

## CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>An overview of Historic Preservation</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>History of Austin's Physical Development</i>	5
<i>A History of Historic preservation in Austin and the United States</i>	19
<b>Austin Today</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Preservation Agencies and Organizations</b>	<b>27</b>
<i>National</i>	28
<i>State</i>	29
<i>Local</i>	30
<i>Duplication of Effort by Existing Preservation Interest Groups</i>	32
<i>New Directions for Existing Agencies and Organizations</i>	33
<b>Preservation Programs</b>	<b>34</b>
<i>Historic Designation</i>	35
<i>Zoning</i>	39
<i>Comprehensive Inventory</i>	41
<i>Building Codes</i>	47
<i>Preservation Financing and Funding</i>	50
<i>Tax Incentives</i>	52
<i>Preferential Public Leasing and Acquisition</i>	55
<i>Legal Tools</i>	56
<i>Public Information and Assistance</i>	57
<i>Federal Legislation Affecting Local Historic Preservation Efforts</i>	58
<b>Program Recommendations for Implementing the Plan</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>75</b>
<i>Preservation Terms</i>	76
<i>Architectural Styles in Austin</i>	79
<i>Standards for Granting Certificates of Appropriateness</i>	87
<i>Guidelines for Appropriate Rehabilitation</i>	89
<i>Repositories and Collections</i>	94
<i>Existing Inventories and Partial Inventories in Austin</i>	95
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>103</b>

## **Austin City Council**

Carole Keeton McClellan, *Mayor*

Larry Deuser

Roger Duncan

Richard Goodman

Ron Mullen

John Trevino, Jr.

Charles E. Urdy

## **Historic Landmark Commission**

Blake Alexander, *Chair*

George Boutwell

Jim Christianson

Phillip Creer

Sharon Greenhill

Martha Hartzog

Jane Hickie

Bill O'Connell

Betty W. Phillips

Suzanne Saulniers

Ina Ray Smith

## INTRODUCTION

The *Austin Historic Preservation Plan* is a resource manual and set of recommendations designed to guide the work of Austin's Historic Landmark Commission and the broader preservation community in Austin in the near future.

The plan has been prepared for the Historic Landmark Commission. It is principally addressed to the Commission but also speaks to other persons in the City government, to private developers, and to interested members of the preservation community and the general public. It has been prepared in conjunction with recommendation for the revision of Austin's Zoning ordinance, and effort that has brought problems and solutions in historic preservation into sharper focus.

Preparation of the plan was begun in the fall of 1979. After numerous meetings with the Landmark Commission, City staff, the Austin Heritage Society, the staff of the Texas Historical Commission, and other interested parties, a Preliminary Draft Historic Preservation plan was issued February 15, 1981. This final report refines the draft material and incorporates responses to the Preliminary Draft.

This plan is organized in four major parts: an introduction, description and analysis, recommendations, and appendix.

The introduction consists of four subsections that provide a context within which to view the City and its opportunities for historic preservation actions. These sections are concerned first, with historic preservation, what it is, what it seeks to do, and how it goes about achieving its objectives; second, with the history of Austin's physical development; third, with the history of historic preservation in the United States and in Austin; and fourth, with Austin today, viewed in the context of its historical development.

The second major part consists of two subsections. In *Agencies and Organizations*, all federal, state, and local entities concerned with preservation are described, and new interrelationships and responsibilities are proposed. In the second subsection, *Programs*, the spectrum of existing and possible preservation programs is discussed, including zoning and design review, a comprehensive Citywide inventory of cultural resources, building codes, funding sources and financing methods, preferential public leasing and acquisition, miscellaneous legal tools, and public information programs.

The third major part, *Implementing the Plan*, pulls together recommendations made previously and organizes them into a plan of action.

The body of the report is followed by an *Appendix* containing supplementary information which, with the body of the report, serves as a handbook of information on preservation in Austin. In the *Appendix*, terms are defined; standards for granting Certificates of Appropriateness are outlined; guidelines for appropriate rehabilitation are provided; existing inventory work in Austin is described; repositories and collections of historical material are listed; and a bibliography of sources on the history of Austin and historic preservation is provided.

Altogether this plan provides a framework for understanding preservation and its possibilities in Austin today, and for undertaking activity to ensure that Austin's significant cultural resources survive and continue to play a vital part in the modern, growing City that is Austin.

## **An Overview of Historic Preservation**

### ***What is Historic Preservation?***

*Historic Preservation* is a term, which refers to a broad variety of activities involving the identification, recognition, protection, and interpretation of buildings, structures, objects, sites, landscaping, and districts, which are important in American history.

Traditionally the concern of a small group of specialists, historic preservation has broadened the scope of its concerns and its constituency enormously in the last 15 years. Initially concerned principally with great houses associated with historic figures, preservation has come to value the entire scope of America's history and architecture, from the folk houses of rural immigrants to the skyscrapers of sophisticated corporations, and has come to look beyond individual structures to the fabric of cities in streetscapes and neighborhoods.

Similarly, historic preservation has become the concern not only of an enlarged group of architects, historians, and other interested individuals but also of government agencies at all levels and the general public.

### ***What are the Objectives of Historic Preservation?***

Historic preservation has grown in scope and in the size of its constituency in recent years in large part because of broad urban and social changes that have little to do in themselves with historic buildings. The post World War II expansion of American cities, accompanied by new freeways, urban renewal, the destruction of buildings for parking lots, and the boom in central-city construction of skyscrapers, has destroyed many fine buildings and eroded neighborhoods, creating a climate of interest in the built environment and ways of protecting its best traditional qualities. As the historic preservation movement has grown in response to these changes, it has changed its focus to meet a new situation and has acquired more sophisticated techniques to handle a more complex set of problems.

Thus, in addition to its traditional concerns for the preservation of individual buildings of historic and architectural value, preservation today looks at more complex urban problems. Indeed the issues associated with historic preservation today are inseparable from the central problems facing cities as a whole. Historic preservation can no longer be viewed as a frivolous or peripheral activity. Rather it is an essential element of public planning efforts at all levels of government. The specific objectives of historic preservation are the identification, protection, and enhancement of a city's cultural resources. But the results are much greater than the sum of successful preservation efforts; the results are a richer and more vital city for all citizens.

### ***What are the objects of Historic Preservation Today?***

In recent years, the range of cultural resources considered worth of preservation has increased enormously to the point where the *characteristic* structures of every community are considered worthy of preservation. The standard

of worthiness for preservation is no longer its significance at the national level but rather its significance at the community level.

Given this change of scope, it is useful to ask what is meant by the term *history*. It is important to recognize that history is part of a continuous development that flows right into the present. In looking at the history of a City, some periods may have been more exciting than others but each period is just as important as every other in spanning the time from first settlement to the present. In this way, no one period ought to monopolize preservation efforts.

Most preservation programs (for example, the National Register of Historic Places) deal with properties that are at least fifty years old. This is not because the last fifty years have been without significant buildings or events, but because it is not always easy to know what is truly significant until some time has passed. The danger in waiting fifty years for official recognition is that important structures will be lost. There are, however, cases where the National Register has recognized very recent structures of outstanding merit; for example, Dulles Airport (ca. 1962), outside Washington, DC.

In addition to asking *when* history was, we ought to ask *what* is it. History is what the first governor did and where he lived, but it is also what the slaves and the immigrant Germans did and where they lived. It is reflected in a 19<sup>th</sup>-century pioneer homestead, a turn-of-the-century suburban estate, and an early automobile strip from the 1920s. Just as much as the governors, the successful businessmen, and the socially prominent, the ordinary people and the structures and landscapes, which they built also, belong to history and are proper subjects of historic preservation.

History, then, is what happened in the past, and historic preservation seeks to protect and enhance the most important physical manifestations of the past.

#### ***What Activities Are Involved In Historic Preservation?***

The early approach of historic preservation involved *preservation* itself, the sustaining of an existing structure; *restoration*, the recovering of an earlier form; and *reconstruction*, the reproducing of lost structures. Today preservation is still rooted in a concern for authentic examples of historically important or architecturally outstanding buildings. But as the range of buildings considered worthy of preservation has expanded and as new ideas have grown for the proper place of old buildings in modern societies, new uses have been sought for old buildings that would keep those old buildings as active functioning components of a modern society. These have been achieved through acceptance of the ideas of *rehabilitation* and *adaptive* use. The typical example of preservation of the past, the house museum, has become a much smaller part of the preservation world. This change has been brought about partly through economic necessity, forced by the need to make the preservation of larger numbers of buildings feasible. House museums inevitably require endowments or outside funding, but a house converted for use as offices, for example, can pay its own way.

The change in the direction of historic preservation has come about for aesthetic reasons as well. When 18<sup>th</sup>-century federal style houses were the focus of historic preservation, the fine craftsmanship of those houses deserved the greatest respect and care. Now that more recent factories, builder-designed houses, commercial structures, and early gas stations are more apt to be the objects of preservation efforts, the same degree of respect for the quality and integrity of the structure is not always called for. It is entirely acceptable to adapt such structures to new uses if the structure and character of the buildings can be maintained. The integrity of re-used structures is still of paramount importance,

but such integrity may be reinterpreted to emphasize, for example, the original exterior appearance of a 19<sup>th</sup>-century brick factory structure while allowing a total redesign of interior spaces to accommodate offices.

Finally, and most importantly, the acceptance of the idea of adaptive use has involved a philosophical change within the preservation movement that has seen historic structures as functioning elements in the modern world. Rather than removed from the productive economy and contemporary society as museums, historic structures today are seen as properly belonging to the ongoing life of a City. The quality of urban life is as much a goal of preservation today as the preservation of great works of architecture.

Beyond the preservation of individual structures, historic preservation in the 1980s is concerned with the maintenance of the historic character of whole neighborhood conservation zones which very often employ special review procedures to guide alterations and rehabilitation in addition to the traditional planning tool of zoning.

## **History of Austin's Physical Development**

*The following brief history of the urban and architectural development of the City of Austin is intended to serve as a broad overview of the City's development against which this plan document should be read. At the same time it is intended to serve as a rudimentary outline for a much more detailed history of the City which ought to be prepared in conjunction with the proposed comprehensive inventory of the City. This essay emphasizes those aspects of the City's past which have influenced the form and appearance of the City today. No attempt has been made to recount in detail the social or political history of the City, which are handled better, and more appropriately in other places. The emphasis here, as well as in the more detailed history, which should follow, ought to be on the physical development of the City.*

The City of Austin was established in 1839 as the new capital of the Republic of Texas. The City's founding exhibited idealism rare in the planning of contemporary Texas cities. Like Washington, DC, with which its planners and early citizens were familiar, and like Brasilia in more recent times, it was a planned capital City located in a remote frontier to encourage settlement in the interior of the country. Austin was platted on a site chosen for its beauty, climate, availability of water, and other natural advantages, and the circumstances of its founding minimized the role of land speculators in an era when few surveyors gave much thought to urban amenities.

Edwin Waller in consultation with Mirabeau B. LAMAR, then President of the Republic of Texas laid out Austin. The plan they chose, like the plans for many American cities including the state capitals of North Carolina and Florida, was based on the 18<sup>th</sup> - century plan for Philadelphia. That plan consisted of a grid with a central square that terminated major crossing axes, and smaller, secondary squares located within the grid on either side of the major axes. Austin's was a typical plan of the period (with simpler cousins in many Texas county seats), successful in its accommodation of a commercial society, but it represented an enlightened aspect of American grid planning in the symbolic place which it gave to the main public building and in the dominance of a aesthetic concept over one of pure expediency.

The City was positioned at the edge of the Gulf coastal prairie, where the prairie meets the abrupt escarpment of the Edwards Plateau. The initial grid was laid out on the north bank of the Colorado River between two creeks on a square 640-acre tract of land that sloped gradually down to the river. The City grid was part of a larger government tract that would be gradually surveyed in detail later. The initial grid of fourteen blocks on a side included four block-sized public squares and adjacent reservations of land for churches, a courthouse and jail, and a railroad depot. Other blocks were set aside for an arsenal, and for an academy and a university which were located on the main cross axes from the capitol square. But the large four-block Capitol Square with its additional half-block border dominated the plan. In a variation of the prototypical Philadelphia plan, the main square in Austin was placed beyond the center of the grid in order to occupy the highest ground.

Austin had been made the capitol against opposition from many quarters, after the seat of government already had been moved several times during the brief existence of the Republic. Because the lack of appropriate buildings had been the principal reason for abandoning at least two of those prior capitols, Austin's survival was initially dependent upon the successful readiness of a capitol and other public buildings in time for the first legislative session following its designation. Edwin Waller was placed in charge of constructing the necessary buildings. He built clapboarded wood-frame structures for a capitol, president's residence, and state offices. These were placed along Congress Avenue and adjoining areas between the Capitol Square and the river. The necessary buildings were constructed successfully in time for convening of the Legislature, and if the fledgling city of 1840 was not very comfortable or attractive, it was at least functional.

Austin, in the years of the republic, was not much worse than most Texas cities, but it was not particularly pleasant. Although some buildings were given board sidings, many were of log construction and were almost uniformly without pretensions of any kind. Houses typically were one room with a porch and a chimney, or two rooms with an open "dog run" for ventilation. Undoubtedly, the finest building to be constructed in the City during the Republic, and the only known survivor from that period, is the French Legation of 1841. The French Legation is



a brace-frame building clad in milled siding with a hip roof and a front porch. Largely without explicitly stylistic affectations, it resembled contemporary buildings in Louisiana.

By 1845, Texas had become a state, which immediately attracted large numbers of settlers and money for improvements, and inaugurated about fifteen years of prosperity. Thus, when the capital returned to Austin in 1850, secure that it would remain there for at least 20 years (following a statewide election), the City also prospered. After barely surviving its years of abandonment, Austin became permanently established within a short period of time with many substantial new buildings and a small but viable population that had commercial ties to the surrounding area in addition to its primary reliance on the economic base generated by the presence of the state government.

The majority of buildings constructed in the decade of the 1850s were unpretentious but well-built wooden houses, designed on the same simple plans as before. These plans were largely representative of vernacular types from older parts of the South. Houses typically were set in large, fenced lots with gardens and domestic animals.

Although most houses were plain, some were dressed up in the Greek Revival style, characterized occasionally by gables treated as pediments, by flat transoms and sidelights around doors, symmetrical fenestration and composition, and columned porches. The Greek Revival had been popular in the eastern United States as early as the 1820s but was most popular in the South after the 1840s. It was extremely successful in a pre-industrial economy such as Austin's, where its effects could be achieved relatively easily. Indeed, in its general form and character, it was so much like the vernacular houses of the period that the result of adding Greek Revival details to a vernacular house often was quite convincing. The larger and more pretentious of the Greek Revival houses of this period, many of them the work of Abner Cook, were unusually fine examples of the style. Many of these houses still stand.

In addition to the demand for housing during the 1850s, many substantial public, institutional and commercial buildings were constructed. Compared to a thriving commercial city like Galveston, Austin's needs in the 1850s were simple. Nevertheless, new buildings and new types of buildings were badly needed. A new stone capitol building was begun in the capitol square in 1852, a state land office was built on the capitol grounds in 1855, the county built a courthouse, the City built a jail, private interests built hotels, and many new churches were built. Many of these buildings were stone and several were Greek Revival. Residential construction began to spread out through the original grid of the City.

Congress Avenue and Sixth Street began to develop as the principal commercial arteries with several two-story brick and stone buildings intermingled with one-story wood-frame buildings. Sixth Street was the main road out of town, leading to Bastrop and Houston, and its intersection in the 1850s was, as today, the commercial hub of the City. There was very little industry in Austin at this point.

The Civil War and Reconstruction periods slowed population growth and sharply curtailed new construction. Through lack of maintenance public buildings fell into disrepair. The principal influence on the physical character of the City in these years was the construction in 1869 of a pontoon bridge to South Austin which made some development in that area feasible.

In the 1870s, the City began to change again with both the arrival of the railroads in 1871 and 1876 and the end of Reconstruction. The railroads brought tremendous population growth, commercial activity, and communication links with the rest of the state and with American cities beyond the South, and all the appurtenances of the industrial revolution. In the first five years of the 1860s, Austin's population more than doubled to over 12,000. No longer were trade and communication generally arduous and time-consuming burdens that tied the City culturally to Southern port cities, but now there were direct links to places like St. Louis and Chicago. Among the changes were the opening of a library, construction of Millett's Opera House, the opening of a theater and several multi-purpose halls, and establishment of Pease Park, the first park since creation of the four park squares as called for in the original city plan. Telegraph poles and gaslights were put up on Congress Avenue, and the first mule-drawn streetcar lines were put into operation.

An industrial district began to grow up along and below the railroad tracks that came in-

to town on Fifth Street. The original grid began to fill up and spilled over in a few places, notably in East Austin near the railroad. The original grid was extended four tiers of blocks to the north, and although not completely laid out, the remainder of the original government tract was surveyed as large parcels with a few roads, and made more accessible to settlement.

This growth was reflected in an increasingly substantial business district, which saw most of the small wooden buildings on Congress Avenue, and Sixth Street replaced by two- and three-story commercial structures. This development continued into the mid-1880s. The new mansard-roofed County Courthouse and several modest clock towers punctuated the skyline of the commercial district and provided the most visible symbols of the new industrial age.

The most common house types continued to be variations on Southern and Midwestern vernacular types and included hall-and-parlor houses, I-houses, shotgun houses, square cottages with hipped roofs, and others not yet identified. The biggest change was the wholesale adoption of balloon-frame construction that made possible the large amount of building that was required in a short period of time.

The railroads and the industrial revolution also brought with them new architectural styles and the City's first substantial number of trained architects. On the one hand, communication was quicker about new styles and was more direct with the sources of those styles. On the other, the industrial revolution made possible large-scale production of machine-made parts (e.g., cast iron for decorative and structural purposes) and new attitudes towards style that were the antithesis of the restraint embodied in the Greek Revival. Thus, one of the most visible and up-to-date examples of the boom of the 1870's the Second Empire-style Travis county Courthouse, stood out for its asymmetrical massing, its or-

nate, crested towers, and its glaring divergence from the simple structures around it. In addition to the Second Empire style, the 1870s saw the more restrained and less expensively rendered italianate for all types of buildings. The Gothic Revival remained the principal style for churches and, in a less literal fashion, also was used in a few houses.

The boom of the 1870's carried over into the 1880's but at a less feverish pace, only finally expiring with the depression of 1893. The principal changes of those years were the construction of a new capitol building after the old one burned in 1881 and expansion of the City's development well beyond its original grid. The establishment of the University of Texas in 1883 led to the platting of a new grid at an oblique angle to the old, and to the growth of residential construction on the north, south, and west sides of the campus. Mulecar lines to this area and beyond, and the completion of the new iron bridge to South Austin, led to the laying out and promotion of the Hyde Park and Fairview Park subdivisions. Like Boston, New York, Chicago, San Francisco and other major American cities of the period, Austin had its "streetcar suburbs."

As the population grew and the original grid continued to fill up, the pattern of building in the original City grew denser. Whereas before 1870 houses were built on scattered large lots with room for gardens and animals. By the 1880s nearly every lot was built upon, typically with a house at the front, a smaller rental house at the rear on the alley, and a variety of barns and sheds in between. While this growth pattern created neighborhoods mixed by social, economic, and racial groups, at the same time the streetcar suburbs emerged, resulting in new patterns that moved the middle and upper middle classes to the suburbs and left the inner city to the poor. It would be several decades before this latter development would be dominant in Austin, but it had its beginnings in the 1880s.

Small houses continued to be built on old vernacular patterns, while new house types, introduced by Victorian era pattern books, began to be built in larger numbers. On the one hand, this allowed for somewhat freer house plans and a greater variety in exterior appearance and ornament. On the other hand, the first sizable group of nearly identical speculative housing began appearing. Larger, more pretentious houses, which were built in the new suburbs as well as in the western side of the old City, were designed by architects on still more variable plants. Composition, massing, and planning of these houses tended to be asymmetrical, striving for the "picturesque." Still more elaborate machine-made ornamentation was applied to those houses in variations based on the Stick, Eastlake, and Queen Anne styles. Whereas earlier houses tended to be built on lots featuring all-purpose yards, by the 1880s manicured lawns and gardens with decorative iron fences began to appear with the more pretentious houses. At least as significant as those changes was the growing use of indoor plumbing and central heating.

In the downtown area, Congress Avenue and Sixth Street attained the appearance they would maintain with little change until about 1965. The two skyscrapers at the corner of Sixth and Congress in 1910, and the remodeling of several facades in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s would be the principal changes. One of the major additions of the decade was the completion of the Driskill Hotel in 1886. It was the largest building in the commercial district; it incorporated a whole world of technical innovations including elevators, running water, and steam heat. Driskill Hotel was one of the first important designs in the City in the Richardsonian Romanesque mode, a style that had its origins partly in reaction to the excesses of Victorian ornamentation. When the new capitol building was completed in 1888, a view from the dome revealed a generally two-story commercial district

with some three-story buildings and a skyline pierced by church steeples, the County Courthouse tower, a few clocktowers, the Driskill Hotel, and the massive outlines of St. Mary's Academy. Farther away, the main buildings of the University of Texas and St. Edwards University, and the state institutions for the blind, the deaf and dumb, and the insane, stood out by virtue of both size and siting against a predominantly small-scaled residential city.

More than all of these, of course, was the capitol itself with its great dome. Designed by the Detroit architect of several state capitol buildings, E. E. Myers, as the result of a nationwide competition, the capitol dominated the City in its size, its structural character, the quality of its materials, the ambitiousness of its design, and its symbolic power. The capitol provided a unifying image of the City by dominating it, and an appropriately magnificent image of its age, unrivaled by anything else in Austin.

The prosperous times of the late 1870s and 1880s ended in 1893 with a nationwide depression. There would be little construction in Austin from that time until after the turn-of-the-century, but other changes were set in motion in that same year which would have a profound impact on the physical development of the City. The damming of the Colorado River provided electricity for the electric streetcars to replace the mule cars, for the moonlight towers, for general commercial use, and for a progressive new image of the City.

