackshear (possibly Robertson Hill School). The church itself organized in 1880. She discussed the transition that was taking place in the development of East Austin: Wesley Chapel had been located near Trinity and 11th Street. When people began moving east from Trinity Street, Simpson and Wesley broke away from one another.

The old church was built in 1922 and faced The parsonage was located on an adjacent lot at 1703 E. 12th. It was removed in the 1980s. The new church building at 1701 E. 12th Street was constructed in 1952. It replaced a house and barn on the site and is built on the foundation of a partially underground stone basement that may have been part of the barn.

Mrs. Daniels' family was from Caldwell County and she was real young when she moved from Lockhart. They first lived in the St. Johns Addition which stretched from Highland Mall to Highway 183, east on Cameron Road and south to Highway 290. Willie Toliver Jr. Formal Interviews June 12, 2000 and September 15, 2000

Buster Hancock: Informal Interview Eleanor Thompson and Terri Myers June 2, 2000

This interview focused on members of the Hancock family, descendants of slaves and reported to have been sons of Judge John Hancock. Buster is the grandson of Orange Hancock. He lives in East Austin as does his cousin Emma Riley, another of Orange Hancock's grandchildren. She lives at 1903 E. 16th Street and has much information about the family.

According to Buster, Orange Hancock had 23 children. One, Emma Hancock Wicks, was recorded in the famous WPA era slave narratives in which she described life as a little girl during the last years of slavery near the Hancock plantation (present Rosedale) and in the first years after emancipation on the farm near Waters Park. Emma eventually moved into town with her son Frank Wicks and they lived on New York Street near Buster Hancock's present home. Buster's father James (Orange's son) moved from the Orange Hancock farm to the African American enclave of Clarksville. Buster grew up in Clarksville at 1704 W. 11th (now 1904 W. 11th Street). His father James was a railroad worker who worked six days a week.

Many of the Hancock descendants and others who lived in the "Negro Community" near the Waters Park and Duval community eventually moved to East Austin for better schools and greater job opportunities, particularly in the 1930s and 1940s. Among their names are Hancock, Daniels, Wicks, Dickerson and Hansborough.

Mrs. Artie Johnson: Interview with Terri Myers, August 7, 2000

Mrs. Johnson who was born and raised in rural East Austin engaged in several telephone interviews with Terri Myers from her home in San Francisco. A formal interview was conducted on August 7, 2000 and focused on the history of the Eliza Bell House at 1012 Juniper Street in the East Austin project area. Mrs. Johnson had contacted the city of Austin, and subsequently Ms. Myers, to seek a historical marker for the house due to its age and associations with Mrs. Bell, who was one of the earliest landowners in the project area. Mrs. Johnson's sister, Ella Irene Hill Bell, had been married Eliza Bell's grandson, Willie "Bill" Bell, since 1918 and had lived in the house at 1012 until her death

in 1995. Both Mrs. Johnson and her sister knew "Granny Bell as she was called and cared for her in her old age. According to Mrs. Johnson, Eliza Bell's mother and uncle "Uncle Henry" worked for a man named Robinson [sic] who "owned all of land around there" (Robertson Hill) and they either were deeded or sold the parcel containing her house from him. Mrs. Bell's mother and uncles (Henry and William Bell) subdivided the land on Juniper Street and sold lots to family members and friends beginning in the 1870s.

Mrs. Johnson stated that Mrs. Bell told her that the house was the oldest one in the neighborhood, "the old homestead". In 1918, when Mrs. Bell was 95 years old, she told Mrs. Johnson that she had planted the Pecan tree that is still in the yard when she was 14 years old, which would date the tree to 1837. This seems unlikely since the city of Austin wasn't incorporated until 1838 and the Robertsons didn't acquire the property until 1848. Still, the house and the Bell's occupancy may possibly date to the antebellum period. Robertson is known to have owned slaves and to have built quarters for them to the north of his home (the French Legation)(Hafertepe 1989). Mrs. Johnson stated that the house was originally a 2-room cabin and that she had added several rooms including an indoor bathroom in the 1950s to its present configuration. The house now has two bedrooms, a living room, dining room, kitchen and bathroom. Mrs. Hill died about five years ago (1995?) and the house passed to her grandson and great grandson. Mrs. Johnson believed the grandson had died but the great grandson 's still lives in the house. Other early residents of Juniper Street that Mrs. Johnson knew from the early 1900s were the Shackles and Waltons. She knew Dr. Hamilton (James Hamilton who owned the Dedrick-Hamilton House at 914 E. 11th Street). The Manns who lived a couple houses to the west, were "newcomers" [the Manns lived at 10068 Juniper and then built a stone veneered house at 1004 Juniper about 1945 (both demolished by Anderson Community Development Corporation 1998)].