Most of all, the electrification of the streetcars furthered development of the streetcar suburbs, notably Hyde Park and Fairview Park, in this period. Although there was not a lot of construction in these years, and virtually none downtown, the suburban trend continued, with streetcars both creating and reflecting new patterns of living. As portions of the middle class were drawn away from the City, physical proximity to places of business was less important

than the amount of time it took to get to them. The image of country living away from the City held a powerful appeal, partly measurable in Austin by the relative absence of the squalid conditions that propelled the middle class to the suburbs in the East and Midwest. Thus, although the movement was more superficial in Austin, its long-term effects were the same – the segregation of classes of people and the abandonment of the older core of the City to the poor.

Toward the end of the decade and continuing into the new century, with recovery from the depression, several large and fine new houses were built reflecting the continuing vitality of Victorian architecture. In those years, fantastic turrets topped irregular masses textured by patterned shingles and other ornamentation.

A powerful and symbolic end to the late 19<sup>th</sup>-century period of optimism occurred in April 1900, when the seven-year-old Colorado River dam broke. The power generating station was ruined and the approach to the Iron Bridge across the Colorado was washed out. Private producers were able to supply some electricity, but mulecars returned to the streets and it was not until 1913 that a new dam was completed and the main power supply was reestablished.

While the streetcars struggled to obtain a dependable source of electricity, one of the first steps was taken that would eventually lead to their being discontinued. Although the automobile would not take hold until after the First World War, in 1905 Congress Avenue was paved in bricks, largely in order to accommodate the first appearance and growth of motor vehicles in Austin.

Despite steady population growth in the years after 1900, there was very little change in the downtown commercial district until 1910, when two small skyscrapers were built at the corner of Sixth and Congress. In the same year a new reinforced-concrete bridge replaced the fine Iron Bridge over the river at Congress Avenue.

The population growth was reflected mainly in housing. Among small working-class houses, the old, persistent vernacular forms finally gave way to new popular modes of building. Although the classic bungalow that developed in these years in California did not firmly take hold in Austin until the 1920s, new types of houses seem to have emerged, perhaps as a regional counterpart. These new types were often built in large numbers by speculative builders, were of wood-frame construction and were very simply detailed. They tended to be square or rectangular in plan with hipped roofs. Just as antebellum vernacular houses were readily adaptable to the Greek Revival, these houses easily assimilated details of the most popular style of the period, the Colonial Revival.

Among more pretentious houses, within a few years after 1900, a new stylistic trend took hold that eschewed the wild eclecticism of the Victorian years and returned to more "correct" and restrained forms of classicism, notably the Colonial Revival and Neo-classical Revival. Similarly, the new high school built in 1900 (now demolished), with the bold urban scale of its classical composition and details, was an outstanding example of this swing toward more orderly designs. It also represented one of the first instances of design in Austin to reflect the influences of the great French architecture school, the Ecole des Beaux-Arts.

Following the stagnant building years of the First World War, the pace of building and change increased again about 1920. The City grew rapidly in the 1920s, culminating, as elsewhere, in the construction of new skyscrapers in the late 1920s. The most notable of these was the Norwood Building. The new skyscrapers were few enough in number, situated on low enough ground, and short enough that they did not compete with the capitol dome on the skyline but rather enhanced it by acting together as a foil.



The 1920s resulted in the particular growth of new residential areas, both south of the river and west of the old City. Low-pitched gabled bungalows and simple square cottages with hipped roofs were among the common houses of this period. Among larger and more pretentious houses a variety of historical periods provided sources for comfortable, informal, eclectic designs. English Tudor, Georgian, Colonial, and most of all, the Greek Revival (called Southern Colonial), all of which can be lumped together at this time as part of the widespread Period Revival, provided the imagery for most of these designs. The most substantial group of these houses was built along Woodridge Road west of Pease Park.

The most significant long-term development of the 1920s was the greatly increased use of automobiles. These led to a number of new building types including garages, gas stations and the earliest automobile strip developments with motels, diners, and automobile service buildings. In the 1920s and 1930s, the impact of these developments was confined largely to peripheral areas.

Despite the depression of the 1930s, Austin's population continued to grow, furthering the patterns established in the 1920s. Bungalows and square cottages continued to be built, as did the Southern Colonial and other revival modes. A few scattered examples of Moderne houses were built but these were insignificant on the cityscape as a whole. The first public housing also was built, following clearance of dilapidated housing in East Austin.

For the first time since 1910, notable changes occurred downtown with remodeling of a few building facades, and, more importantly, with the construction of several fine public buildings in the Moderne style. The City Hall, County Courthouse, U.S. Courthouse, State Highway Building, and Railroad Commission

Building are the outstanding examples. Although the imagery of the Moderne was no longer historicist, it harmonized with the City. Utilizing similar attitudes to ornament, massing, and relationship to the street, the modern buildings of this period reflected an understanding and sympathy with the existing City.

Architecturally, the high point of the 1930s in Austin was the expansion of the University of Texas campus. After oil was discovered on university land in 1924, Paul Cret, one of the nation's most distinguished Beaux-Arts architects, was brought from the University of Pennsylvania to prepare a new campus plan and to consult on the design of several campus buildings. Building upon a simpler Beaux-Arts plan prepared by the equally distinguished architect, Cass Gilbert, Cret enlarged the plan and reworked it to accommodate a more complex program. Of the many fine buildings with whose design Cret was involved, none surpasses the Main Building in inventiveness and interest of plan and detail. Altogether, the Cret campus, which developed from the late 1920s to the mid-1950s and which has remained remarkably intact at its core, is one of the most distinguished examples of Beaux-Arts planning and design in America. The University Tower forms a suitable counterpart to the Capitol dome on Austin's skyline, each symbolizing major institutions of the state and the City.

At the end of the 1930s several dams were built above Austin for water, recreation, flood control, and the provision of employment during the depression. And, in 1939, the City's first municipal airport was established. The World War II years brought some industrialization to Austin, but for the most part resulted in limited growth or change in the physical character of the City. After the war the population boomed again. From 1945 to about 1965 large new tracts of single-family houses

were built, aided particularly at first by the GI Bill and FHA guidelines. Previous housing types were completely abandoned, as the air-conditioned ranch house became the universal dwelling unit. Automobile use increased to such an extent that streetcars were abandoned and public transit allowed to languish. The automobile freed the City from established patterns of density and from relatively flat areas. The physical size of the City expanded rapidly, building up the areas below Oltorf to the south, above Koenig to the north, and the entire hilly section on the west and southwest.

With this expansion and move to suburban areas came the corresponding decline of the older parts of the City. The construction of I.H. 35 also hastened the deterioration of East Austin by altering its relationship to the rest of the City.

The principal changes to the older core area of the City in this period were demolition of older buildings for parking lots and remodeling of some commercial facades. A few new buildings were constructed downtown, but their impact was minor.

Most importantly in the 1940s and 1950s, traditional approaches to architectural design largely were abandoned and Modern architecture was adopted in its place. Unlike the non-historicist architecture of the 1930s – the Moderne or Art Deco – the Modern architecture of the post-war era often failed to establish a supportive relationship with the buildings and landscape of the existing City. The cumulative effect of this was further erosion of the cohesive fabric of the pre-war City. Although radical changes had occurred in Austin between 1945 and 1965, the City was widely regarded as being only a larger version of its former self. About 1965, a new larger scale of change began as the population continued to grow. The Hancock Center shopping mall and the Chevy Chase office park drew retail and

business activity away from its traditional base downtown to the northern part of the City. The University and the state government began to grow and in the process cleared large areas of older homes, many of them in sound condition. While the University left its old campus largely intact and the state has maintained the integrity of the capitol grounds, both have detracted from their historic and symbolic centers by the size and character of functionally supportive new construction around them. Sadly, and despite the clear legacy of the original City plan and the Beaux-Arts campus, the opportunity provided by so much demolition between the capitol and the university was not seized upon to rectify the skewed grids of both parts of town and the axis of the campus to the dome. Big buildings built by the state, the University, and private interests have detracted from the long time dominance of the dome on the City's skyline and from the relation of the dome to the University Tower.

In addition to demolition in many areas for parking lots, the approval of requests for zoning changes and special permits has encouraged the deterioration of older neighborhoods by allowing incompatible uses. During these years the City has grown even farther beyond its original boundaries, especially to the north and south. The City has become even more dependent on the automobile.

Interestingly, although there were many examples of historic preservation in Austin prior to the late 1960s, it was at that time that preservation became more than an isolated activity and became part of a later public reaction to rapid and unsettling changes in the urban environment.

Today there are marked changes in some of the destructive patterns of the recent past. More residential developments of higher density are being built, many of them closer to the older core area of the City rather than still farther from it. The energy crisis is forcing a reexamination of the relative roles of private automobiles and public transportation. And, increasing awareness of the relative roles of private automobiles and public transportation. And, increasing awareness of the losses of the last 35 years has caused many people to seek out remaining opportunities for obtaining older housing in the central City.

## A History of Historic Preservation in Austin and the United States

The history of historic preservation in the United States has gone through three major periods. The first period, which began before the Civil War, was characterized by an interest in patriotic and historic values. The historic house museum was the characteristic expression of this early period, and Mount Vernon was the first historic house museum and the model for others that followed. Most 19<sup>th</sup>-century house-museums were established as shrines to the men and women who lived in them. The great care that was often taken to restore them to their original appearance and to furnish them authentically had to do with veneration of political or military heroes who had once lived in the house rather than with any interest in the aesthetic values represented. Indeed, the architecture of most early preservation efforts was not merely ignored, but was sometimes openly considered to be plain, crude, and ugly.

Early American efforts at historic preservation focused on heroes and events of the American Revolution, and particularly on sites associated with George Washington. As the century wore on, other presidents, Civil War heroes, and sites of local historic interest came within the concerns of historic preservationists. In Texas, the interest in historic and patriotic values of this first phase was embodied in the Constitution of 1876, which stated:

The legislature may, from time to time, make appropriations for preserving and perpetuating memorials of the history of Texas, by means of monuments, statues, paintings and documents of historic value.

Although the state government was not, by this provision, directly involved in the preservation of historic structures, it clearly fostered a climate of opinion that would support such efforts. Indeed, the Alamo, which might be said to hold a symbolic place in Texas similar to what Mount Vernon holds in the United States at large, was the object of a preservation campaign that involved both private parties and the state between 1877 and 1905.

This early interest in historic and patriotic values continued in Texas through the 20<sup>th</sup>-century and still remains stronger in Texas than in most parts of the United States. One example of this attitude, and perhaps the first in Austin, was the state's action in 1917 to turn the 1856-57 Land Office on the Capitol grounds into a museum. The programs of the Texas Centennial Commission of 1936, which restored buildings all over the state as museums, erected monuments, and placed historical markers, also are in this tradition, as are the continuing marker programs today. One recent example would be the opening of the Lyndon Johnson boyhood home near Johnson City as a house museum.

In the 1980s there was a tremendous surge of interest in historic preservation all over the United States. National organizations like the Daughters of the American Revolution and the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America were formed with individual state chapters, which took an interest in historic preservation. In Texas, these groups were joined by the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the Texas State Historical Associa-

tion. While historic house museums and an emphasis on history and patriotism continued, there also began to be a new interest in preserving buildings for their scenic or architectural values.

The second period in the history of historic preservation began with this new emphasis on architectural quality as the principal criterion for saving older buildings. This approach grew out of the work of 19<sup>th</sup>-century antiquarians who drew and photographed old buildings, at first principally for their picturesque qualities. Architects began to take an interest in older buildings, partly as sources for design; the American Institute of Architects formed preservation committees; and architects got more involved in restoration work for house museums and interiors reconstructed in art museums. "Outdoor museums," culminating in creations such as Historic Williamsburg, were another aspect of the new interest in architecture by preservationists.

The leading organization in this approach was the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, founded in 1910, which sought to protect buildings for their place in the history of American architecture or for their intrinsic architectural interest alone. In 1924, the San Antonio Conservation Society was the first major Texas group to follow that lead. The Heritage Society of Austin was established in 1953, in an expansion of the same tradition, "to encourage and foster the preservation of Austin's unique architectural, cultural and environmental heritage."

From the 1920s to the 1950s, great value was placed on authentic restoration of historic structures. Hundreds of buildings throughout the state were preserved, usually privately, but sometimes with state aid. Among them, shortly after World War II, were the French Legation and Neill-Cochran House in Austin. Private efforts at preservation were aided by the Legislature in 1955, when it adopted enabling legislation to permit granting of tax relief to historic properties owned by non-profit organizations.

In 1953, the Texas State Historical Survey Committee was set up by the state (although it was funded privately by the Texas Historical Foundation until 1959) to lead, coordinate, and sponsor preservation work in the state, and to survey, record, preserve, restore, and mark buildings and sites worthy of preservation. This was to be done in part through the creation of county historical survey committees.

The establishment of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1949 also belongs to this period, but the role of the National Trust in Texas was insignificant until the 1960s. The National Trust is a private organization, chartered and partially funded by Congress, which was formed to promote preservation from a national perspective. When the efforts of the Trust shifted emphasis in the 1960s from the protection of a few great houses to providing preservation services, its influence began to be felt in Texas.

A parallel increase of interest in archeology began in 1928 with formation of the Texas Archeological Society. In 1935, a first attempt was made at a statewide survey of archeological resources.

Meanwhile, the federal government gave a big boost to preservation and to its new emphasis on architectural values in the establishment of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) in 1933. HABS work was done in Austin, in the 1930s, 1960s, and 1970s, documenting important structures with measured drawings, photographs, and research.

As with the earlier interest in history and patriotism, this later interest in architecture in Texas has continued up to the present and is fixed firmly in the third period, as well. The third

period in the history of historic preservation is characterized by an expanded sense of what is historically and architecturally important, by the growth of the idea of adaptive use of historic buildings, and especially by a new focus on the environment. Without relinquishing its earlier interests in history and architecture as the principal criteria of value, the historic preservation movement in this period derived its vitality largely through these new areas of interest. In particular, the emphasis on the environment as a whole has characterized the period, stressing the importance of the integrity of the historic urban fabric, the relationships of buildings to one another and to the streetscape, and the importance of a sympathetic or harmonious context for the proper appreciation of even the most traditional historic or architectural landmarks. In general terms, then, historic preservation broadened its scope to include overriding planning, design and environmental qualities of the larger urban context. Preservation shifted, in part, from being a specialized activity isolated from other concerns to an adjunct or even a component of city planning.

The characteristic activity of the period might be said to be the architectural survey, which provides a means of identifying and assessing large numbers of historic structures. The first survey in Texas occurred in San Antonio in the 1950s. The first survey efforts in Austin began in the late 1960s.

Although this period has its roots in the establishment of historic districts in Charleston and New Orleans in the 1930s, its real impetus came after World War II with the demolition of individual landmarks and whole districts by a variety of forces. Federally-financed urban renewal projects, new private construction, and pressures of the automobile to build parking lots and freeways in cities all over the country made enormous changes in the cities and created a new and much larger constituency for preservation.

At the same time, the federal government has led the way in the dramatic increase in preservation work at all levels of government. The private commitment of preservation also has grown dramatically, but for the first time, government agencies all over the country have taken a prominent role.

This third period in the history of historic preservation can be said to have commenced formally with passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. In the Act, the National Register of Historic Places was established, providing some degree of protection for historic properties likely to be affected by projects involving federal licenses or funding. This Act also required each state to administer the National Register program, to conduct its own statewide inventory, to prepare a state historic preservation plan, to administer federal grant and loan programs to public and private parties, and to administer environmental review. Thus, the National Historic Preservation Act has engendered preservation efforts by the states, which in turn have encouraged local participation.

In the establishment of the National Register program, which succeeded the National Survey of Historic Sites and buildings (this latter program began in 1935), the definition of objects suitable for preservation was expanded to include a wide range of cultural resources; these included buildings, sites, structures, objects, landscaping, and districts. At the same time, traditional historical criteria of value were explicitly expanded beyond concerns with political and military history. And traditional criteria of architectural value explicitly were expanded beyond concerns with the oldest buildings and the finest works of art to include representative works, curious works, works notable for engineering features or craftsmanship, and folk architecture.

Because the State of Texas already had established a preservation program and there was widespread sentiment in the state for preservation, implementation of the National Historic Preservation Act came more quickly, more thoroughly and more enthusiastically than in many other places. At the same time, because existing programs had been established when earlier concepts prevailed of what historic preservation was all about, there has continued to be a conservatism in some state programs and in the attitudes of citizens that is less pronounced in states where preservation arrived in 1966 as a new activity. For example, there continues to be a bias on the part of preservationists in many Texas cities for directing preservation efforts at 19<sup>th</sup>-century structures, to the virtual exclusion of later buildings.

In 1968, the State of Texas began to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act through the Texas State Historical Survey Committee (known after 1973 as the Texas Historical Commission), and preservation work in the state has proliferated since that time. In 1968, the Antiquities Act was passed by the Legislature, protecting archeological sites on publicly owned land and on some privately owned land. In 1971, the Historic Courthouse Act made it more difficult to alter or demolish a county courthouse. And, in 1973, the reorganized Texas Historical Commission published a historic preservation plan and was given broader powers.

Today, the Texas Historical Commission administers the National Register Program and the statewide inventory, disburses grants, administers environmental review, and coordinates preservation planning among state agencies. It has overseen the growth statewide of historical museums, and it supports a variety of preservation-related projects such as school programs, oral history projects, films, and the Main Street project. Three Austin properties that received grants from the state in recent years are the Carrington-Covert House, Gethesmane Church, and the Caswell House. Altogether, since 1966, the state government's role in historic preservation has shifted from functioning primarily to make the public aware of the state's heritage to taking an active role in protecting an expanded concept of that heritage.

In Austin, local preservation efforts have also increased noticeably since about 1966. The Heritage Society of Austin has sponsored three architectural surveys in that period and has focused its efforts downtown where it administered a facade improvement program. In the public sector, the Historic Landmark Preservation ordinance was passed in 1974, establishing the Historic Landmark Commission and providing for the designation of landmark structures and districts which are eligible for partial tax exemption.

These efforts, though considerable and reflective of the emphasis of the third phase of the preservation movement on the urban environment, have been limited by a narrow interpretation of their possibilities. As in much of the rest of Texas, a conservative, although deeply committed, interpretation of historic preservation prevails in Austin. This interpretation has meant that surveys, the City's landmarks program, and other preservation efforts have been overwhelmingly focused on the 19<sup>th</sup>-century heritage of the City to the virtual exclusion of more recent cultural resources.

In addition to these organized efforts at historic preservation, in recent years, spontaneous preservation efforts have sprung up independently of any formal encouragement or, indeed, of an articulated consciousness of "historic preservation."

Today the preservation movement in Austin is continuing to change in response to changing conditions in the City and to changing percep-



tions about the need for preservation on the part of the public. The preparation of this plan is the latest significant step in the development of historic preservation in Austin.

Private reinvestment in properties in older neighborhoods that only a few years before were declining in value and considered to be a part of deteriorating neighborhoods is but one prominent example. Such reinvestment often occurs because people appreciate the charm of an old house in an older neighborhood, the quality of its construction, and its central location, but this often occurs without any specific awareness of its historic or architectural value. Although not necessarily a conscious manifestation of preservation, this is an important aspect of preservation today and is likely to become more so. The only drawback to this phenomenon, and potentially a very serious one, is the displacement or dislocation of the existing residents of a neighborhood that cannot pay the inevitably higher prices or higher property taxes that accompany reinvestment and rehabilitation. This process by which middle-income residents who are often professionals displace the poor has been given the name "gentrification."

Another aspect of spontaneous preservation occurs through the formation of neighborhood organizations, which hope to maintain or improve the existing character of an area. Such organizations may attempt to have their neighborhoods "down-zoned" with a new classification that supports existing uses, resulting in preservation even if the name is not used. Or they might seek solutions to neighborhood problems through application of more formal kinds of preservation tools. The recent establishment of a National Register Historic District in Clarksville is an example of this latter approach.

Like cities across the United States, Austin today is at a crossroads. An essentially unbroken period of development from its founding up to World War II created a cohesive, beautiful, and livable City. The years since the War have seen an erosion of many of the best qualities of the older City and the intrusion of new elements that create visually jarring juxtapositions and disruptions of old ways of life.

Vastly increased use of the automobile has brought new freeways, street widening, parking lots and garages, and automobile-oriented business like shopping centers, gas stations, and drive-in restaurants and banks. This has meant the demolition of older buildings and the erosion of older neighborhoods. The enormous new scale of spending and development by state and federal governments, the University of Texas, and large private corporations and financial institutions has remade whole sections of the City while spurring relocation of old inner City functions and population to the outskirts.

Much of the change that has occurred has been beyond the control of the City of Austin, as the state government and the main campus of the State University grew enormously with the population of Texas. Concurrently, the federal government provided vast sums of money for the interstate highway and for other, large-scale public projects.

Like other cities, Austin is facing choices today about managing future growth and change. For many years the City was guided by a "growth ethic", and to challenge the course of change was to be opposed to progress. But today significant elements of the City, both inside and outside the government, see the management of that growth as essential to maintaining the quality of life in Austin.

In recent years public and private interests within the City have responded in a variety of ways, not to limit growth in Austin, but to direct it in such a way as to maintain and enhance the best qualities of the traditional City. Among these efforts have been a new Comprehensive Plan in 1977 that grew out of the *Austin Tomorrow Goals* study of 1975, the Creeks and Waterways Plan, the recommended revisions to the City's Zoning Ordinance prepared in conjunction with this document, and the growth in both the public and private sectors of the historic preservation movement.

The preservation movement is only one aspect of the response to the changes in the City but it is related to the whole spectrum of changes and responses. The preservation movement itself is composed of both public and private efforts and it includes spontaneous efforts that do not necessarily go under the name of historic preservation.

The rehabilitation and adaptive use of older inner-city structures by individuals without explicit concerns for historic preservation are widespread and growing responses to the economics of modern urban life as well as to the structure of the City which is increasingly spread out at the edges and clogged by traffic. Such spontaneous preservation efforts are positive responses to the situation but they often create problems of their own. These include, on the one hand, "gentrification" and, on the other, because they are outside the organized preservation movement and often unconscious of historic or architectural values, a loss in many cases of

the integrity and real meaning of older buildings and neighborhoods.

The organized preservation movement in Austin revolves in large part around two entities: the Heritage Society of Austin and the Historic Landmark Commission, with secondary roles played by the state and federal governments, largely at the hands of the Texas Historical Commission.

Over the last several years the Heritage Society has emerged as a visible actor in local preservation. The Heritage Society was instrumental in passage of the Historic Landmark Ordinance. It has sponsored three architectural surveys, administered a facade improvement program, operated the 1886 Tea Room, published a newsletter, and acted to protect endangered properties through purchase and resale to appropriate owners, among a variety of preservation activities.

The Historic Landmark Commission was established following the adoption of the Historic Landmark Preservation ordinance in 1974. The ordinance established a program for the designation of landmarks and historic districts, established procedures for the alteration or demolition of designated properties, called for preparation of a historic preservation plan, and, as a result of a 1978 ordinance, permitted tax exemption for designated structures and structures within designated districts.

Thus far, on recommendation of the Commission, the City Council has designated over 120 landmark structures, conferring "H" zoning status to each. The Commission has also granted Certificates of Appropriateness for alterations to designated structures. The Commission staff researches potential landmarks and makes an annual inspection of designated landmarks to verify compliance with the ordinance.

The Texas Historical Commission, in a secondary role, has been most important in Austin in recent years by nominating Congress and East Sixth Street for listing on the National Register as Historic Districts. There are other National Register Districts in the City but these are the most visible, and their status has prodded the Landmark Commission and the Heritage Society to take actions in these areas.

In the cases of both the Heritage Society and the Landmark Commission, their efforts represent a good beginning for preservation in Austin. Compared with preservation efforts in many other cities, Austin has made excellent progress in establishing a framework for preservation in both the public and private sectors. But, at the same time it can be said that a sound framework for action exists, it should also be noted that programs and other actions have not been implemented in force and measure equal to the challenge.

The principal achievements of the Heritage Society have been to raise awareness of preservation issues in Austin and to place itself in a position of significant potential influence in the City. Indeed, without a cohesive program, the potential of the Heritage Society for effective action in Austin has barely been tapped. With its financial and human resources, the Heritage Society can be much more influential than it is.

The Historic Landmark Commission has been highly effective in designating a large number of the most significant 19<sup>th</sup>-century buildings in Austin as landmarks. At the same time the Commission has taken a narrow view of its charge, concerning itself overwhelmingly with 19<sup>th</sup>-century structures and never with districts, and confining its concerns to the designation of landmarks rather than taking a leadership role in the full range of preservation activities. This conservative approach has been appropriate to the initial stages of the program. The early structures are fundamental to the subsequent history of the City, in many cases they were the most vulnerable, and they were the most publicly acceptable and politically feasible structures with which to

build a program. But such an approach has limited the long-term effectiveness of the program by leaving important aspects of the City's heritage exposed and by creating a false impression of the scope and potential of historic preservation.

While the interpretation of the criteria for designation of landmarks has been too narrow in some respects, the standards for granting Certificates of Appropriateness have been too lenient (for example, in the ground floor alterations to some commercial structures along East Sixth street). Such leniency leaves the entire ordinance, including the tax exemption benefits of designated structures, vulnerable to court challenges and opens to question the certifiability of designated structures for benefits under the Federal Tax Reform Act of 1976.

The demands of preservation in Austin today require the correction of these deficiencies, but at least as importantly they require a broader perspective on the entire scope of preservation activity. Preservation in Austin today consists of spontaneous private actions that are not intentionally "preservation" actions, of private actions with an explicitly preservationist goal, of public actions such as zoning which affect preservation, and of public preservation policy as embodied in the Landmark Ordinance. The Heritage Society and the Historic Landmark Commission need to be aware of the full range of preservation activity in the City. They need to coordinate their own actions so each reinforces the work of the other. In addition, these local bodies need to fully understand the role of the state and federal governments in preservation in order to take advantage of their programs and resources.

Preservation in Austin today is guided by a mixture of traditional attitudes that take a narrow view of preservation and an organized framework for action that is progressive and broad in its potential. The legal financial and human resources are present today in Austin to make preservation an influential voice in the City. It is the purpose of this plan to help guide changes in the preservation movement in Austin toward the release of this potential.



*Agencies and organizations related to historic preservation are listed here along with a discussion of their functions. More specific information on the programs administered by each agency is found in the following chapter.*

## **National**

---

### **National Park Service**

---

Preservation programs at the federal level are administered through the National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Department of the Interior. Formerly, this was a function of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (HCRS), an agency of the department of the Interior established in 1978. With the abolishment of HCRS in February 1981, federal preservation programs were placed under the jurisdiction of the NPS. Those programs absorbed by NPS include the National Register of Historic Places, Technical Preservation Services, the National Architectural and Engineering Record, and Interagency Archeological Services.

#### **Office of Cultural Resources**

##### **National Park Service**

*440 "G" Street, NW*

*Washington, DC 20243*

#### **South Central Regional Office**

*5000 Marble Avenue, NE*

*Albuquerque, NM 87110*

---

### **The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation**

---

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is an independent agency of the Executive Branch, which advises the President and Congress on historic preservation matters. An essential duty of the Council is to ensure that projects involving federal funding or licensing consider the historic resources, which potentially could be affected by such projects. This procedure, called the 106 process, requires the federal agency to submit "determinations of effect" and "determinations of eligibility to the National Register" to the Advisory Council for comment.

Although local preservation agencies and organizations are not formally involved in this process unless they are certified, non-certified local interests nevertheless should monitor federal activities occurring locally and make sure that historic resources are being identified and considered in the planning stage of each federal project.

#### **Advisory Council on Historic Preservation**

*1522 "K" Street, NW, Ste 430*

*Washington, DC 20005*

The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a private, non-profit organization, chartered by Congress in 1949 to stimulate public awareness and participation in historic preservation. The Trust provides a variety of services to its members and to those involved in preservation, including professional consultation, education programs and workshops, grant programs, and the administration of historic properties. The Landmarks and Preservation Law Division of the Trust in Washington, DC, provide legal information related to the purview, programs, and procedures of landmark commissions.

National Trust offices in Washington, DC, include a bookstore and a library, both open to the public. Six regional offices also provide preservation services within their respective geographical areas. Most National Trust services are available to the public, while membership privileges include receipt of publications and invitations to participate in programs.

**National Trust for Historic Preservation**

*1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW*

*Washington, DC 20036*

**Southwest/Plains Regional Office**

*210 Colcord Building*

*Oklahoma City, OK 73102*

**State**

***Texas Historical Commission***

---

The Texas Historical Commission (THC) is the state agency responsible for coordination of preservation activities in Texas. It is a commission composed of 18 appointed members, supported by a staff of approximately 40 persons. The Executive Director of the Commission serves also as the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

The THC works closely with a network of 250 county historical commissions and 237 non-profit heritage groups. As the statewide preservation agency it offers services to individuals and organizations regarding National Register nominations, Tax Act certifications, technical assistance, and other preservation related inquiries.

**Texas Historical Commission**

*P.O. Box 12276*

*Austin, Tx 78711*

---

**Texas Antiquities Committee**

---

The Texas Antiquities Committee is charged under regulations of the Antiquities Code with location, protection and preservation of cultural resources within the state. To accomplish this, the Antiquities Committee is empowered to designate State Archeological Landmarks, enter into contracts for research and salvage activities on such Landmarks, and determine the disposition of objects recovered by salvage activities.

The Committee is composed of seven members including the Director of the Texas Historical Commission, the Director of the State Parks and Wildlife Department, the commissioner of the General Land Office, the Director of the Texas Memorial Museum, the State Ar-

cheologist, a professional archeologist, and a professional historian.

**Texas Antiquities Committee**

*P.O. Box 12276*

*Austin, Tx 78711*

---

***Texas Historical Foundation***

---

The Texas Historical Foundation (THF) is a private, non-profit organization, which operates on funds from memberships and donations. It was established in 1954, primarily to finance the then unfunded Texas Historical Survey Committee (later renamed the Texas Historical Commission). After the state legislature began to provide appropriations for the Commission, the THF continued to play a vital role in financing various preservation projects of historical groups statewide. Projects supported by the Foundation today include county history filmstrips, oral history programs, an annual preservation conference, a visiting specialist program, museum programs and publications. Membership is open to both individuals and groups.

**Texas Historical Foundation**

*P.O. Box 12243*

*Austin, Tx 78711*

---

**Local**

---

**Historic Landmark Commission of the City of Austin**

---

The Historic Landmark Commission of the City of Austin is an eleven-member body appointed by the City Council and assisted by staff of the Planning Department. The Commission is empowered with a variety of duties set forth by City ordinance.

The most basic is the designation of buildings, structures, sites, districts, areas, and lands as historic landmarks through use of "H" zoning. This designation carries a strong measure of protection, since no landmark may be demolished or altered without approval of the Commission through issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Staff of the Planning Department assists the Commission with conduct of its business. Information regarding the Historic Landmark Commission and its activities may be obtained by contacting the Planning Department during normal business hours.

**City of Austin Planning Department**

**301 West Second Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor**

**Austin, Tx 78767**

---

**Heritage Society of Austin, Inc.**

---

The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc., a non-profit organization, was founded in 1953 to promote the preservation of Austin's architectural, cultural and environmental heritage. The society has provided various types of assistance to preservation efforts in Austin including participation in local surveys, outright purchase and resale of historic properties, loan and grant programs, and the administration of historic properties. Membership in the Society is open to the public.

**Heritage Society of Austin, Inc.**

*P.O. Box 2113*

*Austin, Tx 78768*



---

## **Travis County Historical Commission**

---

The Travis County Historical Commission is appointed by the County Commissioners Court for the purpose of initiating and conducting programs related to the preservation of the county's historical heritage. The seven-member commission is empowered to carry out surveys, erect historical markers, prepare a history of the county and operate a museum. In addition to continuing its nomination of properties for designation as recorded Texas Historical Landmarks, the Commission has prepared an extensive inventory of cemeteries in Travis County.

---

## **W. H. Passon Historical Society**

---

The W. H. Passon Historical Society, a non-profit organization, was founded in 1976 to discover, promote and protect elements of the Austin Black experience. The society has participated with other organizations in historic preservation projects. Its major project is to provide at least two major exhibits annually for the Carver Museum. The Society also participates in Black History month and is represented in the membership of other historical organizations.

### **W.H. Passon Historical Society**

*P.O. Box 6128*

*Austin, Tx 78762*

---

## **Private Organizations**

---

A variety of organizations with purposes not directly related to historic preservation are involved in the restoration and administration of historic structures in Austin. The Daughters of the Republic of Texas, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, the Society of Colonial Dames in Texas, the Austin Woman's Club, and the Classroom Teachers of Texas all own or administer historic structures in the City. The total effect of these individual private efforts is significant for the preservation movement in Austin.

---

## **Public Agencies and Departments**

---

Although other municipal agencies and departments are involved in activities, which affect historic sites and areas, none have programs directly related to historic preservation. In general, most public activities conducted outside the Planning Department and Historic Landmark Commission are related to management, operation, or maintenance of historic resources. The parks and Recreation Department probably is most directly involved in such activities. The Pioneer Farm and Nature Center are sites managed by the Department and utilized for interpretive purposes. But because of the specialized function of these sites and their associated programs, their direct impact on historic preservation in Austin is not significant.

The Tax Department is involved in the procedures for granting partial tax exemptions to owners of qualifying Historic landmark properties. Its role in this activity is to assess the value of the structure for which tax exemption is sought, as well as the portion of the land that is necessary for access. However, subsequent application review and site inspection are functions of the Historic Landmark Commission.

The Electric Department is responsible for the maintenance of Austin's Historic Moonlight Towers, constructed in the 1890s as a municipal street-lighting system. Although only nineteen of the towers are standing today, they are highly visible elements of Austin's history that the Electric Department should continue to retain and maintain.

The Austin Redevelopment Authority, formerly the urban Renewal Agency, undertakes new construction and renewal projects which can affect neighborhoods and historic areas of the City. Although the Authority follows no formal procedures in regard to historic sites and districts, when it is involved in actions that may affect "H" zoned sites, structures or districts, the authority notifies the Historic Landmark Commission. On a more informal basis, the Authority also notifies the Commission when its activities may affect sites or structures that are not designated landmarks but which appear to meet the criteria for designation. (The Authority is presently being moved to another City department but will continue to perform the same functions.)

The Department of Urban Transportation and the Public Works Department potentially affect individual historic structures as well as neighborhoods through new construction and maintenance activities. These two departments do not have formal procedures to follow if designated or eligible properties are encountered in a project.

### **Duplication of Effort by Existing Preservation Interest Groups**

Despite the variety of existing preservation interest groups and services in Austin, there nevertheless is very little duplication or overlap in efforts that could be considered contrary to the collective forward direction of preservation programs. Of course, several different organizations own and manage historic properties, but this is an understandable state of affairs. No one would propose that any one organization dominate or monopolize the ownership of such properties.

More significantly, there is some loss of efficiency in the co-existence of identification programs at various governmental levels that is the result of duplicate or parallel efforts. Austin City Landmarks, the State Historic Sites Inventory and the various markers programs, and the National Register have different objectives and do not necessarily overlap but do require similar efforts. These efforts could be streamlined if all could rely on a comprehensive Citywide survey and inventory, whose criteria were broad enough to include all existing programs and whose files could serve as a common base of information. Such an inventory is discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report.

One potential area of overlap lies in the creation of lecture series by the Heritage Society, a program that is proposed elsewhere in this report. As interest in Austin's physical environment increases, such a series could overlap with similar programs by the local chapter of the Texas Society of Architects or the University of Texas. On the one hand, such duplication could be unnecessary and self-defeating. On the other hand, efforts should be made not to segregate the preservation movement entirely from a broader interest in good design and an improved physical environment throughout the City. In other words, the Heritage Society could broaden its appeal and strengthen its message by occasionally inviting contemporary architects to speak on contemporary design issues. The best constituency for preservation in Austin will not be a narrow preservation constituency, but one which is well informed about the environment as a whole. This potential for duplication could be avoided simply by coordinating lecture series sponsored by different organizations so that they occur at different times and do not repeat the same programs.

---

**Austin Historic Landmark Commission**

---

In fully addressing its responsibilities as spelled out by ordinance, the Historic Landmark Commission requires additional staff, particularly an architect, to work with applicants for Certificates of Appropriateness at an early stage in the development review process. In addition, the Commission and staff need to adopt procedures through which they will be informed by all City agencies as well as state and federal agencies of projects affecting preservation. Most specifically, the close relationship with the Building Inspection Department, in which the Landmark Commission is notified of permit applications for alteration of "H" zoned structures and structures within "H" zoned districts, needs to be maintained and expanded.

Regular contact would be maintained between the Historic Landmark Commission and the Texas Historical Commission. In addition, the Landmark Commission should monitor all federal and state preservation policies and programs with a potential impact on Austin. These efforts should enjoy equal priority, for example, with the existing program that verifies maintenance of "H" designated properties, and the extensive research that is conducted by Commission staff of proposed landmark properties.

In planning for the future, the Heritage Society and Landmark Commission should see themselves as complementary entities with mutually reinforcing objectives. In summary, the Landmark Commission should concern itself with official designations at all levels and with public processes that affect preservation. The Heritage Society should pursue projects and activities, which extend beyond the more formal purview of the Landmark Commission and assist with the implementation of policies and programs.

---

**The Heritage Society of Austin**

---

The Heritage Society of Austin is an important organization whose effectiveness can be expanded and increased. This could occur principally through enlargement of its staff and development of a specific program that is coordinated with the efforts of the Historic Landmark Commission and other aspects of local preservation activities. In addition to present staff, the Heritage Society needs an executive director to develop policies and programs and to oversee general operations. With its financial resources, the Society also should retain an architect and an architectural historian to generate and maintain information on Austin's architecture, lead tours, provide guidance to individual property owners on rehabilitation process in Austin. The Society should take note of spontaneous preservation efforts in Austin, and the staff, for example, can assist with formulation of detailed design guidelines for rehabilitation in specific neighborhoods and preparation of a directory of resources related to preservation. The Heritage

Society also can expand its role in public education regarding preservation through development of school programs, contacts with the media, an expanded newsletter, and sponsorship or preparation of appropriate publications about Austin architecture. Public education programs also would include walking tours and lecture series.



*A range of techniques and programs can be utilized to promote and accomplish the goals of historic preservation at the local level. Zoning, historic designation, tax incentives, as well as financing programs are commonly recognized. These and other techniques applicable to Austin are described in this chapter. Using this information as a practical guide, those involved in preservation and conservation activities in Austin can make informed decisions about their future actions.*

## **Historic Designation**

The designation of sites, structures and districts as historic properties is a preservation activity that occurs at the federal as well as state and local levels. This process identifies significant historical properties and alerts public officials, preservationists and the public to their importance. In many cases designation as landmarks or historic sites also qualifies properties for specific benefits. The following describes the three federal programs that identify historic properties, the State's Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks Programs and the local Austin program that designates properties of historic significance and assigns them zoning status. Further information on how these programs relate to the development of a comprehensive inventory is contained in the appendix.

---

### **National Historic Landmarks Program**

---

The National Historic Landmarks Program (NHL) is the federal program to designate nationally significant sites, buildings and objects that illustrate or commemorate the history of the United States. This recognition is bestowed on a thematic basis to historic resources, which have exceptional value to the nation as a whole, rather than to a particular state or locality.

Protection for National Historic Landmarks is available under Section 8 of the National Park System General Authorities Act which mandates that the federal preservation agency monitor activities affecting Landmarks and make an annual report to Congress on any anticipated threats to their integrity. Under provisions of the Mining in National Parks Act of 1976, in cases where an NHL may be irreparably lost or destroyed by surface mining activity, the Secretary of Interior must submit a report on the activity to the advisory Council on Historic Preservation along with a request for alternative measures to mitigate potential damage. Properties designated as NHLs also are listed on the National Register of Historic Places and are afforded the same benefits and protections as National Register properties. One site in Austin, The Governor's Mansion, is designated as a National Historic Landmark.

---

## National Register of Historic Places

---

The National Register of Historic Places is the official list of the nation's significant cultural resources. It includes districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects. Properties of national, state, or local significance are nominated by state offices of historic preservation or federal agencies, and with the approval of the Secretary of Interior, are placed on the National Register. Local groups or individuals also may initiate nominations, which then go through the state office. In Texas, the National Register Program is administered by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), who also serves as the Executive Director of the Texas Historical Commission.

Before a district or privately owned property may be included on the National Register or listed as a National Historic Landmark, the owner (or majority of owners in a district) must be notified. If there is objection by the owner (or majority of owners), the property(s) will not be listed. Nevertheless, properties subject to owner objections still will be examined for eligibility for the National Register. Eligible but unlisted properties are protected from potentially negative effects of federal projects, but they cannot qualify for benefits such as grants or tax incentives.

Listing on the National Register carries with it protection from adverse effects of federally licensed or -funded projects. Under the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the National Environmental Policy Act, planning for federal projects must consider properties on or potentially eligible for the National Register.

Private sector actions affecting a National Register property are not restricted. Owners of properties listed on the National Register can alter, modify, or even demolish their structure(s) if they wish. There are, however, incentives and disincentives to private owners, which encourage preservation of, listed properties. National Register properties are eligible for federal grants-in-aid and for potential tax advantages under the Tax Reform Act of 1976. As a disincentive, the Tax Reform Act also provides that owners or lessees of certain National Register structures cannot deduct the cost of demolition of their building. This only applies to depreciable properties on the National Register or located within a National Register district or certified state or local district. This Act also prohibits the use of accelerated depreciation for a new structure on a site that was occupied by a certified historic structure that has been demolished or substantially altered.

There are 52 resources in Austin that have been placed on the National Register (through January 1, 1980):

*45 individual buildings*

*4 historic districts*

*1 archeological site*

*1 park*

*1 structure*

---

## National Architectural and Engineering Record (NAER)

---

In 1979, the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) programs were combined under the National Architectural and Engineering Record (NAER). NAER provides extensive documentation of selected historic structures throughout the country. Under NAER's documentation program, inventories and recording projects are carried out nationwide. Final products often include measured drawings, photographic documentation, historical data and published reports.



NAER drawings and photographs can be useful for a number of purposes. They provide a benchmark, illustrating the appearance or condition of a building at a particular point in time. They also can be used as the basis for rehabilitation or restoration actions.

NAER drawings and photographs are available from the Library of Congress. Published reports and catalogs can be obtained from the NAER office in Washington, DC. In Texas, microfilm copies of all Austin materials are available at the Architectural Drawings Collection at the University of Texas, and on a limited basis, from the Texas Historical Commission.

HABS surveys were conducted in Austin in 1934, 1936, 1937, 1961, 1965, 1966, 1973 and 1979. A total of twenty-one structures have been documented, sixteen of which still are standing.

## **State**

The Texas Historical Commission designates historic sites, structures, and districts through three separate but related programs. The Historical Marker Program was the original program established to distinguish significant properties throughout the state. Today the Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks Program and the Historic Sites Inventory have assumed equal or greater importance in this function. The criteria used in designating both Recorded Historic Landmarks and Historic Sites are similar to National Register criteria although the requirements for Recorded Historic Landmarks are somewhat stricter. Landmarks are protected by law and may not be demolished without notification to the Texas Historical Commission, which may then delay demolition for up to 90 days.

## **Local**

In Austin the Historic Landmark Commission may designate buildings, structures, sites, districts, areas and lands as historic landmarks through the use of "H" zoning. No landmark may be demolished or altered without approval of the Commission through issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The Commission also can enforce the maintenance of landmark building exteriors and structural soundness. In cases where a landmark structure is found to be unsound, the owner is notified and given 90 days to effect the necessary repairs unless valid reasons are established as to why such repairs cannot be undertaken. Violation of these provisions constitutes a misdemeanor and can result in the imposition of a fine.

Aside from restrictions associated with landmark status, there are strong incentives to undertake appropriate preservation actions since landmark structures are entitled to property tax exemptions. Owner-occupied landmarks are entitled to an exemption of 100 percent of the assessed value of the structure and 50 percent of the portion of the land determined necessary for access. Other designated properties, including commercial properties, are allowed an exemption of 50 percent of the assessed value of the structure and 25 percent of the assessed value of the land.