Mrs. Johnson's family, the Hills, also lived in East Austin. She was born and reared on Webberville Road. Her parents, George and Ella Hill organized the Pleasant

Hill Baptist Church in East Austin and they were celebrating the 100th anniversary of the church this year.

*Leonard Mann: Interviews with Terri Myers May 9, 2000 and with
Eleanor Thompson and Terri Myers September 12, 2000*

Leonard Mann met with members of the East Austin Architectural and Historical Survey team and city of Austin staff Jerry Freese and Barbara Stocklin on May 9, 2000, in the project area to discuss property ownership, demographic, use and social change in the area, particularly on E. 11th Street. On September 12, 2000, he met with project director Terri Myers and preservation liaison Eleanor Thompson at the Southgate-Lewis House, 1501 E. 12th Street, for a formal taped interview. A full transcript of the interview taped on September 12, 2000, is on file at the Austin History Center. The following information was gleaned from the two meetings.

Mr. Mann was born in 1932. His parents were Leonard and Olive Dorn Mann from East Texas, Weimar, east of La Grange. He grew up in the shotgun house at 1008 Juniper Street (destroyed 1998) and his mother built a new stone veneer house at 1004 Juniper during World War II when his father was stationed in the Phillipines (demolished 1998). He is very familiar with the businesses on E. 11th Street from the 1940s onward. His father owned a Phillips 66 service station on E. 11th. Other noteworthy businesses in the 1940s and 1950s were Dr. Young's Hillside Drugstore at Navasota, Walter Yates' variety and liquor store, Deacon Jones' Bar B Q and Breakfast restaurant at 1002 E. 11th Street. Dr. DeLashwa was another pharmacist who owned the large house on the hill east of the Hillside Drug (now the offices of Planned Parenthood) on E. 11th Street.

Mr. Mann emphasized the importance of the Schieffer family to the community on East 11th Street. They remained in the neighborhood after many other white families had moved away. According to Mr. Mann, three members of the family had stucco houses near one another. Several family members owned and operated the meat market

and grocery. They helped [African American] families in the neighborhood by offering credit and jobs when needed.

Mr. Mann also discussed how African Americans were systematically moved further and further east from central Austin as land values increased and their property became more valuable to whites. He gave an example of Dr. Young a pharmacist who started out with a store on San Jacinto, later moved to 6th Street and East Avenue and finally to E. 11th and Navasota (Hillside Drug). This happened to many others, he said. Institutions such as churches were likewise moved from the central city to the east side.

In the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s a lot of whites, particularly Germans lived in the area. They began moving out in the 1950s and 1960s. Arnold's Bakery - there was a bakery in the front and a house in back. It became the Southern Dinette in the 1940s and 1950s. [possibly an attached unit that has since burned?]

Mabel Hancock Walker Newton: Interview with Terri Myers on January 29, 1999

Mrs. Newton was interviewed as part of a project to document the Rubin and Elizabeth Hancock farmstead in the small community of Waters Park, in far North Austin. She is a granddaughter of Rubin Hancock who was a slave and, according to

African American enclaves in Clarksville and Wheatville, East Austin had the attraction of the county's only black high school and two black colleges. Rural families often sent their older children to board with families in East Austin while attending Anderson High School or college. Many never returned to the farms and made new lives in the expanding African American neighborhoods of East Austin during the early 20th century.

Ora Lee Taylor Nobles: Interview Eleanor Thompson and Terri Myers, July 17, 2000

Mrs. Ora Lee Taylor Nobles taped a formal interview with Terri Myers and Eleanor Thompson on July 17, 2000, in her home at 2008 E. 8th Street, Austin, Texas. A full transcript of this interview has been submitted to the Austin History Center. Mrs. Nobles is an East Austin political and social activist whose interview focused on family and community life in the 1930s and 1940s. Although she did not grow up in the immediate project area, her interview shed light on development and demographic patterns in East Austin in the early 20th century.