## **• LANDMARK DESIGNATION CRITERIA**

The criteria for designation of historic landmarks in Austin are set forth in Section 45-45 of the Historic Landmark Preservation ordinance. These criteria appear to be sufficiently comprehensive to encompass the full range of cultural resources that might be worthy of landmark status in Austin. Nevertheless, the existing criteria should be prefaced by a provision requiring that all designated landmarks possess, in

words similar to those of the National Register criteria, integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. While this does not change the substantive meaning or intent of the existing criteria, it changes potential application of the criteria somewhat by insisting that a structure continue to possess, regardless of alterations and modifications subsequent to its original construction, a degree of integrity which will identify the structure with its historical interest. Without the addition to the criteria of such a provision, buildings which have been totally remodeled but which are original in their underlying strict and plan technically could be construed as being eligible for designation as landmarks. Or in other cases, buildings with inappropriate alterations could be designated, cheapening the meaning of the designation. This provision is not intended to exclude structures which may have been altered somewhat over the course of time. Certain alterations, such as additions, porches, towers, new ornamentation, and various other functional modifications, are necessary developments in the life of many buildings and therefore ought not necessarily to be seen as negating the historical value of the building. On the other hand, the provision is intended to exclude structures that derive their chief significance from the 19th-century, for example, and which in the years since World War II have been stripped of all ornamental detail or subject to inauthentic reconstruction or additions.

If the existing criteria are adhered to, including the proposed additional provision, the range of resources designated as landmarks can and should be expanded without any additional changes to the criteria. In other words, the existing criteria are more than adequate. It is their interpretation and application, which need to be fully recognized, specifically in moving beyond the 19th-century to the period between 1900 and the 1930s.

With respect to the criteria of other relevant inventories, it is useful to note that the National Register of Historic Places and the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) of the State of Texas possess, in different words, essentially the same criteria with one exception: unlike the National Register, the HSI does not routinely exclude resources less than 50 years old. The Austin Landmarks criteria also are without an age limitation. In addition, the Austin criteria do not exclude “cemeteries, birthplaces or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religions, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, (and) properties primarily commemorative in nature” as do the National Register and the HSI under normal circumstances. The National Register criteria are more tightly drawn than Austin’s landmarks criteria, but in substance are very similar. The two most important ways in which Austin’s criteria are more flexible are their potential designation of buildings less than 50 years of age and their potential inclusion of buildings, which have been moved. In both cases it is appropriate that Austin possess criteria that are more flexible than the National Register. In the case of buildings which have been moved, it only recently has come to be recognized that moving buildings is a legitimate part of growth and change in a city, and therefore, that it is artificial to exclude buildings from an inventory simply because they have been moved. Of course, the original location of a building which is significant primarily for its historical associations should continue to command primary importance, in contrast to the degree of importance attributed to the original location of a building that is significant primarily for its visual qualities.

### **Zoning**

Zoning is a tool, which is used in Austin to achieve historic preservation as well as neighborhood conservation. Although historic preservation and neighborhood conservation involves similar activities and often achieves similar results, neighborhood conservation involves the protection of older structures and areas for reasons other than those, which underlie and inspire historic preservation. Neighborhood conservation seeks to rehabilitate older structures and retain the character of older districts for reasons of economics, energy savings, environmental amenities, and social desires. While it explicitly has had little to do with historic or architectural values, neighborhood conservation often serves such goals as effectively as, or even more so than, historic preservation itself.

To formally recognize the value of historic preservation in Austin, the City Council in 1974 adopted an ordinance, which provides special zoning for historic sites and districts. Neighborhood conservation also is recognized as a vital and integral part of the City’s planning programs and accordingly, has been addressed in recently recommended revisions to Austin’s Zoning Ordinance. Both of these zoning classifications are overlays that can be added to other use designations established in the Zoning Ordinance.

---

### **Neighborhood Conservation Combining District**

---

Revisions to the Zoning Ordinance recommend the Neighborhood Conservation Combining District as an appropriate tool for retaining and enhancing older areas or districts possessing distinctive features, identity, or character. To

obtain this zoning overlay designation, neighborhood residents or a neighborhood association must prepare and submit a plan which identifies both significant built resources and specific ways of applying the City's zoning requirements to fit the distinctive characteristics of the neighborhood. Both the underlying zoning classifications and site development regulations can be modified for a given neighborhood district through use of this overlay mechanism.

To qualify for the district designation, an area must meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. *Distinctive building features, such as period of construction, style, size, scale, rhythm, mass, color, and material.*
2. *Distinctive features or articles associated with the streetscape, such as light fixtures and devices, signs, benches, curb markers, kiosks, and bollards.*
3. *Distinctive site planning and natural features, such as lot platting, street layout, setbacks, alleyways, sidewalks, creek beds, parks, and gardens.*
4. *Distinctive land uses or land use patterns, such as mixed or unique uses or activities, not permitted by base district regulations without modifications.*

#### **"H" Zoning**

Designation of landmark structures and districts in Austin occurs when the City Council adopts "H" zoning for a historic landmark in addition to other uses established in the Zoning Ordinance. A comprehensive set of criteria related to architectural, historical, and cultural

values are considered in the designation of historic sites and districts. These criteria differ from those used for Neighborhood Conservation combining Districts, which are related to the distinctive features which unite the district and are less restrictive or selective than those used to designate historic sites.

Designated historic sites and districts are protected further through the oversight activities of the Historic Landmark Commission, which can grant or deny Certificates of Appropriateness to owners of structures who construct, reconstruct, alter, change, restore, remove, or demolish any exterior feature of a designated landmark.

Opportunities for securing tax exemption on "H" zoned properties present another major difference between the two zoning designations. This provision encourages the preservation and maintenance of "H" designated properties, a provision which owners of properties in Neighborhood Conservation Combining Districts do not enjoy.

There are a number of ways in which the two zoning classifications can and should be used together to promote historic preservation and neighborhood conservation. In Austin there are situations where "H" zoned landmark properties exist in proximity to each other but are not located in areas which possess the architectural or historical integrity to qualify for designation as a historic district.

To retain the setting of these structures as well as the neighborhood as a whole, the Neighborhood Conservation combining District designation may be used. In other cases, combining districts can recognize and protect significant areas that surround historic districts, recognizing once again that such areas do not qualify for landmark status but nonetheless do possess special qualities worthy of retention or enhancement. In this way, neighborhood Conservation Combining Districts can reinforce and complement "H" designated properties and landmark districts.

### **Comprehensive Inventory**

The development of a comprehensive inventory of Austin's cultural resources is essential if historic preservation, City planning, and development are to complement and support one another. A properly conducted inventory not only will facilitate public decision making, but it also can be valuable to private organizations or individuals directly or indirectly involved in the historic preservation process.

An inventory is a tool, which can be used by a variety of local interests. It is developed apart from political concerns so it is an objective standard. Using the inventory as a common base, each interest can establish values and set priorities for future actions.

Identification of resources through an inventory does not imply that every site or structure is of equal historical or architectural value or deserves the highest form of preservation. To the contrary, the inventory allows for comparisons and decisions based on relative significance of properties. This comprehensive view of historic resources is basic to a successful historic preservation program, which is integrated into planning and development activities.

Before an inventory is undertaken, its purpose and potential beneficiaries must be identified in order to establish a framework for interpreting evaluative criteria and for aiming at specific end products. The general criteria, as discussed below, are established and widely accepted, but the way in which such criteria are interpreted vary from City to City and always need

refinement in view of specific objectives and constituencies. Desired end products might include files of survey forms and photographs, separate research files, publications, posters, exhibits, and slide shows. An inventory is, of course, the first step in any comprehensive preservation program and is essential to such a program. Beyond that, one must identify the various constituencies who will be served by it. These will include the general public, commissioners and staff of public agencies, development interests, school children, historians, architectural historians, and antiquarians. For each of these constituencies it is important to ascertain how the inventory can be made most useful. All concerned – review boards, planning staff, and private developers – ought to be able to look at an inventory and make decisions based on it. The public at large also should understand and use the inventory.

It is more likely to be supported when it is presented clearly and related to the contemporary fabric of the City. Widespread private-sector preservation activities suggest that the public is interested in using preservation to promote contemporary urban values as well as traditional historic values. If a goal of preservation is to support conservation and enhancement of neighborhoods and districts, then preservation will be better understood, better appreciated, and better supported by a broader constituency.

### **Components of a Comprehensive Inventory**

- **DEVELOPMENT HISTORY** Just as preparation of a historic preservation plan should be preceded by completion of a comprehensive inventory, such an inventory should be done in the light of the history of the community. Thus, the first step in an inventory is preparation of a development history. And, as the inventory is useful in general City planning as well as in historic preservation, so also the development history is not merely an introduction of the inventory but rather should be considered as background to formulation of City planning policies and programs.

While planners, architects, and historians frequently invoke history to prove a point, it is rare that a city has an adequate written history of its own development that would support many of the points being made. Every city has its histories of political, economic, and social events, but few (and Austin is no exception) have histories which describe the physical evolution of the City, i.e., how it has looked over time, and what has been significant in bringing about important changes. Such a history must go beyond orthodox historical sources and utilize a range of new sources that describe such things as the City's infrastructure (street layout, sewers, electric and gas lines, water sources, transportation), subdivision growth, commercial and industrial development, the economic base, changes in technology, and the arrival of significant immigrant groups. A history that focuses on these developmental factors can provide a context within which the development of the City's architecture has taken place. With such a background many of the deficiencies of previous surveys will be resolved easily. A rudimentary development history of Austin appears near the beginning of this Historic Preservation Plan.

- **FIELD SURVEY** A field survey provides much of the raw material out of which the eventual evaluated inventory will emerge. In a field survey, every cultural resource within the area to be inventoried should be viewed. Those resources, which meet preliminary visual criteria for significance, should be photographed, and survey forms should be filled out.



The City should use the survey forms used by the Texas Historical Commission in conducting the State's Historic Sites Inventory. These forms provide space for recording all the basic information needed in a survey; they are concise yet complete and they are easy to use. Moreover, using these forms will facilitate interaction with state and federal preservation programs, and, indeed will be recognized if state funds are used in conducting the inventory. (Note: as of this writing, the future availability of such state inventory money, formerly supplied by the federal government is uncertain at best.)

The preliminary visual criteria used in deciding which resources ought to be recorded in the field survey should be those aspects of the criteria used in assessing eligibility to the Historic Sites Inventory and the National Register which pertain to Architectural or design values. At this stage those criteria should be loosely interpreted so that nothing is left out which, after historic research, might later prove to be of significance. Once the research has been done, those resources, which do not measure up to the inventory criteria (see below), will be dropped from further consideration. At the level of the field survey including too many resources does no harm, whereas important resources can be omitted by using an approach which is too restrictive. Indeed, in order to ensure the consistency and quality of the final inventory, it is essential to take a broadly inclusive approach at this stage.

- **RESEARCH** Once the field survey is complete, each identified resource should be researched for its historic associations and its history: who built it, who has occupied it, what it has been used for, what significant events have occurred there, who designed it, how was it built, what kinds of significant changes have occurred and what relation, intentional or accidental, does the resource have to its surroundings? The intent of these guidelines is not to increase the amount of research done but to expand its range of concerns. By focusing in on the specific information needed, less research is often necessary.

- **EVALUATION AND CRITERIA** When each resource identified in the field survey has been researched, each can be evaluated, based on explicit criteria, as to potential eligibility for nomination to the Historic Sites Inventory and the National Register; eligibility as a City-designated historic landmark; as a contributor to a conservation area; or of no interest. The inventory itself should be inclusive rather than exclusive. Because it is a source of information and not a program governed by City codes, it should look broadly at the built environment. The inventory should include a range of resources and not be restricted to preconceptions of what today constitutes good or interesting architecture. The criteria of the State's Historic Sites Inventory, which are the National Register criteria loosely interpreted, ought to serve as criteria for Austin's inventory. (This would involve including structures built up to about 1945. To cut off at an earlier date would produce an inventory that would be quickly out-dated from the standpoint of National Register Criteria. The National Register requires that most structures be at least 50 years old, which today means that a building constructed in 1931 is potentially eligible.) In this way, by adhering to established criteria but interpreting them in such a way as to provide a broad base of information about the City's resources, the consistency and quality of the inventory can be achieved.

There was relatively little new construction in Austin between 1930 and 1945 because of the Depression and World War II. Thus, with relatively few additions, the inventory can be brought up to 1945, making it a valuable tool for the next 15 years without significant revision.



- **REVIEW** The inventory should be reviewed by local persons knowledgeable in the history and architectural history of Austin, both to check the information and to lend credence and respectability to the findings of the inventory. Such a review panel should include persons knowledgeable in the history and architectural history of Austin, including the City's ethnic diversity and its folk and popular architecture. The panel should be so familiar with both the City's history and with the purposes, methods, and content of the inventory that it can judge the results and contribute to them. Whatever the final product, it must be widely recognized as comprehensive and professional.
- **PUBLICITY** Contrary to the expressed concerns of some in Austin, an inventory, which is widely publicized, is unlikely to create problems for preservation. Rather, as seen in situations all over the United States, the well-publicized results of an inventory have yielded long-term benefits. Ideally the publicized inventory consists of a high-quality document that explains its methodology, illustrates its findings, and includes a brief historical introduction. It can be a most powerful tool for public education and public support. At the same time, it informs private investment and construction interests that certain properties are considered valuable to the City. Such information, once made available to the community at large, often results in avoiding confrontations between interest groups. It also can result in the retention and enhancement of a community's significant resources.
- **ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE** Once the inventory is complete, it should be maintained by the City. Files ought to be available to City agencies, development and business interests, and the general public. Additions should be made to the files, as new information becomes available.

Periodically, a general review should be made of the files to note resources that have been demolished or altered. It also should be recognized that even the most expert opinions about architecture and historical periods change, and that adjustments are likely to be made from time to time on that account.

- **END PRODUCTS** The direct, tangible products to result from any inventory would be two sets of files, one of which would consist of completed Historic Sites Inventory forms and photographs while the other would consist of historic research on individual resources. In addition, several other products could be generated including posters, exhibits, slide shows, and a survey publication.

---

#### **Requirements for Conducting a Comprehensive Inventory**

---

- **FUNDING SOURCES** Three potential sources of funding stand out for conducting an inventory of Austin's cultural resources. The first and most obvious is the Texas Historical Commission, which is obligated under the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to conduct an inventory of cultural resources in the state. The Texas Historic Sites Inventory, the HSI, could be expanded in Austin for the City's purposes as well as those of the state. The principal condition to be observed is use of the state's inventory forms and photography format, but this requirement should present no conflicts with an Austin inventory. The Texas Historical Commission funds surveys that must be matched by local money or in-kind services. (However, because of the uncertainties of the present federal budget, such funding in the future is not assured.)

A second potential funding source is the community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Other federal government sources also may be possible, but CDBG funds can be utilized directly for inventory purposes. Use of any federal funding would stipulate that assessment of resources potentially eligible for listing on the National Register must be included, a step that would facilitate environmental review and would be one of the key features of any inventory which involves the City's participation.

A third potential source is the Austin Heritage Society. The Heritage Society has contributed to past survey efforts and was among the first to express strong interest and support for conducting a comprehensive inventory of Austin.

- **ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING** In terms of quality, comprehensiveness and cost effectiveness, the historic preservation inventory should be compiled by professionals. However, if a decision is made to utilize services of community volunteers, professionals nevertheless should be retained to conduct the field survey and to manage the evaluation at the end of the process, as well as to train volunteers who are guided by a local coordinator. Volunteer input works best when it is centered around established institutions that can make a commitment to carry out a project. The Junior League is one example of such an organization that has been active and successful in assisting, or in actually conducting, historic preservation inventories all over the United States. The Heritage Society of Austin is perhaps the most obvious local organization to provide and coordinate volunteers for such a project.

## **Building Codes**

Austin as a major American City, possesses a wide variety of building types and styles. New construction ranges from single-family dwelling units to high-rise office and commercial structures. Existing construction includes building types from residential to major governmental and commercial structures. There also are special types, such as historic and landmark buildings. In the public interest Austin has adopted a building code to regulate construction and alteration of most all of these structures. The code's overriding objective is to "provide minimum standards to safeguard life or limb, health, property, and public welfare by regulating and controlling the design, construction, quality of materials, use and occupancy, location, and maintenance of all buildings and structures."

---

### **The Uniform Building Code**

---

In order to meet its needs for establishing and enforcing building regulations, the City of Austin has adopted the 1979 Edition of the Uniform Building Code (UBC). With certain amendments, these provisions are enumerated as Chapter 36 of the Austin City Code. The UBC is written by the International Conference of Building Officials and was first published in 1927. A new edition is published approximately every three years and contains the changes agreed upon by the conference since the last edition.

The building code is strongly oriented towards new construction, and the provisions that apply to existing and historic structures are brief and found mainly in Sections 104 and 105. Paragraph 104(b) of Section 36-104, entitled "Application to Existing Buildings and Structures," provides that, in the case of existing buildings, only the proposed addition, alteration, or repair must conform to all present code requirements. The three conditions attached to this are: 1) the proposed new construction shall not make the existing building unsafe or overloaded; 2) if construction involves a change in use or occupancy the resulting building will not exceed code requirements for height, number of stories, or area; and 3) minor repairs may be made in the same materials and methods of construction as the existing building.

Paragraphs 104(c) and 104(d) establish the "applicable code theory" regarding occupancy and construction, meaning that any existing building, must, as a minimum, comply with the codes that were in effect at the time of construction

Any change in occupancy, as defined by the building regulations, is conditioned on the new use being less hazardous, based on life and fire risk, than the existing use. If the change in occupancy is more hazardous, then the entire building must conform to the requirements for a new structure.

The special construction requirements for certified historic buildings are recognized in Paragraph 104(f). It provides that any rehabilitation work (or continued use) of a designated historic structure need not conform with all code requirements so long as unsafe conditions are corrected and no new life safety, fire, or sanitation hazards are created.

Section 36-105 provides for official acceptance of any materials or methods of construction that may not be specifically described in the code so long as they are equivalent in performance to accepted types. For existing buildings, this section can be used to establish code approval for archaic materials and methods of construction.

• **REHABILITATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES** Because the Austin Building code is rooted principally in the Uniform Building Code, it is oriented primarily towards the requirements of new construction. Typically, application of the building code to the rehabilitation of existing construction has caused several problems: construction costs are frequently inflated, time required for approvals is lengthened considerably, and otherwise feasible projects are discouraged. These problems exist because present code requirements, which are new-construction oriented, may not be applicable to the materials and methods of construction used in existing structures. As building technology changes, so does the building code in updating its provisions. In the process older types of construction are deleted from the code. Also, when code questions arise concerning a proposed rehabilitation project, the approval process is made longer and more difficult because the code does not specifically address the issues involved. As a result, solutions are frequently forced into what may be most appropriate for new construction. In terms of older buildings this may result in considerable additional cost. The combination of approval and construction problems too frequently makes projects infeasible, resulting in no improvement to the property where there might otherwise have been some.

In addition, present day codes emphasize property protection over life safety. There are strict requirements for materials and methods of construction that are designed to limit fire damage to buildings and to prevent fire from spreading to adjoining buildings. These requirements are in excess of what is necessary to provide safe egress for persons from a burning structure. However, existing buildings typically have materials with lower fire resistance than is now required. Improvements to the life safety of persons should be encouraged, but to require major reconstruction of a building to reduce fire risk to the property itself may cause unnecessary condemnation of substantial and usable buildings.

The rehabilitation of existing buildings, whether historic or not, should be encouraged in Austin. One method of promoting this activity is to develop special guidelines for rehabilitation. These would specify special egress rules, fire-resistive standards for archaic materials, improvement of electrical and plumbing systems, and special requirements for handicapped access and energy conservation. One potential source to consult for developing such special guidelines is a series of publications recently released by the Federal Department of Housing and urban Development (HUD).

*The Rehabilitation Guidelines 1980 (Volumes 1-8)* were written to fulfill the mandate of the Housing and community Development Amendments of 1978, Section 903. As Congress intended, they are not a code and they are not a code and they are not written in code language. They are "designed for voluntary adoption and use by states and communities as a means to upgrade and preserve the national building stock, while maintaining reasonable standards for health and safety."

Volumes 1 to 4 are advisory guidelines intended for use by government policy makers and code officials. They address procedures for modifying existing codes and regulatory practices to promote rehabilitation of buildings, suggest new permit and inspection procedures, outline liability concerns for building officials, and in general, develop recommendations for state or local rehabilitation codes. Volume 1 is the only guideline (of all eight) to specifically address historic structures. This material is only one Page in length and merely points out that historic buildings may be exempted from full code compliance, as stated in the national model codes.

Volumes 5 to 8 analyze specific building code requirements that adversely affect rehabilitation and recommend solutions for the problems caused. These guidelines are intended to mitigate the effects caused by application of the prevailing code, wherein full compliance is required for existing buildings to standards mandated for new construction. Volumes 5 to 8 may be used in parallel with a prevailing code; however, the preferred approach is for a jurisdiction to specifically write and adopt a rehabilitation building code.

The HUD *Rehabilitation Guidelines* provide comprehensive and up-to-date information concerning specialized building regulations that affect existing structures. It is a source of material that warrants close examination by the Austin Building Inspection Department leading potentially to recommendations for amendment of Austin's building code.

- **MODIFICATION OF LANDMARK STRUCTURES** Landmark structures present even more specialized circumstances with regard to building code requirements. Frequently such structures are among the oldest in a City. Their materials and methods of construction usually are archaic and no longer generally available or code-approved. From a code standpoint, this makes restoration work much more difficult. Since present code provisions tend to force substitution of new materials for original ones and require more strict fire-resistive and egress standards than those found in older construction, major damage to the historical and architectural integrity of structures and streetscape areas frequently occurs.

Austin's building code does not specifically address the issues related to historic structures since paragraph 36-104(f), amended, assigns review of building permit applications for historic landmarks (either designated or pending) to the Historic Landmark Commission. For exterior restoration, removal or demolition of a designated historic landmark, a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Landmark Commission is required before the building official can act on the application. For structures pending designation, a building permit may not be issued until the status of the landmark application is resolved.

In cases of repair, however, the Building Inspection Department exercises discretion. With the exception of utility systems, the department allows routine repairs to be made to the exterior of "H" zoned structures without referral to the Historic Landmark Commission.

The Historic Landmark section of the Zoning Ordinance contains a special provision for structures within designated historic districts. The preservation plan required for these districts can include recommendations for amendments to the building code in order to "preserve the architectural and historical integrity and authenticity of structures within each district." This allows for appropriate consideration of the special characteristics of buildings within historic districts.

Another method for addressing the special needs of historic structures is to develop alternative building regulations that apply to designated historic structures at either the City or state level. The California State Historical Building Code (SHBC), adopted in 1979, is one example. Its purpose is to provide alternative building regulations for the rehabilitation, preservation, restoration (including related reconstruction), or relocation of buildings or structures designated as historic. Such alternative building regulations are intended to facilitate the restoration or change of occupancy so as to preserve original or restored architectural elements and features, to encourage energy conservation and a cost-effective approach to preser-

vation, and to provide for the safety of the building occupants.

The SHBC includes requirements for construction and establishes general levels of performance. The restoration work cannot create new safety hazards and the safety of occupants is emphasized over the protection of property. Where possible, specific regulations have been stated to aid the building official in reaching affirmative decisions. To allow for unique circumstances in particular buildings, the code establishes procedures for approvals on a case-by-case basis.

In California the SHBC carries the weight of state law. It is a permissive code (that is, its requirements are not mandatory minimums), and any building official may cite its provisions by reference. It has proved to be a useful tool in achieving successful restoration of historic structures. The Historic Landmark Commission, along with other interested parties in Austin, should investigate the advantages of a state historical building code. Upon completion of this type of investigation, and based upon a sufficient number of affirmative findings, the Commission can play a leadership role, together with the Texas Historical Commission and other interested organizations and interests, in formulating alternative code provisions and pressing for enactment of appropriate state statutes.

In conclusion, the Austin Building code provides the framework for considering the special requirements of existing buildings. It also offers the opportunity to further develop specific building regulations, such as guidelines for rehabilitation and a historical building code that would maintain essential levels of health and safety while reducing regulatory barriers.

## **Preservation Financing and Funding**

---

### **National Programs**

---

As federal financial support for historic preservation and planning appears headed for major cutbacks, cities such as Austin no longer should anticipate federal sources of funding for historic preservation projects. A number of programs have been eliminated or sharply curtailed under the Reagan administration and with those that will continue to operate, preservation will be competing with a variety of other activities for limited amounts of money.

Two programs which in the past have held the greatest potential for preservation funding have been the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Historic Preservation Grants-In-Aid Program, sponsored by the Department of the Interior. The status of other programs related to preservation, rehabilitation and economic development sponsored by the Departments of Commerce, Labor and Agriculture is uncertain at this time. The Challenge Grants program, sponsored by the National Endowments for the Arts (NEA) and Humanities (NEH), which provides support to cultural organizations, is also scheduled for a major cutback. Due to the changing requirements and uncertain status of all federal programs, interested individuals should contact the Texas Historical Commission or their state legislators. The regional offices of each federal agency can also provide current information on the status of their programs.

- **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS** Block grants are available to communities through HUD's CDBG program. In the

Past, there has been substantial local discretion in determining how funds are to be used, although projects have had to demonstrate that they benefit low- or moderate-income persons, aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or meet other community development needs. Across the country, block grant money has been used for preservation activities such as surveys and inventories, planning, and acquisition and development.

Due to the elimination or absorption of other HUD programs into the CDBG program, preservation projects will be competing with a variety of other activities. The availability of CDBG money for preservation projects will be determined by the locality.

- **HISTORIC PRESERVATION GRANTS-IN-AID** The Department of the Interior's Grants-In-Aid program provides federal funds to the state offices of historic preservation to help pay for up to 50 percent of the costs of state and local studies, plans, surveys, and acquisition and development projects involving National Register sites. State and local governments may receive grant money but private projects no longer qualify. Due to proposed cuts, the program is currently inactive.

In Texas, there may be an alternative to this federal source of funding, however. Proposed state legislation would establish statutory authority for the Texas Historical Commission to administer a grants-in-aid program utilizing state, rather than federal appropriations. As a supplement, or alternative, to federal grants-in-aid sponsored by the department of the Interior, this program has important implications for local preservation efforts. For more information, contact the Texas Historical Commission.

- **NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION** The National Trust for Historic Preservation has recently established an Inner-city Ventures Fund to assist neighborhood self-help groups acquire housing in historic districts for low-income residents, particularly minorities. To provide leveraging power to neighborhood groups, the fund will make grants and loans of equal amount at half the prevailing prime rate to qualified groups that must in turn raise an amount equal to the grant. Ten to twelve neighborhoods will be assisted during the program's first year. Assistance will be limited to neighborhoods on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

---

### Local Programs

---

The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc. provides a substantial amount of support for local preservation efforts. A loan program administered by the Society supplements or substitutes for conventional financing for preservation projects. A \$100,000 Facade Grant Program started in 1978 has provided matching or supplemental grants to owners of commercial properties for restoration or rehabilitation of significant building facades. The Society also has matched a federal grant to pay for a historic structures inventory in East Austin, funded preservation studies, and undertaken the outright purchase, restoration, and resale of historic properties. Interested individuals should contact the Austin Heritage Society.

---

### Private Sources

---

- **CORPORATIONS** Private corporations are potential sources of financial assistance for historic preservation activities. Increasingly, they have made efforts to enhance the quality of life in areas where they operate. Most corporations establish either a company foundation or designate a contributions committee with

authority to authorize corporate contributions. When soliciting corporate support it is most useful for local groups to approach the local officer or general manager of a corporation. In Austin, representatives of local preservation organizations should contact locally based corporations to generate interest and involvement in historic preservation activities and to encourage their financial support.

- **FOUNDATIONS** Private foundations offer another source of funding for preservation and neighborhood improvement activities. Those, which show support in these areas, include Ford, New York Community Trust, John Hay Whitney, Gund, Cleveland, Kettering, William Penn, Dayton-Hudson and the St. Paul Company. For more information of foundations, consult *The Foundation Director*, one of the publications issued by the Foundation Center, a non-profit education organization established to collect and disseminate information on philanthropic organizations. For information on state foundations, consult *The Directory of Texas Foundations*.

- **INDIVIDUAL DONORS** Individual donations can also provide private support for historic preservation activities. Both those involved in preservation and those outside the field are potential contributors. The Austin Heritage Society, The Junior League and other non-profit organizations should take advantage of their membership programs to develop involvement and financial support from individuals.

- **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS** Local economic development corporations have been established throughout the country by groups of savings and loan associations or commercial banks which have committed resources to neighborhood preservation and rehabilitation projects. Some economic development corporations actually purchase and renovate buildings under their own programs. Others may enter into joint ventures with private developers.

Some economic development corporations may be quasi-public or entirely public bodies. As with economic development corporations established by local lending institutions or other private financing and development sources, the activities of public economic development corporations vary from full-scale renovation, adaptive use and new construction projects to joint ventures with private development companies.

## **Tax Incentives**

---

### **Partial Tax Exemption**

---

The Texas Constitution allows governing bodies, which levy property taxes to exempt certain historic structures. Owners of designated historic properties in Austin can take advantage of these tax relief measures at the City, County, and school district levels.

In the City of Austin, the City Council can approve for partial exemption from ad valorem taxes historic landmark properties zoned "H." Owner-occupied residences are allowed an exemption of 100 percent of the assessed value of the historic structure, and 50 percent of the assessed value of the land, which is determined to be necessary for access to the structure. All other historic properties, including but not limited to those used for commercial purposes, have an exemption of 50 percent of the assessed value of the structure and 25 percent of the assessed value of the land. To qualify, owners of designated landmark properties must file an application with the Landmark Commission for each year they wish to obtain the tax exemptions.



Travis County allows similar ad valorem tax relief to historic properties. Eligible for tax exemption are Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks and historic properties as designated by the Austin Landmarks Commission.

The Austin Independent School District also has adopted a historic property tax relief ordinance. The School Board offers tax abatements to structures which are Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks or Landmark Commission-designated historic landmarks. The inclusion of both categories allows the School Board to recognize structures of historic significance, which are within the School District but outside City limits.

- **TAX EMEMPTION AND "H" ZONING** Austin's Tax Exemption ordinance allows owners of qualifying "H" zoned properties to apply for and receive partial tax exemptions on their properties for an indefinite time period. Although this provision unquestionably acts as an incentive to owners of historic properties to retain and preserve such landmark properties, tax exemption as presently constituted most probably is pushing the Landmark Commission and City Council into a stricter interpretation to designation of significant structures. Limiting the program in this manner can weaken the effectiveness of "H" zoning. This zoning designation is a form of protection, and therefore should be applied broadly enough to include the full potential range of eligible historic properties in Austin.

Since the Tax Exemption ordinance does not set a limit on the number of years owners of "H" zoned properties may file for tax exemption, the benefits may continue indefinitely. Rather than serving as a perpetual reward to a relatively small number of property owners, tax exemption should act as an incentive to owners and investors undertaking rehabilitation, repair, and maintenance on a broad spectrum of landmark properties. To reach this broader constituency, the City Council and the Historic Landmark Commission should give serious consideration to amendment of the Tax Exemption ordinance providing for a maximum term of 10 years.

---

#### **Tax Reform Act of 1976 and Revenue Act of 1978**

---

Federal tax incentives for the rehabilitation of income-producing historic properties currently are available. Established by the Tax Reform Act of 1976 and the Revenue Act of 1978, these incentives originally were due to expire in 1981 but have been extended for three years under the terms of the Tax Treatment Extension Act of 1980.

To be eligible for application of the provisions, a property must be of an income-producing nature; owner-occupied residential structures do not qualify. The property also must be listed on the National Register of Historic Places (individually or within a district) or located within a certified state or local district. Those applying for the benefits must be owners or long-term lessees.

There are several options. An owner may amortize rehabilitation costs over a five-year period, rather than depreciating the costs over the actual useful life of the improvements. Or, if a property qualifies as "substantially rehabilitated," the owner instead may take accelerated depreciation by depreciating the adjusted basis of the entire rehabilitated structure at a faster rate than otherwise allowed. If effect, this allows owners to depreciate property as though they were the original users. The economic benefits of these provisions depend upon a variety of factors, including the project schedule,

the investor's financial situation and the amount of time the owner intends to hold the property. To accurately determine the potential advantages, investors should consult an accountant or tax lawyer.

As a disincentive, the Tax Reform Act also provides that an owner or lessee of a certified historic structure cannot deduct the costs associated with demolition of the structure. Any depreciable structure located in a National Register or certified state or local historic district is treated as a certified historic structure unless the Secretary of Interior determines, before or after demolition, that is not of historic significance to the district. The Act also prohibits the use of accelerated depreciation for a new structure on a site that was occupied by a certified historic structure that has been demolished or substantially altered.

The application process for these tax benefits is a relatively simple one. Property owners must complete a two-part, four-page Historic Preservation Certification Application. In Part 1, the Certification of Significance, the application summarizes the structure's significance and how it contributes to the district. In Part 2, Certification of Rehabilitation, the applicant presents pertinent information on the rehabilitation work. Rehabilitation improvements must observe the criteria as spelled out in *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. Applications and *Standards for Rehabilitation* are available from the Texas Historical Commission. The combined processing time for review at the state and federal levels normally is four to five months.

The Revenue Act of 1978 also provides an investment tax credit to encourage owners or lessees to rehabilitate older buildings. The tax credit applies to commercial and industrial buildings that have been in use for twenty years or more. At least 75 percent of the existing external walls must remain in place after rehabilitation, and improvements must have a life of five years or more. Buildings do not have to be designated historic structures to qualify but if they are on the National Register or within a certified district, the Department of the Interior must certify the rehabilitation. For more specific information on technical requirements and the application procedures pertaining to the Tax Act, individuals should contact the Texas Historical Commission.

## **Preferential Public Leasing and Acquisition**

Both the federal government and the Texas State government are required by law to give preferential consideration to historic properties when leasing or purchasing office space. In Texas, the State Purchasing and General Services Commission must give first consideration to any structures that have been designated as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks, that have been listed on the National Register of Historic Places, or have been designated as landmark structures by the local governing authority provided that the structure meets certain requirements and is not substantially more expensive than other available office space.

The Texas Purchasing and General Services Commission maintains Zip Code mailing lists and notifies all potentially-interested parties when office space is needed within certain Zip Code areas. Those interested in the preservation of larger-scale historic structures should watch the state lease announcements and inform the General Services Commission of available landmarks.

### **Texas State Purchasing and General Services Commission**

*P.O. Box 13047*

*Austin, Tx 78711*

At the federal level, the public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976 directs the General Services Administration (GSA) to acquire space for offices in buildings of historic, architectural or cultural significance. The legislation also encourages GSA to lease office space located in federal buildings to individuals or groups affiliated with recreational or cultural resource activities.

To recommend specific structures for leasing or to obtain more information on the legislation, contact the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

### **Advisory Council on Historic Preservation**

*1522 "K" Street, NW, Ste 430*

*Washington, DC 20005*

## **Legal Tools**

---

### **Easements**

---

An easement is a limited ownership right in a piece of real property, granted by the owner and conveyed to a qualifying individual or organization. Easements are granted in perpetuity and accompany the title to the property through successive ownership. They usually are conveyed to a public body or non-profit organization.

In most cases, easements are granted on the facade of a structure. This prohibits the owner from altering the exterior appearance of the building without prior review and approval of the individual or organization to whom the easement has been conveyed. Since an easement is less than a total or "fee" interest in property, it can be a less expensive way to control use than outright purchase.

Property owners granting easements potentially can save on federal income and local property taxes. The value of the donation may be deducted from taxable income pursuant to Internal Revenue Service regulations. Although this technique has been used around the country, there can be some difficulty involved in establishing an acceptable value of the easement. By shopping around for a knowledgeable real estate

appraiser and tax lawyer, an owner of a qualifying historic property potentially can realize significant tax benefits.

---

### **Restrictive Covenants**

---

An instrument similar in nature to the easement is the restrictive covenant. A covenant is a legal restriction on the use of property and not a right of ownership. Restrictive covenants as part of a deed transfer bind record owners and their successors to certain restrictions with regard to use and enjoyment of their property. Frequently such covenants have a time limit, such as 99 years. Covenants used in historic preservation often stipulate that no alteration can be made to an exterior surface without prior consent of a designated body; that the body may sue the owner if this agreement is somehow abridged or violated; and that the body has first option to purchase the property if it is put up for sale.

---

### **Revolving Funds**

---

A revolving fund involves a sum of money which is set up and invested in preservation projects. Money from the fund can be used for loans, grants, or the purchase and resale of properties. The fund is "revolving" because it continually is replenished by repayment or returns on investments, only to be turned around and put into new projects. The Austin Redevelopment Authority administers a Historic Revolving Loan Fund from which loans are made to qualified applicants for exterior restoration of designated historic structures, both commercial and residential. The loan ceiling is \$30,000 per structure, with an interest rate of 3 percent for a twenty-year term. To qualify, the structure must be on or eligible for the National Register, listed in a state or local inventory, or locally designated as an "H" zoned structure. It must be located in a deteriorating area where the City of Austin is undertaking a comprehensive program of improvements; in a designated low- or moderate-income area; or the project must eliminate detrimental conditions outside a blighted area. Preference is given to low- and moderate-income applicants who cannot qualify for a commercial loan. Two loans, each in the amount of \$30,000 have been made from the fund to date.

### **Public Information and Assistance**

Perhaps the most immediate and far-reaching need to address, as well as the area that potentially offers the greatest returns to Austin preservation and conservation efforts, is development of new forms of public information and public assistance. Unquestionably several programs aimed at public appreciation of preservation activities already exist, and the value of these programs to Austin goes without saying. There nonetheless remains substantial room for new efforts, both in number and type.

In conjunction with preparation of a comprehensive inventory, and subsequent to its completion, Austinites understandably will be interested in attending lecture series and participating in walking and self-guided tours centered on noteworthy architects and periods of construction in Austin. The Austin Heritage Society, already involved with similar kinds of activities, is a logical source of leadership for initiating and sponsoring these types of programs. The Austin-Travis County collection and the University of Texas Potentially can serve as major sources of support.

In addition to serving as the central repository for information and materials resulting from completion of a comprehensive inventory, the Austin-Travis County Collection can and should exist as the repository for other types of related materials, such as private collections of photographs and oral history tapes. The resources, programs and exhibitions of this municipal collection should be widely publicized and the subjects of special features, not only to encourage additional submissions but to reach new users and interests of the community.

The Historic Landmark Commission needs to spell out and make available procedures for filing an application necessary to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness. This should be coordinated with other permit processing activities and procedures of the Planning and Building Departments. Accordingly, several specific recommendations are in order. First, applicants should be referred to the Standards for Granting Certificates of Appropriateness and Guidelines for Appropriate Rehabilitation in the Appendix of the document. Second, applicants may require assistance in filling out and completing, in a satisfactory manner, a standard application form and required attachments. This does not mean that staff does the work of the applicant. It also must be made clear that applications must be completed before they can be accepted and acted upon, for to do otherwise would penalize the conscientious applicant and increase permit processing costs. Third, assembling and maintaining a counter manual and other reference files which are illustrative of Austin projects approved under the Certificate of Appropriateness process can be very helpful to applicants. The kind of manual provides "living" examples, which may be inspected in the field. Caution must be expressed, however, not to mimic or copy such examples and thereby expect automatic and unconditional approval of an application. Fourth, the Commission should investigate costs and benefits of using a two-step review process, which provides for addressing conceptual issues and concerns at a preliminary session, and then reviewing plans at a second or final session. The benefits accruing to both the applicant and the Commission have been demonstrated conclusively in many communities utilizing this approach. For one thing, premature and therefore unnecessary design and engineering expenditures very often are avoided. For another, the applicant and the Commission are freer to communicate and work with each other by first addressing and agreeing upon basic concepts, and then being able in a second stage of discussion to address details and refinements to a scheme. Fifth, minor types of alterations, such as review of a proposed paint scheme, may require only one session, or, as some review bodies prefer, the review of specific types of minor alterations is delegated to staff. Sixth, required submissions for each type of improvement or alteration must be spelled out clearly as part of the application procedure. For example, proposed paint schemes should include submission of paint chips. By contrast, rehabilitation of a major commercial structure could require submission of a site plan, building elevations, landscaping and irrigation plans, and specifications for building materials and colors. While there occasionally is some resistance to making these submissions, the requirement in almost every case is of benefit to the applicant, for it imposes "early" consideration and resolution of interrelated design, material and color decisions. In setting up and applying the above procedures, the Historic Landmark Commission should appoint a separate committee, which can provide the requisite review services on a regular basis.

The Planning Department, with the advice and counsel of the Historic Landmark Commission, should investigate funding sources and

Prepare a proposal(s) aimed at producing design manuals that offer specific guidelines and technical assistance to specific client groups (e.g. the homeowner or property owners and merchants association wishing to commence a revitalization program in an older commercial district). Very often such design manuals rely upon the assistance and participation of several public agencies, such as the Building Inspection and Public Works Departments and the Redevelopment Authority. In terms of providing directly beneficial service to a specific client group and/or neighborhood district, which in turn can result in leveraging significant amounts of capital investment, the design manual can facilitate the achievement of appropriate kinds of property improvements with resounding success. Its potential contribution to conservation of Austin's quality housing stock and qualifying neighborhood districts is enormous.

#### **Federal Legislation Affecting Local Historic Preservation Efforts**

Federal legislation related to the protection of historic resources has been in effect since 1906. The legislation of the past fifteen years, however, has defined more specifically the public sector's responsibility with respect to historic preservation. This more recent legislation generally has addressed the responsibilities at the state and federal levels, with comparatively little definition of responsibilities at the local level.

---

#### **National Historical Preservation Act of 1966**

---

Enacted in 1966, this Act formalized federal agency responsibilities regarding historic resources through establishment of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and enactment of Section 106. Section 106 requires that when planning for funding projects, federal agencies must consider the effect upon existing or eligible National Register Properties. This involves the preparation of determinations of eligibility to listing on the National Register as well as determinations of potential effect. Local involvement in this process has not been formalized, and has varied from city to city. In most cases, the City has assisted the lead federal agency and/or State Historic Preservation Officer in preparing the documentation as required by Section 106.

The 1966 Act also called for creation of the National Register of Historic Places, and established a Grants-In-Aid program for acquisition and rehabilitation of National Register properties. Local governments have become involved with Grants-In-Aid program, when grant money has filtered through the state offices of historic preservation in order to fund planning, acquisition and rehabilitation projects at the local level.

---

#### **National Environmental Policy Act of 1969**

---

This Act obligates federal agencies to prepare an environmental impact statement for major undertakings affecting man and his environment. The impact of such undertakings upon cultural resources must be addressed in the statement according to requirements of Section 106 of the National historic Preservation Act and Executive Order 11593.

---

## **Executive Order 11593, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment**

---

This federal order addresses itself to specific implementation of previous federal preservation laws and regulations. It requires federal agencies to: 1) survey, nominate, and maintain historic properties under its control; and 2) determine whether properties affected by federal actions are eligible for listing on the National Register.

---

## **Procedures for the Protection and Enhancement of Historic and Cultural Properties (36 CFR 800)**

---

These procedures were established to ensure compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Executive Order 11593, and the National Environmental Policy Act. They require review and comment of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on federal actions that could have an effect of properties presently listed, or eligible for listing on the National Register. Although Advisory Council recommendations are not ultimately binding on federal agencies, adherence to terms of these regulations is mandatory. This process has resulted in an opportunity for local participation and has required federal agencies to consider the potential effects of projects on historic resources in the planning stage.

---

## **National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980**

---

Before passage of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments, local government involvement in federal historic preservation programs was not clearly defined in legislation. The greatest potential involvement for local entities existed through participation in the federal grants-in-aid program established under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. This provided for local preservation projects on a matching basis.

With enactment of the 1980 amendments, however, a greater role for local governments involved in federal historic preservation programs has been defined. The amendments require the state offices of historic preservation to certify qualified local governments so that they may participate in the National Register nomination process, Section 106 review, and funding programs. Any local government can be certified if it meets the following requirements:

1. *Enforces appropriate state or local legislation for the designation and protection of historic properties;*
2. *Has established a qualified historic preservation review commission;*
3. *Maintains a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties;*
4. *Provides for adequate public participation in the local historic preservation program; and*
5. *Satisfactorily performs the responsibilities delegated to it by the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments.*

Once a local government is certified, it then becomes eligible for pass-through money from the state office of historic preservation. It also can become formally involved in the National Register nomination process and in the compliance process for Section 106. Before a property within the jurisdiction of the certified local government can be nominated to the National Register, the owner, the applicable local elected official and the local historic preservation commission must be notified. The historic commis-

sion is then afforded the opportunity to submit a report evaluating the property in terms of National Register criteria.

The City of Austin is potentially eligible for certification. For information on the certification process and its potential benefits, the City should contact the Texas Historical Commission.