Mrs. Nobles was born April 28, 1921 in Travis County. A midwife attended her birth at the family home at 2014 E. 9th Street. Her sister Julia Faye Mitchell still lives in the family house. Mrs. Nobles parents Maude Estelle Fields and Monroe Taylor Sr. had the house built about 1915. Lots in the Grandview Addition lost \$50 and the mortgage was \$5.00 per month. They used to send money orders to the "Homeowners Exchange" at 444 Cotton Exchange Building, Dallas, Texas through Gracy Title. Both the house Mrs. Nobles lives in now and her parents' home are in the Grandview Addition.

Mrs. Nobles said the neighborhood was always integrated with blacks, Mexicans and whites. Neighbors included the Boatwrights, Frank Cushback, Durants (white) and the Gonzales and Mendoza (Mexican) families. Her family were working people: father worked first as a truck driver and later a foreman at Calcasieu Lumber for a total of 35 years. Her mother washed clothes for UT students. Both her parents catered parties for members of the lumber company. Mother and children picked cotton, as well, and went as far as El Paso and Corpus Christi to do so. Generally, they picked fields near Hutto,

Taylor, Georgetown, and New Sweden where they stayed in "cotton picking shacks". They got about .50 cents per 100 pounds of cotton.

The family shopped at Franzetti's Checker Front Store on 6th Street. They were one of the only families to own a car and had a garage. Her father gave rides to the neighboring ladies who worked at the Driskill and other downtown hotels when he went to work in the mornings. She remembered a 1929 Dodge. Everyone used the streetcar and the end of the streetcar line was 6th and Chicon while the city limits were at Pleasant Valley Road. For amusement, the family sometimes took the streetcar to Lake Austin on Saturdays. Other family members lived around town and some came in from the country to visit. Sometimes they went to visit family in Kyle.

Mrs. Nobles attended Gregorytown School - now Blackshear - beginning when she was about eight years old. She attended Kealing and then old Anderson. Later she went back to night school and graduated from new Anderson. In 1937, at age 16, she went to Madame Christian's Crescent Beauty School. [Perhaps she had to quit school at one point?, "Daddy got sick - I had to go to the cotton patch"]. She took the state exam and built a beauty shop behind the house. She always kept the family home but lived at 1404 Apt. D Cotton for 18 years.

11th and 12th Street businesses recalled by Mrs. Nobles included Miss Pie Johnson's store, a grocery and cafe at the corner of 11th and Chicon, on the east side. There is a house and a little store where they had chili. The Starks had a store by King Tears (on E. 12th Street). Mrs. Nobles had a Bar B Q that just closed. On the corner of E. 11th Street and Waller, Howard Wynn had a beer joint (Haenel Store?). Mr. Mayes had a liquor store where the Victory Grill is. F.G. Kane had a beer joint. Where there is now a vacant lot is Rock Carter's Cab Company and there were houses from the lodge further on down (toward East Avenue?).

Haehnel Store (1123 E. 11th) was a grocery store and Big Boy Davis' barbershop. There was a bakery (Arnold's ?) and next door Mrs. Josephine Edmundson lived on the corner. Mrs. Dedrick was -- (Jewel?) Hamilton's mother. Tillie Stewart was her daughter

too. Ankie Kirk bought the house next door (912 E. 11th Street, now demolished). Millie Kane and her mother lived there.

Mrs. Nobles was raised in both the Holiness Church (her mother's) and Primitive Baptist (father). The Holiness Church was where Greater Mt. Zion is now. At home the family had a garden where they grew onions, beans, potatoes, greens. Each child had a chicken and they even had cows, horses and Mexicans had goats.

Except for 6th Street, the streets were not paved in East Austin until very late. Eleventh Street was eventually paved. Miss Hattie Nichols and Mrs. Nobles' mother fought to get sewer, paving and gas in the neighborhood in the late 1930s and early 1940s. They still had outside toilets at that time. At one time Emancipation Park was by the railroad tracks. There was a celebration there for the 1876 centennial. When Mrs. Nobles was a child it was in Rosewood. The creek now runs under Washington Avenue down Poquito Street. They used to pick watercress along the creek.