## **Program Recommendations for Implementing the Plan**

*Austin has established itself both within and beyond Texas as a community committed to historic preservation. As preceding chapters of this historic preservation plan indicate, there are numerous public bodies and private organizations with associated programs which, when considered collectively, reflect both a sizable interest in preservation and an impressive list of results. Nonetheless, it also is evident that Austin's present preservation activities need additional support, and expanded focus and direction, and a stronger relationship with neighborhood conservation.*

*This chapter provides policy directions and offers specific recommendations for local groups involved in preservation activities. It also looks specifically at those programs of greatest importance for Austin – historic designation and "H" zoning, the development of a comprehensive inventory, building codes, Certificates of Appropriateness, and tax abatement for historic structures.*

- I. *Expand the scope of local preservation efforts beyond the present emphasis on preservation of 19<sup>th</sup>-century landmark buildings, to encompass cultural resources of all types and periods, and to provide for neighborhood conservation, historic districts, and quality of the urban environment as a whole.***
  - A. *Preservation Ordinance which define Historic Landmark (Section 45-42, Austin City Code) and spell out the Declaration Policy (Section 45-43, Austin City Code). This review calls to mind the possibilities, which exist to expand local efforts by the Historic Landmark Commission. These sections are reprinted here to emphasize the value and importance of the original mandate to the Historic Landmark Commission. (The Criteria to be used in Historic Landmark Designation, whose review is equally important to considering an expanded scope of local preservation efforts, are reprinted in *Program Recommendation II.*)***

#### **HISTORIC LANDMARKS – DESIGNATION**

The City Council may designate buildings, structures, sites, districts, areas and lands in the City as historic landmarks and define, amend and delineate the boundaries thereof. The suffix "H" shall indicate the zoning designation of those buildings, structures, sites districts, areas and land that the City Council designates as historic landmarks. Such designation shall be in addition to any other use designation established in the comprehensive zoning ordinance. The zoning map shall reflect the designation of a historic landmark by the letter "H" as a suffix to any other use designation established in the comprehensive zoning ordinance.

*(Section 45-44 Austin City Code)*

#### **HISTORIC LANDMARK PRESERVATION DECLARATION OF POLICY**

The City Council hereby finds and declares as a matter of public policy that the protection, enhancement, preservation and use of historic landmarks is a public necessity and is required in the interest of the culture, prosperity, education and general welfare of the people. The purposes of this chapter are:

- (a) To protect, enhance and perpetuate historic landmarks, which represent or reflect distinctive and important elements of the City's and state's architectural, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, ethnic and political history and to develop appropriate settings for such places.*
- (b) To safeguard the City's historic and cultural heritage, as embodied and reflected in such historic landmarks by appropriate regulations.*
- (c) To stabilize and improve property values in such locations.*
- (d) To foster civic pride in the beauty and accomplishments of the past.*
- (e) To protect and enhance the City's attractions to tourists and visitors and provide incidental support and stimulus to business and industry.*
- (f) To strengthen the economy of the City.*
- (g) To promote the use of historic landmarks for the culture, prosperity, education, and general welfare of the people of the City and visitors to the City.*

*(Section 45-43 Austin City Code)*

Particularly pertinent to the recommended objective of expanding the scope of preservation efforts is the inclusion of districts as historic landmarks in Section 45-44, and the charge or assignment in Section 45-43(a) "to develop appropriate settings" for landmarks, a purpose which can be satisfied, for example, through creation of neighborhood conservation combining districts.

**B.** The Historic Landmark Commission should broaden its function to include involvement not just with individual landmark properties but with all public policy related to historic preservation. Such involvement should include a basic understanding of present zoning regulations as well as proposed revisions (and, in particular, the proposed procedures and requirements for establishing Neighborhood Conservation Combining Districts), as well as the activities and programs of all City departments and state and federal agencies whose discharge of function affects historic preservation in Austin.

- The Historic Landmark Commission should review and support adoption of those proposed revisions to the City's Zoning Ordinance, which relate to historic preservation. The adoption of these revised zoning regulations will significantly enlarge Austin's ability to support preservation and conservation efforts both as a matter of policy and in specific instances. Although not within the explicit purview of the Historic Landmark Commission, these zoning revisions would bolster and complement the work of the Commission, and would make an expanded scope of the Commission's preservation efforts easier to carry out.
- The Historic Landmark Commission should recognize the value of neighborhood conservation in the protection of landmark properties as well as the validity of neighborhood conservation as an end in itself. The Commission should provide technical assistance to neighborhood groups and should assume leadership by supporting efforts to establish appropriate neighborhood zoning. In particular, Neighborhood Conservation Combining Districts can be promoted by the Commission as a means of accomplishing both the long-term preservation of designated landmarks and the conservation of their neighborhood contexts. The benefits of such districts should be made known through meetings with neighborhood associations, sponsorship of informational workshops, and occasional publication of newsletters.

**C.** The Historic Landmark Commission should recognize the full scope of the criteria for designation of landmarks and districts under terms of present ordinance language, and expand its activities accordingly. Specifically, the program should refocus its efforts to include a much broader span of Austin's development (looking at properties built as recently as the 1930s). The program should look for opportunities to establish historic districts; and it should look beyond the traditional historical criteria utilized to date in designation of landmarks and give new emphasis to expanded historical criteria, to architectural quality, and to environmental value. In the designation of historic districts, until a completed inventory establishes priorities in a Citywide context, the Bremond Block and portions of East 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Congress Avenue which already are National Register Historic Districts ought to be considered priorities for local district designation.

**D.** The Austin Heritage Society should examine the scope and effectiveness of its various programs by evaluating the publicity, attendance, and participation in such programs. It should determine whether its programs include efforts to

→ CLG →

reach new interests and constituents not presently active in or knowledgeable of, the preservation community. Expanded efforts can include presentations to school groups, service clubs, real estate and development associations, and neighborhood organizations.

**E.** The Historic Landmark Commission and the Austin Heritage Society should complement and support one another as each expands the scope of its activity. The Landmark Commission should seek the support and assistance of the Heritage Society when necessary and appropriate, and the Heritage Society likewise should assist the Commission when and where it lacks resources to discharge its function in the most effective manner possible.

**F.** Efforts should be made to broaden institutional support for historic preservation in Austin by undertaking collective efforts and actions with organizations such as the Austin Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, the Women's Architectural League, the Junior League. The example of such a collective effort is the comprehensive inventory of Austin's cultural resources.

***II. Identify all of Austin's significant cultural resources by conducting a comprehensive inventory, and recognize qualifying resources by designating them as historic landmarks.***

**A.** Over the years, a number of inventory and identification programs in Austin have been undertaken and carried through to various stages of completion. However, a comprehensive inventory of Austin's historic resources never has been completed. As the basis for a wide variety of decisions and programs, the completion of such an inventory is of the highest priority for Austin's historic preservation program.

An inventory should be sponsored by the Heritage Society. Such an inventory should be conducted apart from the City government and the City landmark process to ensure its independence from existing political or policy considerations. The inventory should be an objective identification and evaluation of the City's cultural resources. The inventory will provide a base of information for landmark and other official designations, but the inventory itself will not mean automatic designation of resources. The Historic Landmark Commission should support the preparation of such an inventory and upon its completion should establish priorities for future designation of landmarks and landmark districts based upon the results of the evaluated inventory.

The purpose, benefits, components, potential funding sources and other requirements related to conducting the inventory are addressed elsewhere in this document. However, in terms of initiating the process and relating its work program and results to existing organizations, the following actions are recommended:

- Formation of a comprehensive inventory policy committee, consisting of one representative each from the Historic Landmark Commission, Austin Heritage Society, Austin-Travis County Collections, Junior League of Austin, and the Texas Historical Commission.
- Development of a preliminary project scope, work program elements, and probable budget, in order to solicit and tentatively line up various types of assistance and participation required for this project.
- Preparation and distribution of a Request for Proposal, which outlines the intended scope, components, products, potential budget, and time frame for completing the comprehensive inventory.
- Review of submissions received in response to the Request for Proposal, and if necessary, conduct interviews to select a survey contractor.
- Appointment of a project administrator from the agency or organization designated to administer the project and contract, while at the same time stipulating that the contractor will coordinate execution of the project work program through meetings with the project administrator and inventory policy committee.
- Publication and distribution of the findings of the completed comprehensive inventory through numerous channels and by utilizing different kinds of products (e.g., a high-quality final survey document, a poster for widespread community distribution, a slide show, and exhibition panels).
- Make provision for future updating and continuing maintenance of the comprehensive inventory, by establishing the Austin-Travis County Collection as the principal repository for materials generated by this project and other survey-related materials.

**B.** The designation of official landmarks should systematically consider the full range of cultural resources in Austin by following priorities



established by the inventory. Closer attention to the definition of a historic landmark, reprinted above in Program Recommendation I, and to the criteria for designating landmarks, reprinted immediately below, will assist in establishing priorities.

[The following is an insert – not normal text]

#### **CRITERIA TO BE USED IN HISTORIC LANDMARK DESIGNATIONS**

**In making such designations as set forth in Section 45-44, the City Council shall consider, but shall not be limited to, one or more of the following criteria:**

- (a) Character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City of Austin, State of Texas, or the United States.*
- (b) Recognition as a recorded Texas Historic Landmark, a National Historic Landmark, or entered into the National Register of Historic Places.*
- (c) Embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen.*
- (d) Identification as the work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has influenced the development of the City.*
- (e) Embodiment of elements or architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship which represent a significant architectural innovation.*
- (f) Relationship to other distinctive buildings, sites or areas that are eligible for preservation according to a plan based on architectural, historic or cultural motif.*
- (g) Portrayal of the environment of a group of people in an area of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style.*
- (h) Archaeological value in that it has produced or can be expected to produce data affecting theories of historic or prehistoric interest.*
- (i) Exemplification of the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of the City, state, or United States.*
- (j) Location as the site of a significant historic event.*
- (k) Identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, state, or the United States.*
- (l) A building or structure that because of its location has become of value to a neighborhood, community area, or the City.*
- (m) Value as an aspect of community sentiment or public pride.*

*(Section 45-45 Austin City Code)*

Although generally adequate for addressing the needs of Austin's historic landmark program, the criteria should be amended to incorporate a new criterion for the integrity of designated landmarks. This can be accomplished by adding a provision to the criteria requiring that all designated landmarks possess integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Once this is done, existing landmark properties can be reviewed for compliance, and those, which do not measure up to all of the criteria, should be re-evaluated from landmark status. By way of example, certain landmark designations on East 6<sup>th</sup> Street should be re-evaluated

***III. Provide economic and other incentives to the private sector to engage in historic preservation and neighborhood conservation activities.***

Because funding for historic preservation from public or private non-profit sources is limited, investment dollars potentially available from the private sector should be leveraged as effectively as possible. There is much that the public and private non-profit sectors can do to provide incentives for private preservation activity. As a general guideline for providing economic incentives, efforts should be made to make sure that incentives are as widely available and applicable as is possible.

A. The Historic Landmark Commission and the City Council should consider amending existing provisions for partial tax exemption on designated landmark properties to allow for a ten-year rather than indefinite term of partial exemption, as is the case in San Antonio and other cities across the country. Such a change to a fixed term for partial tax exemption would lead to designation of a larger number of landmark properties, and therefore would extend incentive to preserve and maintain historic properties, and incentives to larger numbers of property owners without permanently committing the exemption provision to a relatively small number of owners. It also would address the increasingly sensitive issue of absolute growth of tax-exempt situations for local governments.



B. The Historic Landmark Commission and the Planning Department can and should develop a program to inform developers and other private individuals and organizations involved in rehabilitation of income-producing properties of the benefits of the Tax Reform Act of 1976 for owners of income-producing properties. Extensive use of the Tax Act has the added advantage of stimulating appropriate rehabilitation improvements, because any such rehabilitation must be carried out according to established state and federal guidelines. The Texas Historical Commission can assist with this effort to encourage use of the Tax Act through use of slide presentations at community meetings, publications, and other materials.

C. With the help of the Texas Historical Commission, the Historic Landmark Commission, the Planning Department, and the Austin Redevelopment Authority also should provide guidance to state, federal, and private sources of funding for private developers. Sources of funding and methods of financing are listed elsewhere in this document and should be consulted.

D. The Austin Heritage Society should use its stature in Austin's financial community, attained largely through its leadership and composition of membership, to encourage financial institutions and corporations to increase the scope and magnitude of their participation in, as well as general support of, preservation programs in the community.

E. It is recommended that the Heritage Society investigate the potential numerous benefits which can result through establishment of a revolving fund for use in financing historic preservation projects. The Society presently administers a variety of projects ranging from loan and grant programs to purchase and resale of historic properties. By establishing a specific fund for these programs, the Heritage Society can achieve a picture of its financial performance in terms of particular programs.

F. It also is recommended that the Heritage Society investigate the possibility of establishing a historic preservation easement program, by which the owner of a landmark quality structure conveys to the Society, in perpetuity, a limited property right. The benefit of an easement program is that it provides a recognized instrument for retention of distinguished structures without the necessity of total acquisition.

#### ***IV. Increase public awareness, knowledge, and appreciation of Austin's built environment.***

Although there are some programs already in existence aimed at public appreciation of Austin's built environment; there nevertheless are several areas which can benefit from increased public knowledge and appreciation.

A. A central repository for historical materials, and materials developed as a result of the comprehensive, needs to be designated. The Austin-Travis County Collection already serves in such a capacity, and therefore should be recognized formally by the Historic Landmark Commission, the Austin Heritage Society, and other preservation groups in the community to ensure that all historical materials, as well as survey and inventory findings, are available to the public in one central location. An exception might be made in the case of architectural drawings and blue prints, a number of which are now placed in the Drawings Collection of the University of Texas, contingent on that collection being made more accessible to the public.

- B.** Existing information as part of earlier surveys by the Heritage Society should be transferred to the Austin-Travis County Collection where it will be available for use by the general public.
- C.** The Austin-Travis County Collection should organize exhibitions of its materials to encourage additional submissions, and to reach new users and interests of the community.
- D.** The Historic Landmark Commission, the Heritage Society, and other preservation groups should support the growth of the Drawings Collection at the University of Texas as a major source of information on Austin's built environment.
- E.** There is an urgent need to gather historical materials relating to Austin's built environment before irreplaceable sources of information are lost or destroyed. The Austin Heritage Society should initiate a search for historical records of all kinds, including plans, drawings, photographs, and office records of architects; and maps and other historical documents pertaining to the history of the City. In addition, an oral history program should be initiated to document Austin's architectural past.
- F.** The Heritage Society should continue to sponsor walking tours and lecture series pertaining to Austin's history and architecture. The Austin-Travis County Collection and the University of Texas can serve as major sources of support for this activity.
- G.** The Heritage Society should serve as a clearinghouse of information for architects, designers, developers, and others engaged in preservation and rehabilitation activities
- H.** It should be a high priority to publish results of Austin's proposed comprehensive inventory in order to reach a large public audience, including public officials and investors involved in planning and development decisions.

***V. Increase staffing and reorganize procedures of preservation programs in Austin in light of practices existing across the United States, in order to improve the effectiveness of preservation and conservation activities.***

- A.** The staff of the Historic Landmark Commission should be reorganized, and if necessary, supplemented with additional personnel in order to meet nationally accepted professional standards in the fields of historic preservation, architecture, and architectural history. The first priority for achieving necessary staff support should be retention of a design practitioner whose principal tasks would be to give technical assistance to applicants for Certificates of Appropriateness, and to guide and encourage appropriate rehabilitation and preservation actions in the community at large.
- B.** The Austin Heritage Society should retain the services of an executive director who possesses a strong background in historic preservation programs and fund raising, and should consider expanding its staff capabilities to include a design practitioner experienced in restoration and rehabilitation work, an architectural historian, and a volunteer program coordinator.

C. Modification and clarification of the procedures leading to landmark designation can benefit both the applicant and Historic Landmark Commission. Presently, the Commission staff assumes the responsibility for preparing the individual case reports which are required for proposed landmark designations. After completion of a Citywide inventory, however, there will be a more extensive data base available to property owners and the general public, and the responsibility of conducting research and preparing the case reports could then be more easily transferred to the property owner applying for "H" zoning.

To make the application process clearer for the property owner, guidelines should be established for use in research procedures and list the specific information required, including historical and architectural data, historic name, original owner, architect or builder, date of construction, and significant events or associations that may or may not include all intervening owners. These guidelines should be aimed at eliciting accurate, thorough, and well-rounded documentation of historic properties. The guidelines also should carefully specify means of footnoting and referencing research so that information can be verified.

D. Copies of all historic landmark case reports should be sent to the Austin-Travis County Collection where they would be available for use by the general public.

E. The Historic Landmark Commission should review its present policy of annual on-site review of all designated landmarks. In view of the limited resources and staff time of the Commission, the Commission should consider implementation of a more limited inspection program such as occurs in other cities. When a property owner of a designated landmark makes the annual re-application for partial tax exemption, a form could be filled out describing alterations or maintenance actions during the past year and those anticipated in the coming year. Any actions, which then appear to be inappropriate or inconsistent, could be investigated on a case-by-case basis. Also, spot checks on other properties could be conducted as warranted.

F. The Historic Landmark Commission needs to spell out procedures for filing an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. This should be coordinated with other permit processing activities and procedures of the Planning and Building Inspection Department. These procedures should involve an early meeting of the applicant and Landmark Commission staff, prior to submission of an application, and review by a committee of the Landmark Commission.

G. The Historic Landmark Commission should work with the Building Inspection Department to investigate the advantages to Austin of adoption of a state historical building code. As background to development of specific building code requirements applying to rehabilitation and other kinds of conservation actions, the Building Inspection Department should consult *Rehabilitation Guidelines*, developed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and summarized elsewhere in this document. If such discussions result in positive findings, the Commission should initiate and support efforts to formulate alternative state code provisions, and to amend the appropriate state statutes.

***VI. Monitor and assess programs and activities at all levels of government affecting cultural resources.***

As the principal municipal agency charged with responsibility for historic preservation in Austin, the Historic Landmark Commission should keep abreast of all public programs and projects that affect historic preservation.

A. To assist the Landmark Commission in the task of monitoring government activity affecting preservation at the local level, each City department should appoint a liaison person. This individual would have the responsibility of notifying the Landmark Commission of all proposed actions potentially affecting cultural resources within the City.

B. Any significant activity, which utilizes or occurs within any public right-of-way (e.g. roads, concourses, and creek areas), should be referred to the Historic Landmark Commission for review and comment as to its potential impact and possible mitigation measures.

C. The Historic Landmark Commission should monitor all federally licensed and funded projects, and ensure that review of such projects satisfies requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Executive Order 11593, and 36 CFR 800.

Assistance in this activity logically could come from the Texas Historical Commission. This state office can inform the state and federal projects potentially affecting historic resources and also can provide advice and assistance as to the manner and degree to which compliance with applicable regulations is satisfied. By coordinating their efforts, the state and local preservation offices can require that proposed state and federal projects in Austin consider historic resources in the early planning stages.

D. To obtain a recognized role in monitoring federal actions, the City of Austin should apply for certification under provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980. As discussed earlier, this qualifies the City for pass-through money from the Texas Historical Commission and gives the City a formal role in the review and comment process.

E. The Historic Landmark Commission should monitor state lease announcements and inform the Texas Purchasing and General Services Commission of local landmark structures suitable and available for office use, as the state is required to give preferential consideration to historic properties when leasing or purchasing office space.

F. Members or staff of the Austin Heritage Society should attend all Historic Landmark Commission and City Council when the latter two bodies are hearing agenda items of consequence to preservation. The Heritage Society should provide expert testimony on preservation issues as warranted.

***VII. Historic preservation policies and programs should be integrated as much as possible with the City's planning and development process.***

A. The Planning Department, Public Works Department, and Building Inspection Department can assist preservation efforts by coordinating their efforts with private preservation and conservation activities occurring throughout the City. For instance, the Planning Department and Public Works Department can schedule

public improvements, such as landscaping, sidewalk, and street repair, in neighborhoods or areas where private rehabilitation activities are occurring spontaneously. By monitoring private preservation and conservation activities, agencies can plan for and budget public area improvements to complement private actions. The Building Inspection Department can become involved at the same time by stepping up its monitoring of rehabilitation activities, by providing inspection summaries and referring appropriate rehabilitation cases to the Planning Department or Historic Landmark Commission.

**B.** The Planning Department and Commission can provide tremendous support to historic preservation in Austin through application of zoning policies and planning programs geared towards neighborhood conservation and by assisting applicants and neighborhood organizations with establishment of Neighborhood Conservation Combining Districts.

- The Planning Department, with the advice and counsel of the Historic Landmark Commission, should investigate funding sources and prepare a proposal(s) aimed at producing design and improvement manuals which offer specific guidelines and technical assistance to specific client groups (e.g., homeowners, property owners, and merchants associations wishing to commence a revitalization program in an older commercial district).
- Once the comprehensive inventory is completed and potential historic districts and conservation areas are identified, the Planning Department should design various planning programs and public improvements to support these forms of preservation and conservation. Such programs and improvements may involve partnerships with merchants' associations and neighborhood groups; provision of public area improvements such as planting of street trees, off-street parking facilities, and improvements to curb, gutter, and sidewalk areas.
- The Planning Department should build a program and seek funding for rehabilitation loan programs and workshops, aimed at providing information and assistance on appropriate methods of rehabilitation and maintenance.

## ***VIII.***

### ***Technical assistance***

***should be provided to individuals and organizations to ensure the appropriateness of rehabilitation actions.***

**A.** By providing design manuals with guidelines and technical assistance to specific client groups in different areas of the City, the Planning Department and the Historic Landmark Commission can provide to the community a widely accepted and practical form of technical assistance. These manuals can be put together in-house although outside sources of professional expertise oftentimes are required. If produced outside the Planning Department, funding sources must be established and proposals written. The design manuals can be of standardized format, but must be geared to specific neighborhood and client groups in question. They most often should include recommendations for public improvements required in the specific geographical area, as well as guidelines to assist private property owners in making improvements to their properties. In terms of providing a service of direct benefit to specific client groups and neighborhood interests, which in turn can promote capital investment, design manuals normally facilitate the achievement of substantial amounts of property improvements with resounding success.

- B. The staff of the Historic Landmark Commission should possess the capacity to assist individuals towards development of appropriate design solutions when applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness.**
- C. The Historic Landmark Commission and the Planning Department should actively assist neighborhood associations who wish to obtain Historic District or Neighborhood Conservation Combining District status.**
- D. The Texas Historical Commission should be enlisted to present its slide shows, and to provide technical information, on the National Register and economic incentives for preservation in selected Austin neighborhoods.**

**BLANK PAGE**

**No page #**





## **Preservation Terms**

**Cultural Resources** *Cultural resources is a term which has come into use since 1966, and which refers to the objects of historic preservation. Cultural resources include buildings, sites, structures, objects, landscaping, and districts.*

**Survey** *A survey of cultural resources is a two-step process which involves looking at every site within a given area. For each site that appears to be of a certain age or architectural quality, photographs are taken and a predetermined set of locational and descriptive information is recorded in the field. Research and verification of information follow this.*

**Inventory** *An inventory is a survey that is completed and evaluated to the extent that certain properties are identified as potentially eligible for nomination to the National Register and/or designation as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks or City Historic Landmarks; of contextual but not individual importance; and of no importance. An inventory is evaluated not by establishing a ranking of the most important structure followed by the second most important structure, and so on, but by measuring each structure against pre-established criteria and assigning them to groups of equal value for preservation purposes.*

**Historic District** *A geographically definable area, possessing significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of buildings, structures, sites, areas or lands which are united by architectural, historical, archeological or cultural importance or significance.*

*The following definitions relate to specific types of conservation actions. They apply to the design and actual physical improvements that are made to structures or groups of structures and their settings. The definitions are drawn from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation which are used by federal and state historic preservation offices in the planning and review of preservation projects.*

**Preservation** *This is regarded as the act or process of applying measures to sustain the existing form, integrity, and material of a building or structure, and the existing form and vegetative cover of a site. It may include initial stabilization, as well as repair and on-going maintenance of building materials. Substantial reconstruction or restoration of lost features generally is not included in a preservation undertaking since the emphasis is on minimal alteration and maximum retention of existing features.*

**EXAMPLES:**

**District:** Clarksville

**Structure:** Texas State Capital

**Storefront:** Nicholas Bros. Shoe Repair, 422 East 6<sup>th</sup>

**Southwestern Telephone and Telegraph**

**Rehabilitation** *This is the act or process of returning a property to a state of utility through repair or alteration to make possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions or features of the property which are significant to its historical, architectural, and cultural values. Adaptive use is a form of rehabilitation. It is the process of adapting a building to accomplish a use other than that for which it was designed.*

*Making a structure efficient for contemporary use can involve a range of activities, some major in scale such as utility replacement. When dealing with historic structures, the key is to remember that any alterations or changes should be compatible with the character of the property and its environment.*

*Most preservation activity falls into the rehabilitation and adaptive use category, and individual owners of residential or commercial structures undertake most of this activity. This type of historic preservation activity is important to note, as it is widespread and often falls outside the purview of public agency review.*

**EXAMPLES:**

**District:** West 6<sup>th</sup> Street

**Structures:** Tips House (Franklin Savings & Loan)

**Restoration** This is the act or process of accurately recovering the form and details of a property and its setting as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of removal of later work or by the replacement of missing earlier work. Because of the emphasis on accurately recreating an earlier appearance, restoration involves a greater degree of background research before construction than preservation or rehabilitation activities.

Today, there is less emphasis on restoration since it can involve the removal or modification of architectural features. Rather than emphasize the appearance of a structure at one particular point in time, it is important to study changes for what they illustrate about the evolution of the structure's appearance over time.

Additions and changes acquire significance in their own right, and they should be respected. This change in philosophy also has been prompted by the controversies that can arise when determining which time period the structure should represent.

**EXAMPLES:**

**District:** Bremond block

**Structure:** Carrington-Covert House

**Reconstruction:** *This defines the act of reproducing by new construction the exact form and detail of a vanished building, structure, or object, or a part thereof, as it appeared at a specific period of time. In the strictest sense reconstruction is not a preservation activity since it entails new construction. But since it involves re-creation of a vanished building for aesthetic or interpretive reasons it is considered a part of historic preservation.*

*Due to the costs involved, and to changes in preservation philosophy, relatively little reconstruction is being undertaken. Most reconstruction work is associated with museums or sites, where strict interpretation is regarded as being essential.*

**EXAMPLES:**

**District:** Williamsburg, Virginia

**Structure:** French Legation Kitchen



## **Architectural Styles in Austin**

The following briefly outlines the major architectural styles found in Austin since the City's founding in 1839. Only the most significant styles are mentioned. A more detailed source in which to learn more about Austin's architecture and its styles is Austin, Texas, An American Architectural History by Roxanne Williamson.

---

### **FOLD or VERNACULAR ARCHITECTURE, 1839-present**

---

Architecture designed and built according to traditional local patterns by the people who will use it. Although the potential exists to create folk architecture at all times, there is little true folk architecture remaining or produced in Austin today. Folk types from the 19th-century include:

- **Hall-and-parlor houses**
- **I-houses**
- **Shotgun houses**
- **Double-pen houses**
- **Square cottages with pyramid roofs**

---

### **POPULAR ARCHITECTURE, ca. 1840-present**

---

*Architecture generally built by professional builders that reflects national trends rather than local traditions. Most late 19<sup>th</sup>-century cottages, with or without Victorian stylistic detail, and most bungalows, are examples of popular architecture.*

---

## **GREEK REVIVAL, 1839-ca. 1860**

---

*A popular mid-19<sup>th</sup>-century style adapted from the temple architecture of ancient Greece, used for all building types including the second State Capitol and many houses that still stand. It is characterized by use of the Greek orders with or without low-pitched pediments treated as temple fronts.*

- **Governor's mansion, 1856**

---

## **GOTHIC REVIVAL, 1854-ca. 1940**

---

*A style of architecture that was once common for many building types but which has survived best in churches and other institutional structures. It is derived largely from English Gothic architecture and to a lesser extent from French and other European Gothic buildings. It is characterized by pointed arches, towers, buttresses and steeply pitched roofs or by crenellated parapets and simple masses, depending on the particular sources for the building. Here several aspects of a long Gothic revival tradition are treated as one. The tradition lasted well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century in church architecture.*

- **Texas Military Institute, 1870**
- **Austin Presbyterian theological Seminary, 1941**

---

**ITALIANATE, ca 1855-ca. 1910**

---

*An architectural style, which in Austin had lost touch with all but the most superficial details of its Italian origins, and was a new eclectic fusion of Italian Renaissance details and local building types. After about 1880 it was almost exclusively used in commercial architecture.*

- **Austin State Hospital, 1857**
- **Tips House (Franklin Savings), 1887**

---

**VICTORIAN GOTHIC, ca. 1870-ca. 1895**

---

- **St. Edward's University, 1887**

---

## ROMANESQUE REVIVAL, 1856-ca. 1900

---

*There were several Romanesque Revivals in Austin in the middle and late 19th-century. All looked to the pre-Renaissance architecture of Europe and were characterized by round arched windows and doors. The later Romanesque Revival was influenced by the American architect Henry Hobson Richardson and is called Richardsonian Romanesque. Used for institutional and commercial structures.*

- **State Land Office Building, 1856**
- **Driskill Hotel, 1886**

---

## VICTORIAN, ca. 1880-ca. 1900

---

*A melange of styles, sometimes in combination, made up in large part by elements of the Stick Style, the Eastlake Style, and the Queen Anne. In Austin those styles tended to take on a characteristic blend of their own, hence the umbrella term, Victorian.*

- **Martin-Cabiniss House (1200 Windsor), 1887**
- **Littlefield House, 1893**
- **107-109 East 10<sup>th</sup>, ca. 1900**



---

## **SECOND EMPIRE, ca. 1975-ca. 1895**

---

*A mid-19<sup>th</sup>-century French Classical style whose most distinctive feature is the mansard roof. This was once common in Austin for houses but few are left.*

- **Travis County Courthouse (demolished), 1876**

---

## **RENAISSANCE REVIVAL, ca. 1880-ca. 1890**

---

*A revival of Italian Renaissance details and compositional ideas on a variety of American building types. This was not used much in Austin except for the Capitol Building.*

- **Texas State Capitol, 1882-1898**

---

## **BEAUX-ARTS, ca. 1900-ca. 1940**

---

An approach to design taught at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris rather than a particular style, although usually classical in reference. The Beaux-Arts influenced the design of a great many commercial and institutional buildings in the years after 1900 in Austin. These buildings are considerably simpler and larger in scale than the 19<sup>th</sup>-century styles and types that went before. The University of Texas campus and most of its buildings show the influence of the Beaux-Arts.

- **University of Texas Main Building and Tower, 1933-1937**

---

## **SECOND RENAISSANCE REVIVAL, ca. 1900-ca. 1930**

---

*A revival of Italian Renaissance forms and details that is generally related to the scale and orderliness of Beaux-Arts designs.*

- **The Old Library, University of Texas, 1910-1911**

---

## **BUNGALOWS, ca. 1905-ca. 1940**

---

*A simply ornamented house type that developed in Southern California and succeeded Victorian styles for in-expensive houses throughout the United States. Most Austin bungalows fall under the category of popular architecture. Bungalows are a very common house type in such neighborhoods as Clarksville and Hyde Park.*

---

## **PERIOD REVIVAL, ca. 1915-ca. 1940**

---

*The Period Revival is a name given to a wide array of revival styles, most typical of the 1920s, which shared a common theatrical attitude toward historical styles. Includes Tudor Revival, Colonial Revival, Georgian Revival, and the revivals of European folk imagery from such places as the Cotswold district of England and Normandy in France, to name the most prominently revived "periods."*

- **Fisher House (1415 Wooldridge), 1920**

- **Texas Foundation of Women's Clubs, 1933**

---

## **NEO-CLASSICAL REVIVAL, ca. 1910-ca. 1930**

---

*A revival of ancient classical forms and details that is generally related to the scale and orderliness of Beaux-Arts designs.*

- **First United Methodist Church, 1928**

---

## **SPANISH COLONIAL REVIVAL, 1915-ca. 1940**

---

*A romantic and eclectic revival based on Spanish Colonial architecture common among residential and commercial buildings after the 1915 San Diego Exposition. In some senses this was an aspect of the Period revival (see below).*

- **Davis/Sibley House (2110 Windsor), 1932**

---

## **ART DECO and MODERNE, ca. 1930-ca. 1950**

---

*These are two aspects of the same development which relied on a variety of new sources for ornament, notably the technology of transportation such as railroads, airplanes, and ocean liners on the one hand, and Mayan, Aztec, or Egyptian detail on the other. Mostly found on commercial and institutional structures in Austin.*

- **State Highway Department Building, 1933**

---

## **RANCH STYLE, 1945- present**

---

*A post-war residential style characterized by low-pitched gable roofs and low profiles with horizontal lines. Originally ornamented with western and rustic imagery, a variety of historicist and modern styles later provided the details on these buildings. The typical one-story post-war houses in Austin's newer subdivisions are Ranch Style.*

---

**MODERN, 1945-present**

---

*A wide array of non-historicist designs typified by glass, steel, and concrete materials and orientation to automobiles. Includes the International Style.*

Page 86

## **Standards for Granting Certificates of Appropriateness**

*The Austin Historic Landmark preservation ordinance requires that the Historic Landmark Commission establish guidelines for the granting of Certificates of Appropriateness for evaluating exterior alteration and rehabilitation proposals for all designated Historic Landmark (H) buildings, structures, sites, districts, areas, and lands in the City. The following standards for Granting Certificates of Appropriateness address that requirement and should be adopted by the Commission. These Standards, and the more specific Guidelines for Appropriate Rehabilitation that follow, are based upon the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic preservation Projects which are used in evaluating proposals for National Register properties for a variety of federal preservation goals. These federal standards have become the basis for all state and many local programs.*

*The following general standards apply to all treatments undertaken on historic (H) properties or properties located within historic (H) districts.*

- 1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, or site and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose.**
- 2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided.**
- 3. All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations which have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.**
- 4. Changes, which may have taken place in the course of time, are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.**
- 5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship, which characterize a building, structure, or site, shall be treated with sensitivity.**
- 6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.**
- 7. The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building shall not be undertaken.**
- 8. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties are appropriate when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historic, architectural, or cultural material and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment.**
- 9. Whenever possible, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such additions to structures shall be done in such a manner that if those additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.**
- 10. Reinforcement required for structural stability or the installation of protective or code required mechanical systems shall be concealed whenever possible so as not to intrude upon or detract from the property's aesthetic and historical qualities, except where concealment would result in the alteration or destruction of historically significant materials or spaces.**

***11. Reconstruction of a part or all of a property shall be undertaken only when such work is essential to reproduce a significant missing feature in a historic district or scene, when the reconstruction is essential for understanding and interpreting the value of a historic district, when documentation exists to ensure an accurate reproduction of the original and when a contemporary design solution is not acceptable.***

***12. Reconstruction shall include measures to preserve any remaining original fabric, including foundations, subsurface, and ancillary elements. The reconstruction of missing elements and features shall be done in such a manner that the essential form and integrity of the original surviving features are unimpaired.***

## **Guidelines for Appropriate Rehabilitation**

*The following guidelines are intended to facilitate the interpretation and application by the Historic Landmark Commission of the Standards for Granting Certificates of Appropriateness and to assist individual property owners and City staff in the development, rehabilitation, and revitalization historic properties and districts in a manner consistent with the intent of the standards. The guidelines may be applied to Austin buildings of all types of occupancy as well as to structures, objects and buildings of all construction types and materials. However, they are primarily directed to: 1) designated Historic Landmark (H) properties; and 2) those properties both public and private that lie within designated historic Districts or Neighborhood Conservation Combining Districts.*

### ***The Environment***

---

- Retain distinctive features such as the siting, size, scale, mass, color, and materials of buildings, including roofs, porches, and stairways that give a neighborhood its distinguishing character.
- Retain landscape features such as parks, gardens, streetlights, signs, benches, walkways, streets, alleys, and building setbacks that have traditionally linked buildings to their environment.
- Do not destroy the relationship between buildings and their environment by widening existing streets, changing paving material, or by introducing inappropriately located new streets and parking lots that are incompatible with the character of the neighborhood.
- Use new plant materials, fencing, walkways, streetlights, signs, and benches that are compatible with the character of the neighborhood.
- Use new plant materials, fencing, walkways, streetlights, signs, and benches that are compatible with the character of the neighborhood in size, scale, material, and color.

### ***Building Site***

---

- Retain plants, trees, fences, walkways, streetlights, signs, and benches that reflect the property's history and development.
- Base decisions for new site work on actual knowledge of the past appearance of the property found in photographs, drawings, newspapers, and tax records. If changes are made, they should be carefully evaluated in light of the past appearance of the site.
- Provide proper site and roof drainage to assure that water does not splash against building or foundation walls, nor drain towards the building.

### ***Building: Structural Systems***

---

- Recognize the special problems inherent in the structural systems of historic buildings, especially where there are visible signs of cracking, deflection, or failure.
- Undertake stabilization and repair of weakened structural members and systems.
- Supplement existing structural systems when damaged or inadequate. Replace historically important structural members only when necessary.

### ***Building: Exterior Features***

---

Masonry: Adobe, brick, stone, terra cotta, concrete, stucco, and mortar

- Retain original masonry and mortar, whenever possible, without the application of any surface treatment (e.g., waterproof coatings are frequently unnecessary, expensive, and can accelerate deterioration of the masonry).
- Repoint only those mortar joints where there is evidence of moisture problems or when sufficient mortar is missing to allow water to stand in the mortar joint. Using electric saws and hammers to remove mortar can seriously damage the adjacent brick.
- Duplicate old mortar in composition, color, and texture. (Repointing with mortar of high Portland cement content often



creates a bond that can be stronger than the building material, causing deterioration as a result of the different coefficient of expansion and the differing porosity of the material and the mortar.)

- Duplicate old mortar in joint size, method of application, and joint profile.
- Repair stucco with a stucco mixture that duplicates the original as closely as possible in appearance and texture.
- Clean masonry only when necessary to halt deterioration or to remove graffiti and stains and always with the gentlest method possible, such as low-pressure water and soft natural bristle brushes. Sandblasting (including dry and wet grit and other abrasives) brick or stone surfaces erodes the surface of the material and accelerates deterioration. Do not use chemical cleaning products that would have an adverse chemical reaction with the masonry materials, i.e., acid on limestone or marble.
- Repair or replace, where necessary, deteriorated material with new material that duplicates the old as closely as possible. Do not apply or use new material, which is inappropriate or was unavailable when the building was constructed, such as artificial brick siding, artificial cast stone, or brick veneer.
- Replace missing significant architectural features, such as cornices, brackets, railings, and shutters, window architraves, and doorway pediments.
- Retain the original or early color and texture of masonry surfaces, including early signage, wherever possible. Brick or stone surfaces may have been painted or whitewashed for practical and aesthetic reasons. Removing paint from masonry surfaces indiscriminately may subject the building to damage and change its appearance.

Wood: Clapboard, weatherboard, shingles, and other wooden siding.

- Retain and preserve, whenever possible, significant architectural features such as siding, cornices, brackets, window architraves, and doorway pediments. These are, in most cases, an essential part of a building's character and appearance that illustrates the continuity of growth and change.
- Repair or replace where necessary, deteriorated material with material that duplicates in size, shape, and texture the old as closely as possible.
- Do not resurface frame buildings with new material, which was unavailable when the building was constructed (such as artificial stone, brick veneer, asbestos or asphalt shingles, and plastic or aluminum siding). This is inappropriate in appearance and can contribute to the deterioration of the structure from moisture and insects.

Architectural Metals: Cast iron, steel, pressed tin, aluminum, and zinc

- Retain original material, whenever possible. Clean when necessary, by methods that do not abrade the surface. Do not expose metals that were intended to be protected from the environment or use cleaning methods that alter the color or texture of the metal.

### ***Roofs and Roofing***

---

- Preserve the original roof shape, and retain the original roofing material, whenever possible.
- Do not change the essential character of the roof by adding inappropriate visible features such as dormer windows, vents and skylights, or apply new roofing material that is inappropriate to the style and period of the building and neighborhood.
- Replace deteriorated roof coverings with new material that matches the old in composition, size, shape, color, and texture.
- Preserve or replace where necessary, all architectural features that give the roof its essential character, such as dormer windows, cupolas, cornices, brackets, chimneys, cresting, weather vanes, gutters, downspouts, and lightning rods.

### ***Windows and Doors***

---

- Retain and repair existing window and door openings, including window sash, glass, lintels, sills, architraves, shutters, doors, pediments, hoods, steps, and all hardware. Avoid changes to windows and doors that produce an image of an earlier time.

[The following is captions for pictures:]

- a) **Design guidelines need not and do not produce predictable designs. Rather, solutions to situations such as the signage on the portion of East 6<sup>th</sup> Street can be both appropriate and imaginative.**
- b) **This is the interior of a block located on West 6<sup>th</sup> Street, whose structures have been converted for the most part to professional offices and small-scale commercial uses. Additionally, the rear yards have been converted to a common parking facility, which in many instances serves to minimize disruption of the visual character of the neighborhood.**
- c) **The W. J. Caswell residence is a fine house whose rehabilitation has been well intentioned but nevertheless misguided in terms of the integrity of the original design. The basic character of the house is intact, but second level glazing is an inappropriate color and transparency. Design guidelines and assistance from the planning department can prevent such unfortunate kinds of improvements and help make adaptive use projects such as this take full advantage of design resources and opportunities.**
- d) **This handsome building long ago suffered insensitive remodeling of its storefront bays. It is possible to avoid this kind of inappropriate "improvement" to storefront areas through creation of a landmark or urban conservation district and the provision and application of design guidelines.**

- Do not introduce new window and door openings into the principal elevations, or enlarge or reduce window or door openings to fit new stock window sash or new stock door sizes.
- Duplicate the material, design, and hardware of the older window sash and doors if new sash and doors are used.
- Do not install inappropriate new window or door features such as aluminum storm and screen window insulating glass combinations that require the removal of original windows and doors or the installation of plastic, canvas, or metal strip awnings, or fake shutters that detract from the character and appearance of the building.
- Install visually unobtrusive storm windows and doors that do not damage existing frames and that can be removed in the future.
- Use original doors and door hardware when they can be repaired and reused in place.

### ***Entrances, Porches, Porte Cocheres and Steps***

---

- Retain porches and steps that are appropriate to the building and its development. Porches or additions reflecting later architectural styles are often important to the building's historical integrity and, wherever possible, should be retained.
- Repair or replace where necessary, deteriorated architectural features such as handrails, balusters, and roof decorations of wood, iron, cast iron, terra cotta, tile, and brick.
- Do not enclose porches and steps in a manner that destroys their intended appearance.

### ***Building: Exterior Finishes***

---

- Discover the historic paint colors and finishes of the structure and repaint with those colors to illustrate the distinctive character of the property.
- Do not remove paint and finishes down to the bare surface; strong paint stripper, whether chemical or mechanical, can permanently damage the surface. Stripping also obliterates evidence of the historical paint finishes.
- Preserve existing paint color and finishes, where possible, rather than repainting with colors that cannot be documented through research and investigation to be appropriate to the building and neighborhood.

### ***Building: Interior Features***

---

- Retain (except where essential for safety or efficiency) original materials, architectural features, and hardware such as stairs, elevators, handrails, balusters, ornamental columns, cornices, baseboards, doors, doorways, windows, mantel pieces, paneling, lighting fixtures, parquet, or mosaic flooring.
- Do not replace interior door and transoms without investigating alternative fire protection measures or possible code variances.
- Repair or replace where necessary, deteriorated material with new material that duplicates the old as closely as possible.
- Do not install new decorative material and paneling, which destroys significant architectural features or was unavailable when the building was constructed, such as vinyl, plastic, or imitation wood wall and floor coverings, except in utility areas such as bathrooms and kitchens.
- Do not remove plaster to expose brick to give the wall an unfinished appearance it never had.

### ***Building: Interior Finishes***

---

- Discover and retain original paint colors, finishes, wallpapers, and other decorative motifs, or, where necessary, replace them with colors, wallpapers, or decorative motifs based on the original.
- Do not change the texture and patina of exposed wooden architectural features (including structural members) and masonry surfaces through sandblasting or use of other abrasive techniques to remove paint, discoloration, and plaster, except in certain industrial and warehouse buildings where the interior masonry or plaster surfaces do not have significant design, detailing, tooling, or finish; and where wooden architectural features are not finished, molded, beaded, or worked by hand.