Industrial properties included a cotton gin on 6th and Comal, a railroad roundhouse at 6th and Chicon. Where the Durants had a beer joint at 6th and Chicon, the horses would come to water at a trough. There was an oil mill and a place where they killed animals (on 6th). People brought animals down to dip vats there. There were beer joints on 6th, 7th, 11th and 12th Street. Sixth Street had the [most] businesses.

Mr. Roger Taylor: Interview with Karen Riles & Eleanor Thompson, September 7, 2000

Mr. Taylor discussed historic businesses along East 11th Street and East 12th Street, especially clubs such as the Cotton Club and Victory Grill. He described the 800 block of East 11th Street as "faculty row" where many of the Samuel Huston College teachers lived. That entire area has since been demolished. Mr. Taylor detailed his mother's efforts to bring gas and other services to East Austin and described the family's early activism in bringing city services to the African American community. He discussed changes in the physical environment, such as the loss of "Lookout Point" and the development of IH-35. He stated that Lookout Point was a hill that lay in the middle of

East Avenue. Developed with steps somewhat like present Mt. Bonnell, people could hike to the top for views of the city. It was a popular Lovers Lane before being leveled for the highway. Mr. Taylor also discussed the eradication of neighborhoods on the west side of East Avenue, particularly those along Sabine and in the vicinity of present Brackenridge Hospital, where African Americans were displaced as a result of urban renewal.

Ms. J. B. Thompson: Interview with Eva Lindsey, July 20, 2000

Ms. Thompson was born in 1915 at 910 E. 10th Street, moved to a house on Rosewood Avenue and grew up on E. 13th Street, all within the East Austin project area. Ms. Thompson was an educator and lifelong resident of East Austin. She attended Gregorytown School (now Blackshear) and old Anderson High School. Both the home in which she was born and the house on Rosewood have been demolished as part of urban renewal efforts. Mrs. Thompson discussed educational facilities, historic businesses, churches and neighborhoods in East Austin, and the effects of urban renewal on the community.

Willie Toliver Jr.: Interview with Terri Myers, June 12, 2000

Willie Toliver Jr. met with Terri Myers at his home at 5501 Manor Road, Austin, Texas 78722 on two occasions and had several follow-up telephone conversations. See formal transcript of taped June 12, 2000 interview. Tapes and transcripts are on file at the Austin History Center as part of the East Austin Architectural and Historical Survey project.

Mr. Toliver's interview focuses on the importance of E. 12th Street as the heart of a thriving commercial and residential corridor through East Austin in the 1940s and 1950s. It is detailed and offers valuable insight on the influence of African American educators in the community, the community's cohesiveness, and fact that people of all economic classes lived in the same neighborhood because of segregation.

Mr. Toliver grew up on East 13th Street in the project area. He was born in 1937 and lived with his mother Nelline Toliver and grandparents Harry and Louise Lott at 1405 E. 13th Street. Mr. Toliver said he is four generations removed from slavery. Mr. Toliver's family on his maternal grandmother's side goes back to Elizabeth Glasco a woman who was a slave and after emancipation opened a restaurant on E. 6th Street in Austin. Elizabeth Glasco is the matriarch of the family. Her daughter was Cora E. Glasco Hamilton who married Isaiah Hamilton, a blacksmith. Mr. Toliver allowed us to scan a photograph of Mr. Hamilton at work. Hamilton's daughter Louise married Harry Lott, one of Austin's first postal carriers (photograph) for whom Lott Park, in the project area, is named. Both Louise and Harry were prominent within the East Austin African American community. Mrs. Lott was a businesswoman who administered an insurance agency and was active in establishing the Howson Community Center on Angelina Street.

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1000 E. 9th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District
1000 block E. 9th	commemorative	historical marker			Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1002 E. 9th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1890		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1004 E. 9th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1008 E. 9th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1885		Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1985; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1010 E. 9th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1885		Eligible under Criterion C	Fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1012 E. 9th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1900		Eligible under Criterion C	Fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1014 E. 9th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1106 E. 9th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations and architectural craftsmanship; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1108 E. 9th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1206 E. 9th	religious	rectangular	1950	Greek Revival/Romanesque	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1206 E. 9th, rear	religious	rectangular	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1005 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District
1009 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District
1010 E. 10th	religious	rectangular	1953	Gothic	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1010 E. 10th, rear	religious	rectangular	1955		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1011 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1013 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1101 E. 10th	religious	rectangular	1923	Gothic	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1102 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1915		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1104 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1885		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1105 E. 10th	religious	center passage	1880		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District
1106 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	modified L-plan	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District
1107 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1108 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1926	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1108-B E. 10th	domestic: single-family	shotgun	1924		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1108 E. 10th, rear	domestic: single-family	two-room	1924		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District
1109 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1110 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1893		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1111 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1915	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District
1115 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	modified L-plan	1905	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1204 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	irregular	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1206 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1212 E. 10th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
900 E. 11th	commercial	rectangular	1960		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
911 E. 11th	landscaping	stone steps	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
912 E. 11th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1880		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; one of few extant examples of its type.
916 E. 11th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
920-A/B E. 11th	commercial	rectangular	1960		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
924-28 E. 11th	commercial	irregular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1000-02 E. 11th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1006 E. 11th	commercial	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1010 E. 11th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1880		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1017 E. 11th	civic	rectangular	1949	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; distinguished example of its type.
1101 E. 11th	commercial	irregular	1883		Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1985; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1104 E. 11th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1950		Eligible under Criterion A	NR listed in 1998; significant for historic associations.
1107 E. 11th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1119 E. 11th	domestic: single-family	modified L-plan	1910	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 9th-10th Street Historic District.
1122-24 E. 11th	commercial	rectangular	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1123 E. 11th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1131-33 E. 11th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1200 block of E. 11th	infrastructure	moonlight tower	1895		Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1976; local landmark; significant for historic associations; one of 19 extant examples of its type.
1209 A/B/C E. 11th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1211 E. 11th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
901 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1885		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
903 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
905 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1010 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1016 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	modified L-plan	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1112 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1115 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1901		Eligible under Criteria A, B, and C	Significant for associations with historic trends and persons; fine example of its type
1117 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1901		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1201 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1204 E. 12th	commercial	rectangular	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1205 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1209 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	modified L-plan	1895		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1215 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1219 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1224 E. 12th	commercial	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1301 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1910	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1308 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1315 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1319 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1406 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1410 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	hipped	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1416 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1500 E. 12th	commercial	rectangular	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1501 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	irregular	1888	Craftsman, Queen Anne, Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1985; significant for historic associations; distinguished example of its type.
1506 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1514 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1514 E. 12th, rear	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1514 E. 12th, rear	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1614 E. 12th	commercial	gas Station	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1700 E. 12th	commercial	rectangular	1945		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1701 E. 12th	religious	rectangular	1952	Colonial Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1706 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	foursquare	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1706 E. 12th, rear	domestic: single-family	one-room	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1713 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1720 E. 12th	commercial	gas Station	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1804 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1806 E. 12th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1808 E. 12th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1810 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1812 E. 12th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1814 E. 12th	commercial	two-part commercial block	1946		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1816-18 E. 12th	commercial	two-part commercial block	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1900-04 E. 12th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1906 E. 12th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1912 E. 12th	commercial	shotgun	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1914 E. 12th	commercial	one-part commercial block	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1915-A/B E. 12th	commercial	rectangular	1960		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2000 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	irregular	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2000 block E. 12th	infrastructure	culvert	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2001 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	irregular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2003 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2005 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2007 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Classical Revival/Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
2008 E. 12th	commercial	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2100 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
2103 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
2104-A E. 12th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
2104-B E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2105 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2106 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2107 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2108 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
2109 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2110 E. 12th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
806 1/2 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930	Tudor Revival	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
808 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
810 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	center passage/ I-house	1873	Classical Revival/Italianate	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Designated a local landmark; determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
813 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	two-room	1880		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; one of few extant examples of its type.
813 1/2 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	shotgun	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
817 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	hipped	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
902-A E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
902-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1950		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
904 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	irregular	1908		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the Swedish Hill Historic District.
905 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
907 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1875		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the Swedish Hill Historic District.
908 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	two-room	1880		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
909 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	modified L-plan	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the Swedish Hill Historic District.

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
910 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
911 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1000 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	irregular	1895		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the Swedish Hill Historic District.
1001 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1909	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the Swedish Hill Historic District.
1002-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1005 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1006-A E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1006-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1007 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1008 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1009 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1200 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1201 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1203-A E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 13th Street Historic District.
1203-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1203-C E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1205 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1206 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1207 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1304 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1306 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1307 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1308 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1310 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 13th Street Historic District.
1312 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1313 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1314 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1315 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1317 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1402 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1407 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; one of few surviving examples of its type; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1409 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1411 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; excellent example of its type; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1502 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1503 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1504 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1895		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the 13th Street Historic District.
1505 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1506 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1507 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1509 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1509-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1600 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1601 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1602 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1603 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1604 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1605 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1915		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1607 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1609 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1611 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1701 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1703 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1705 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1705 E. 13th, rear	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1800 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1885		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1801 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	two-room	1895		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1802 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1803 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	two-room	1915		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1807 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	two-room	1915		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1809 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1903 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	shotgun	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; one of few extant examples of its type.

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1904-A E. 13th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1904-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	two-room	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1905 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; outstanding example of its type.
1906 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1908 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2000 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2003-A E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2003-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2005 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2007-A E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2007-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1950	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2008 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2100 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2102 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2103-A E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2103-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
2104 E. 13th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2105-A E. 13th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; one of few surviving examples of its type.
2105-B E. 13th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
903 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1915	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1986; significant for historic associations; outstanding example of its type; contributes to character of the Swedish Hill Historic District.
907 E. 14th	recreational	park			Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1003 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1005 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1007 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1009 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the Swedish Hill Historic District.
1011 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1930	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Swede Hill Historic District
1507 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1509 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1511 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1605 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1605 E. 14th, rear	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1701 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1703 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1801 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1803-B E. 14th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1907 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1909 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2003 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2005 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2101 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	center passage	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2103-A E. 14th	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2103-B E. 14th	domestic: single-family	two-room	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2105-A E. 14th	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2105-B E. 14th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2107 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2109 E. 14th	domestic: single-family	T-plan	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1180 Alamo	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1207 Alamo	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1309 Alamo	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2100 Alamo	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1190 Angelina	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1890		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1192 Angelina	civic	rectangular	1930	Spanish Colonial Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1995; local landmark; significant for historic associations; rare example of its type.
1206 Angelina	domestic: single-family	shotgun	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1208 Angelina	domestic: single-family	shotgun	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1300 block Angelina	landscaping	Median			Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1304 Angelina	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1200 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1202 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1206 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1208-A Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1208-B Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1209 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1210 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1212 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1304 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1305 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1306 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1310 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1312 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1915		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1314 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1915	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1316 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1400 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1402 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	hipped	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; best example of only two extant dwellings of this type within the project area; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1402-B Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1403 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	two-room	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1404 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	hipped	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1405 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	center passage	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1406 Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	center passage	1915		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; one of few surviving examples of this type.
1408-A Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	shotgun	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; one of few extant examples of its type.

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1408-B Bob Harrison	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1411 Bob Harrison	commercial	one-part commercial block	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1411 Bob Harrison	commercial	one-part commercial block	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1189 Branch	domestic: single-family	center passage	1900		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
912 Catalpa	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1001 Catalpa	domestic: single-family	two-room	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type
1181 Chicon	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1183 Chicon	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1186 Chicon	religious	rectangular	1934		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1186 Chicon, rear	religious	rectangular	1961		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1191 Chicon	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1200 Chicon	commercial	rectangular	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1203 Chicon	commercial	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1209 Chicon	commercial	one-part commercial block	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1212 Chicon	commercial	one-part commercial block	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1215 Chicon	commercial	one-part commercial block	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1217 Chicon	commercial	gas Station	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1301-A Chicon	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1301-B Chicon	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1301 Chicon, rear	domestic: multiple-family	rectangular	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1304 Chicon	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1306 Chicon	domestic: single-family	two-room	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1308 Chicon	domestic: single-family	shotgun	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1184 Coletto	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1188 Coletto	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910	Classical Revival	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1194 Coletto	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1204 Coletto	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1206 Coletto	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1208 Coletto	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1210 Coletto	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1300 block Coletto	infrastructure	moonlight tower	1895		Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1976; listed as a local landmark; significant for historic associations; one of 19 extant examples of its type.
1304 Coletto	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1194 Comal	domestic: single-family	center passage	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1195 Comal	commercial	shotgun	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1204 Comal	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1300 Comal	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1920		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1303 Comal	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1890	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; excellent example of its type; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1313 Comal	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1313 1/2 Comal	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1304 Concho	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1945		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1305 Concho	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1306 Concho	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1308 Concho	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1310 Concho	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1203 Cotton	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1204 Cotton	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1205 Cotton	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1206 Cotton	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1207 Cotton	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1209 Cotton	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1306-A/B Cotton	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1400 Cotton	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955	Ranch	Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1408 Cotton	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1165 Curve	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1937		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1200 Hackberry	domestic: single-family	center passage	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1201 Hackberry	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1202 Hackberry	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1208 Hackberry	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
900 Juniper	domestic: single-family	two-room	1890	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; one of few extant example of its type; contributes to character of the Juniper Street Historic District..

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
902 Juniper	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1885		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the Juniper Street Historic District.
904 Juniper	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1885		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; excellent example of its type; contributes to character of the Juniper Street Historic District.
905-A/B Juniper	domestic: multiple-family	hipped	1890	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the Juniper Street Historic District.
908 Juniper	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
911 Juniper	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
913 Juniper	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1945		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
915-A Juniper	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1945		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
915-B Juniper	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1945		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
1002 Juniper	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1915	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1009 Juniper	domestic: single-family	two-room	1885		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; one of few remaining examples of its type.
1011 Juniper	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1012 Juniper	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1870		Eligible under Criterion A	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; one of few remaining examples of its type
1013 Juniper	domestic: multiple-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1100 Juniper	domestic: single-family	two-room	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1104 Juniper	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1183 Leona	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1186 Leona	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the New York Historic District
1190 Leona	domestic: single-family	hipped	1905		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type
1203 Leona	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1204 Leona	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1205 Leona	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1940		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1206 Leona	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1207 Leona	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1302 Leona	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1945		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1307 Leona	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
900 Lydia	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
904 Lydia	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1154 Lydia	domestic: single-family	T-plan	1895		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1155 Lydia	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1106 Myrtle	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1107 Myrtle	domestic: single-family	H-plan	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1109 Myrtle	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1113 Myrtle	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1157 Navasota	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1159 Navasota	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1170 Navasota	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1173 Navasota	domestic: single-family	center passage	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1174 Navasota	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1175 Navasota	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1180 Navasota	domestic: single-family	hipped	1910	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A, B, and C	Significant for associations with historic trends and person; fine example of its type.
1182 Navasota	domestic: single-family	center passage	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1184 Navasota	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1186 Navasota	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1190 Navasota	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1191 Navasota	commercial	rectangular	1952		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1192 Navasota	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1195 Navasota	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1208 Navasota	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; excellent example of its type.
1300 Navasota	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1308 Navasota	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1915	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1503 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1504 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; defines the character of the New York Historic District.
1506 New York	domestic: single-family	hipped	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; excellent example of its type; defines the character of the New York Historic District.
1604 New York	domestic: single-family	hipped	1905	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; defines to the character of the New York Historic District.
1606 New York	domestic: single-family	irregular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1607 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; outstanding example of its type; contributes to the character of the New York Historic District.
1608 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1910	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to the character of the New York Historic District.
1612 New York	domestic: single-family	hipped	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the New York Historic District
1617 New York	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; excellent example of its type; contributes to the character of the New York Historic District.
1704 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1706 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1708 New York	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1802 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1803 New York	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1807 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1808 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1900 New York	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1902 New York	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1903 New York	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1905		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1906 New York	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1907 New York	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1909 New York	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2002 New York	domestic: single-family	two-room	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2003 New York	domestic: single-family	hipped	1905		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; unusual example of its type.
2005 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2006 New York	domestic: single-family	two-room	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2007 New York	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
2008 New York	domestic: multiple-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2008-A/B New York	domestic: multiple-family	rectangular	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2009 New York	domestic: single-family	two-room	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2101 New York	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
2103 New York	domestic: single-family	two-room	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2105 New York	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1203 Olander	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1205 Olander	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1305 Olander	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
900 Olive	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1885		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
900 block Olive	recreational	park	1875		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
902 Olive	domestic: single-family	two-room	1900		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
903 Olive	domestic: single-family	two-room	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
905 Olive	domestic: single-family	two-room	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
907-A/B Olive	domestic: single-family	two-room	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the Juniper Street Historic District
1001 Olive	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1100 Olive	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1910		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1108 Olive	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935	Tudor Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1109 Olive	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1600-10 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	T-plan	1890		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type
1610 1/2 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1618 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	foursquare	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type
1700 block of Pennsylvania	infrastructure	moonlight tower	1895		Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1976; listed as a local landmark; significant for historic associations; one of 19 extant examples of its type.
1706 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1900 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1904 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; outstanding example of its type.
1908 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1915		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2004 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2006 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2104 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
2106 Pennsylvania	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1178 Poquito	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1179 Poquito	educational/commercial	irregular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1182 Poquito	domestic: single-family	irregular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1192 Poquito	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1192 1/2 Poquito	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1193 Poquito	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1195 Poquito	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1197 Poquito	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1206 Poquito	domestic: single-family	pyramidal bungalow	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1303 Poquito	domestic: single-family	two-room	1925		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1304 Poquito	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1210 Rosewood	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920		Eligible under Criteria A	Significant for its historic associations.
1202 Salina	commercial	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1204-A Salina	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1890		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1204-B Salina	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1204-C Salina	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1206 Salina	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1207 Salina	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1209 Salina	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes of the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1302 Salina	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1304 Salina	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1305 Salina	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1100 block of San Bernard	structure	iron fence	1880		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1152 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the San Bernard Historic District
1158-A/B San Bernard	domestic: single-family	two-room	1910		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the San Bernard Historic District
1160 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1164 San Bernard	religious	rectangular	1929	Gothic Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1985; significant for historic associations; excellent example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1170 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	modified L-plan	1895	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1985; local landmark; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1172 1/2 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1895		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1174 San Bernard	civic	rectangular	1941		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1174-B San Bernard	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1940		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the San Bernard Historic District

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1176 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1955		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1178 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1905	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1191-A/B San Bernard	domestic: single-family	irregular	1910	Classical Revival, Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1192 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	U-plan	1950		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; outstanding example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1193 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	T-plan	1895	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the San Bernard Historic District
1193 1/2 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	L-plan	1900	Queen Anne	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1194 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the San Bernard Historic District
1196 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type; contributes to character of the San Bernard Historic District.
1196 1/2 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the San Bernard Historic District
1197 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1925	Craftsman	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the San Bernard Historic District
1198 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1915		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the San Bernard Historic District
1207 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1209 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1920	Craftsman	Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1211 San Bernard	commercial	rectangular	1920		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Significant for historic associations; one of few extant example of its type.

National Register Assessments						
Address	Property Type	Subtype	Date	Stylistic Influence	NRHP Recommendation	Justification
1302 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1304 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1930		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to character of the 13th Street Historic District
1305 San Bernard	religious	rectangular	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1306 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1940		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1308 San Bernard	domestic: single-family	bungalow	1935		Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 13th Street Historic District
1201 Short Hackberry	domestic: single-family	two-room	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations
1203 Short Hackberry	domestic: single-family	two-room	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1205 Short Hackberry	domestic: single-family	two-room	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1206 1/2 Short Hackberry	domestic: single-family	two-room	1920		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
902 Waller	domestic: single-family	pyramidal	1910	Classical Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Contributes to the character of the 9th and 10th Street Historic District
1006 Waller	domestic: single-family	hipped	1886		Eligible under Criteria A and C	NR listed in 1985; significant for historic associations; fine example of its type.
1201 Waller	religious	rectangular	1890	Gothic Revival	Eligible under Criteria A and C	Determined eligible in 1993; significant for historic associations; only extant example of a rare type.
1207 Waller	domestic: single-family	rectangular	1950		Not Eligible	Lacks integrity, does not meet NR age threshold, and/or lacks significance
1305 Waller	domestic: single-family	two-room	1930		Not Eligible	Lacks noteworthy architectural attributes and known significant historical associations