- Do not remove paint from wooden architectural features that were never intended to be exposed.

#### ***New Construction***

---

- Keep new additions and adjacent new construction compatible in scale, materials, and texture with the original building.
- Design new work to be compatible in materials, size, scale, color and texture with the other buildings in the neighborhood.
- Use contemporary designs compatible with the character and mood of the building or the neighborhood.
- Do not imitate an earlier style or period of architecture in new additions, except in rare cases where a contemporary design would detract from the architectural unity of an ensemble or group. Especially avoid imitating an earlier style of architecture in new additions that have a completely contemporary function such as a drive-in bank or garage.
- Do not add new floors or remove existing floors that destroy important architectural details, features, and spaces of the building.
- Place television antennae and mechanical equipment, such as air conditioners, in an inconspicuous location.

#### ***Mechanical Systems: Heating, Air Conditioning, Electrical, Plumbing, and Fire Protection***

---

- Install necessary mechanical systems in areas and spaces that will require the least possible alteration to the structural integrity and physical appearance of the building.
- Utilize early mechanical systems, including plumbing and early lighting fixtures, where possible.
- Do not attach exterior electrical and telephone cables to the principal elevations of the building.
- Do not conceal or “make invisible” mechanical equipment in historic walls or ceilings when this concealment requires the removal of historic fabric.
- Do not install “dropped” acoustical ceilings to hide mechanical equipment. This destroys the proportions and character of the rooms.
- Insure adequate ventilation of attics, crawlspaces, and cellars to prevent moisture problems.
- Do not install foam, glass fiber, or cellulose insulation into wall cavities of either wooden or masonry construction. This has been found to cause moisture problems when there is no adequate moisture barrier.

#### ***Safety and Code Requirements***

---

- Comply with code requirements in such a manner that the essential character of a building is preserved intact.
- Work with local code officials to investigate alternative life safety measures that preserve the architectural integrity of the building.
- Investigate variances for historic properties allowed under local codes.
- Install adequate fire prevention equipment in a manner that does minimal damage to the appearance of fabric of a property.
- Add new stairways and elevators that do not alter existing exit facilities, or other important architectural features and spaces of the building.

## **Repositories and Collections**

The University of Texas at Austin houses several collections, which can be useful in preservation planning and inventory work. The Architecture and Planning Library contains references and periodicals related to preservation, architecture, and design. The Architectural Drawings Collection housed there consists primarily of original architects' drawings, but also includes blueprints, photographs, negatives, microfilms, models, specifications, measured drawings, student research reports and clippings files.

The Eugene C. Barker Texas History Center, also at the University of Texas at Austin, is the state collection of documents related to Texas history. This Center consists of the Texas Collection Library, the University Archives, the Texas Newspaper and Non-Textual Records Collection and the Gideon photos in the Battle Collection. The Humanities Research Center at the University contains photograph archives.

The Austin-Travis County Collection at the Austin Public Library is an exceptional municipal repository. It contains reference materials, maps, and photographs related to the history and physical development of the City and County, as well as individual building files. The Carver Museum also is part of the library system of Austin. Its primary function is to house information, exhibits and artifacts on the local history and experience of Blacks. Basic staff funding is provided by the City with additional funding through grants and gifts.

Files of various agencies and organizations also are useful. This includes the survey files of the Heritage Society of Austin; the files of the Designated Historic Landmarks at the Austin-Travis County Collection; the National Register nomination, the Historic Sites Inventory, State Marker, and general files for Travis County at the Texas Historical Commission; and National Architectural and Engineering Record materials at the Architectural Drawings Collections.

## **Existing Inventories and Partial Inventories in Austin**

(through January, 1980)

### **National**

---

**NAME:** National Register of Historic Places

---

**DATE:** 1966 to present.

**SPONSOR:** National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior; Texas Historical Commission.

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *The National Register is the official list of the nation's cultural resources worthy of preservation. It was established by the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and succeeds the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings, authorized by the National Historic Sites Act of 1935 that identified nationally significant structures only. The National Register is an expanded list that is concerned with sites, structures, buildings, objects, and districts which may be significant at local or state levels as well as at the national level.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *Washington, DC, with copies at the Texas Historical Commission and University of Texas, School of Architecture.*

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *Each file contains a nomination form of at least four Pages, which includes a detailed description, and statement of significance, as well as photographs and maps.*

**CRITERIA:** *The criteria for listing on the National Register fall into three general areas: historical, architectural, and archeological value. To be listed, cultural resources ordinarily must be over 50 years old, but exceptions are made for resources of unusually high value.*

### **SUMMARY OF RESULTS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN:**

*45 Individual buildings*

*4 Historic Districts (Bremond Block Historic District, Clarksville Historic District, Congress Avenue Historic District, Sixth Street Historic District)*

*1 Archeological site*

*1 Park (Wooldridge Park)*

*1 Structural type (21 Moonlight Towers)*

### **CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:**

*Every National Register property ought to be included in Austin's inventory, as each is thoroughly documented and has met the application of stringent criteria.*

---

**NAME:** *National Architectural and Engineering Record (NAER): formerly Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Record (HAER).*

---

**DATE:** *1933 TO PRESENT (ongoing; conducted in Austin in 1934, 1936, 1937, 1961, 1965, 1966, 1973, 1979).*

**SPONSOR:** *National Parks Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.*

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *The National Architectural and Engineering Record, under which the programs of HABS and HAER were combined in 1979, provides the most thorough documentation of historic structures of any federal preservation program. It is a highly selective survey, which has sought to record examples of every type of American building from every period and in every geographical area.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *Library of Congress. Microfilm copies of all Austin NAER materials have been ordered for the Architectural Drawings Collection of the University of Texas, Battle Hall. A limited number of copies are at the Texas Historical Commission, National Register Department.*

**CONTENT OF SURVEY FILES:** *Photographs, measured drawings, historical and architectural information.*

**CRITERIA:** *HABS and HAER sought to record examples of architectural and engineering building types from a broad cross-section, but tended to emphasize structures of great age, of great historical significance, and structures about to be torn down. In recent years, there has been a tendency to record more recent structures.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN:** *Altogether 21 structures have been documented by HABS, 16 of which are still standing.*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *Every structure documented by NAER or its predecessors that are still standing ought to be included in the proposed inventory. Like the National Register, however, this has been a selective program and cannot be considered to represent a comprehensive listing of significant structures in Austin or in any part of Austin.*

**State**

---

**NAME:** *Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks*

---

**DATE:** *1962 to present (ongoing).*

**SPONSOR:** *Texas Historical Commission.*

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks are structures identified as part of the Texas Historical Markers program and are marked with Texas Historical Medallions. Other aspects of the Marker program are not concerned specifically with structures. The purpose of the program is to record and protect the state's heritage.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *Each recorded Texas Historic Landmark is marked with a Texas Historical Marker and an interpretive plate, which summarizes the significance of the structure. In addition, more thorough documentation of each marked structure is kept on file at the Texas Historical Commission. Duplicate copies of all files are on microfilm at the State Library and Archives Commission, Department of Records Division.*

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *Each file consists of a written history, which is at least three Pages in length, and a bibliography of sources including oral interviews.*

**CRITERIA:** *A Recorded Texas Historic Landmark must be distinguished in two out of three of the following criteria: architecture, association with significant persons or events, and age. In addition, the structure to be marked must be in good condition, and no marker can be placed without consent of the owner.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:** *There are approximately 1850 Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks in the state and 78 in Austin.*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks have been generated in Austin by different people at different times, and have not been nominated or recommended as the result of a systematic survey. Therefore, although extremely useful in each individual case, the Landmarks, at least as a group, do not constitute a list of the most significant structures in Austin or in any part of Austin. Nevertheless, all Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks in Austin should be included in the City inventory.*



---

**NAME:** *Texas Historical Markers*

---

**DATE:** *1962 to present (ongoing; however, since 1916, there have been several state historical marker programs in Texas).*

**SPONSOR:** *Texas Historical Commission.*

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *The Texas Historical Marker program is a multi-faceted program that incorporates several previous marker programs under one administration. Today these include Texas Historical Medallions, placed on Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks; Texas Historical Subject Markers, interpreting sites, events, persons or institutions significant in Texas history and culture; and granite historical markers commonly commemorating persons or events connected to the Texas War for Independence and the Civil War. Other types of markers are placed on graves and mark the path of the Spanish El Camino Real. Although only one aspect of the program is related specifically to structures (the Texas Historical Medallions that mark Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks), other markers frequently are placed on structures and related to persons or events connected to them. The purpose of the program is to record and protect the state's heritage.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *Every Texas Historical marker includes interpretive text that summarizes the significance of the site. In addition, more thorough documentation of each marked structure is kept on file at the Texas Historical Commission. Duplicate copies of all files are on microfilm at the State Library and Archives Commission, Department of Records Division.*

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *Each file consists of a written history of at least three Pages in length, and a bibliography of sources including oral interviews.*

**CRITERIA:** *Markers are designated on the basis of historical, cultural and architectural value. Ordinarily, persons must be dead or events must have occurred at least thirty years prior to being commemorated; and structures must be 100 years old or two-thirds the age of the present type of habitation of the community, whichever is less.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:** *As of January 1, 1980 there were 63 Texas Historical Markers in Austin (excluding Texas Historical Medallions and grave markers), many of which pertain to structures. In addition there are 49 grave markers.*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *Those markers which pertain to structures will be useful in conducting an inventory, and all should be consulted carefully, but the marker program has not been carried out through a systematic survey and is not a substitute for such a survey.*

---

**NAME:** Historic Sites Inventory (HSI)

---

**DATE:** 1968 to present (ongoing; survey work in process in parts of East Austin).

**SPONSOR:** Texas Historical Commission.

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *A Historic Sites Inventory was established in each state under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Each state was obligated under that Act to prepare a historic preservation plan and to conduct a statewide inventory as a means of identifying potential National Register sites, and of carrying out its historic preservation plan. The HSI has been conducted over the past 12 years by gathering information from existing surveys, from county historical survey committees, from published sources, by comprehensive field surveys by the staff (with the first efforts in cities which possess major concentrations of historic resources), and in cooperation with regional councils of governments.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** Texas Historical Commission.

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *At present the HSI files consist of two separate types of cards. The Texas Historical Commission currently is in the process of consolidating those card types on a single computer printout. Both sets of cards were compiled from field surveys and include 4" x 5" photographic negatives. The files contain basic descriptive and locational information, together with a statement of significance.*

**CRITERIA:** *The HSI utilizes National Register criteria, since one of its functions is to identify potential National Register properties, but HSI applies the National Register criteria in a broad fashion. The 50-year cut-off for including properties generally is adhered to.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:** *There presently are 800 entries of the old type; about 10,000 entries of the new type; and about 7,000 entries that have been fed into the computer and are available on a computer printout. There presently are 109 computer entries for the City of Austin.*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *Where listing in the HSI is the result of a systematic, comprehensive survey, such as that currently being conducted in East Austin, the HSI should form an excellent basis for Austin's inventory. However, in the past, because most HSI listings have come as a result of City Landmark designation, the Austin portion of the HSI has reflected the City's strong emphasis on structures built before 1900. The City's inventory should be brought forward to about 1945, and be sensitive to the whole range of criteria for inclusion.*

---

**NAME:** Historic Landmark Inventory

---

**DATE:** 1974 to present (ongoing).

**SPONSOR:** Historic Landmark Commission, City of Austin.

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *The Historic Landmark Inventory is specifically designed to identify properties eligible for designation as "H" on the City's zoning maps. It was assembled originally from properties already designated as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks and listed on the National Register, and consists largely of such properties.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *Historic Landmark Commission staff offices. Copies are placed in the Austin-Travis County collection of the Austin Public Library.*

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *A survey form and photograph, and additional pages that typically include exhaustive historic research represent each building.*

**CRITERIA:** *Criteria are broadly drawn, including architectural, historical and environmental values, and resemble the criteria of the National Register.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:** *Approximately 118 properties, including 4 historic districts, currently are listed as Historic Landmarks.*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *Each Historic Landmark would be included in the inventory. The inventory must be much broader than Historic Landmarks, as identification of potential Historic Landmarks will be but one of its principal functions.*

---

**NAME:** Austin Heritage Foundation Survey (also known as Junior League Survey)

---

**DATE:** ca. 1963-1965

**SPONSOR:** The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc.

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *To identify existing 19th-century buildings in Austin. All areas were surveyed but not completed. Some outstanding 20<sup>th</sup>-century buildings were also identified. Since 1973, additions to this survey have been made in areas outside of the original City.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc.*

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *4" x 6" building data cards with basic locational and descriptive information including original owner and date of construction and a black and white photograph, supplemented by yellow 3" x 5" cards with historical summaries.*

**CRITERIA:** *No formal criteria. Age and visual interest served as informal criteria.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:** *About 250 survey cards were completed. About 100 historical summary cards supplemented these.*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *This survey formed a basis for subsequent survey work and is superseded by such efforts as the Historic Architecture Evaluation inventory.*

---

**NAME:** *Historic Architecture Evaluation Inventory (also known as the Williamson Survey)*

---

**DATE:** *1972*

**SPONSOR:** *Austin Heritage Foundation (Heritage Society of Austin).*

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *A comprehensive visual survey of every parcel within the original grid of the City of Austin. There has been some updating of information in this survey including ownership changes. A few buildings have been added and others have been deleted following demolition.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc.*

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *Survey form with descriptive and locational information.*

**CRITERIA:** *Age and architectural quality. The emphasis was on 19th-century residential architecture but a few commercial buildings and a few 20<sup>th</sup>-century buildings were included. All were rated on a scale of 1 to 5.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:** *241 survey cards and color-coded maps of evaluated results.*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *As the only significant inventory of any section of Austin, this provides a good starting point for the area with which it was concerned, i.e., and the original grid of the City. Limitations of the survey are its emphasis on pre-1900 buildings, its lack of historical documentation, and the fact that it now is out of date. Many structures identified in this inventory have since been torn down.*

---

**NAME:** *Heritage Society Composite Inventory*

---

**DATE:** *1973 to present (ongoing).*

**SPONSOR:** *The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc.*

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *The Composite Inventory brings together information gathered by two earlier surveys sponsored by the Heritage Society, and expands upon those surveys by adding new properties. The inventory was originally compiled on legal-sized sheets but is being transferred to specially designed index cards. The earlier surveys are the Heritage Foundation and Williamson surveys, described above.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc.*

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *Index cards summarizing earlier surveys.*

**CRITERIA:** *Listing in earlier surveys or inventories.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:** *Around 550 buildings (plus a few other types of cultural resources).*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *Provides the most complete listing of historic structures in the City, and as such would be an important foundation for an inventory. Its principal limitations are its emphasis on pre-1900 structures and its lack of sufficient documentation for many structures.*

---

**NAME:** East Austin Survey

---

**DATE:** 1979-1980 (*in progress*).

**SPONSOR:** *The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc. and the Texas Historical Commission.*

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *The East Austin Survey is being funded partially by federal money through the Texas Historical Commission as part of the state HSI. One of its principal purposes is to identify potential National Register properties in an area lying generally close to and east of I.H. 35 between MLK Boulevard and the River.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *Texas Historical Commission. Copies will be deposited in the offices of the Heritage Society and the offices of the City's Historic Landmark Commission.*

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *Index cards with locational, descriptive and historic information; and 4" x 5" photographs.*

**CRITERIA:** *The National Register criteria, loosely applied.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:** *Survey in progress.*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *This survey should be considered as a principal contributor to the City's comprehensive inventory.*

---

**NAME:** Cemetery Project

---

**DATE:** 1978-1979. *Follow-up work in progress.*

**SPONSOR:** *Travis County Historical Commission.*

**DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE:** *To locate and inventory all family, church, school and other small cemeteries in Travis County. Present plans call for putting completed survey on computer and for indexing and publishing results.*

**LOCATION OF FILES:** *Travis County Collection of the Austin Public Library.*

**CONTENT OF FILES:** *Copies of previous historical survey and Commission lists, Austin genealogical lists, family lists in the Austin-Travis County Collection, and census records.*

**CRITERIA:** *Comprehensive survey.*

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:** *28 City cemeteries surveyed.*

**CONTRIBUTION TO A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY:** *Not appropriate for inclusion in the comprehensive Inventory.*



### ***American Architectural Styles***

---

- Blumenson, John J. *Identifying American Architecture: A Pictorial Guide to Styles and Terms*. Nashville, TN: American Association for state and Local History, 1977.
- Poppliers, John; Allen S. Chambers; Nancy Schwartz. *What Style Is It?* Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1977.
- Whiffen, Marcus. *American Architecture Since 1780: A guide to the Styles*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1969.

### ***Design Plans, Guidelines and Manuals***

---

- Bowsher, Alice Meriwether. *Design Review in Historic Districts: A Handbook for Virginia Review Boards*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts, 1978.
- Bryant, Mavis. *Zoning for Community Preservation: A Manual for Texans*. Austin, Texas: Texas Historical Foundation and the Texas Historical Commission, 1976.
- Carrington, Merrill Ware. *Design Guidelines: An Annotated Bibliography*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts, 1977.
- Cullen, Gordon, *The Concise Townscape*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1961.
- Ewald, William R. Jr. and Daniel R. Madelker. *Street Graphics*. McLean, Virginia: The Landscape Architecture Foundation, 1977 (second printing).
- Land Design/Research, Inc. *Otterbein Homestead Area: Guidelines for Exterior Restoration*. Prepared for Charles Center Inner Harbor Management, Inc., Department of Housing and Community Development, City of Baltimore, n.d.
- Oakland, City of, Planning Department. *Rehab Right*, 1978.
- Page, Charles Hall & Associates, Inc. *Design Guidelines for Old Pasadena*, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Design Guidelines for Restoration and Adaptive Use of the Ferry Building*, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Downtown Alhambra Revitalization: Conceptual Design Plan and Design Guidelines*, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Murphy Avenue: Sunnyvale's Main Street*, 1980.
- San Francisco Department of City Planning. *The Urban Design Plan*, 1971.
- State Historical Society of Colorado. *Good Neighbors: Building Next to History*, 1980.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. *The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, 1979.
- U.S. Department of the Interior and Housing and Urban Development. *Guidelines for Rehabilitating Old Buildings*, 1977.
- Vision, Inc. *Sign Sense: Arlington, Massachusetts*, 1977.

### ***Historical and Architectural Reference***

---

- Abernethy, Francis Edward, Editor. *Built in Texas*. Waco: E-heart Press, 1979.
- Alexander, Drury Blakely and Todd Webb. *Texas Homes of the Nineteenth-Century*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966.
- Barkley, Mary Starr. *History of Austin*.
- Barnstone, Howard. *The Architecture of John Staub: Houston and the South*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979.
- Belasco, Warren James. *Americans on the road: From Auto-camp to Motel, 1910-1945*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1979.
- Fehrenbach, T. R. *Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968.
- Finley, Robert and E. M. Scott. "A Great Lakes-to-Gulf Profile of Dispersed Dwelling Types," *Geographical Review*, XXX (1940), pp. 412-419.

- Glassie, Henry. *Pattern in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968.
- Gutman, Richard J. S. and Elliott Kaufman. *American Diner*. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.
- Hart, Katherine. *19<sup>th</sup>-century Austin*. Austin Heritage Foundation, 1970.
- Hart, Katherine and the Staff of the Austin-Travis County Collection, Austin Public Library. *Austin and Travis County: A Pictorial History, 1839-1939*. A Waterloo Book published by the Encino Press for the Friends of the Austin Public Library.
- Hattersley-Drayton, Karana. "Folk Housing in Pioneer California: A Preliminary Typology." *Southwest Folklore*. (In Press).
- Jordan, Terry G. "German Houses in Texas," *Landscape*, (Autumn 1964).
- Keahey, Kirby and Allen McCree, Editors. *Austin and Its Architecture*. Austin: Austin Chapter, American Institute of Architects/Women's Architectural League, 1976.
- Kniffen, Fred B. "Louisiana House types," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, XXVI (1936), pp. 179-193.
- Lewis, Pierce F. "Common Houses, Cultural Spoor," *Landscape*, XIX: 2 (1975), pp. 1-22.
- Meinig, D. W. *Imperial Texas: An Interpretive Essay in Cultural Geography*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969.
- Papademetrious, Peter D., Editor. *Houston: An Architectural Guide*. Houston: Houston Chapter, American Institute of Architects, 1972.
- Reps, John W. *Cities of the American West: A History of Frontier Urban Planning*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Robinson, Willard B. and Todd Webb. *Texas Public Buildings of the Nineteenth Century*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1974.
- Sumner, Alan R., Editor. *Dallasights: An Anthology of Architecture and Open Spaces*. American Institute of Architects, Dallas Chapter, 1978.
- Vieyra, Daniel I. *Fill'er Up: An Architectural History of America's Gas Stations*. New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1979.
- Vlach, John Michael. *The Afro-American Tradition in Decorative Arts*. Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1978.
- Wilhelm, Hubert G. H. "German Settlement and Folk Building Practices in the Hill Country of Texas," *Pioneer America*, III: 2.
- Williamson, Roxanne Kuter. *Austin, Texas: An American Architectural History*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1973.
- Workers of the Writers' Program of the Works Progress Administration. *Texas: A Guide to the Lone Star State*. New York: Hastings House, 1940.

## ***Resources***

---

- City of Austin Department of Planning. *Austin Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan*, 1980
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Historical Landmark Program*. 1978
- The Foundation Center. *The Foundation Directory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.
- Hooper, William T. *Directory of Texas Foundations*, 1975.
- National Trust for Historic Preservation. *Information: From the National Trust for Historic Preservation*. This series includes:
- Financing Preservation in the Private Market, Private Funds for Historic Preservation, and Public Funds for Historic Preservation.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Guide to Federal Programs: Programs and Activities Related to Historic Preservation*. Washington, DC: Preservation press, 1974. 1976 Supplement. Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Landmark and Historic District commissions*, Bi-monthly newsletter available by subscription.
- Shepard, Randall T., Editor. *Preservation Rules and Regulations 1980*. Evansville, IN: Conrad Baker Foundation, 1980.
- State Purchasing and General Services Commission, Facilities Planning and Construction Division. *Development Study for the Capitol Complex of the State of Texas*, 1979.



Texas Historical Commission. *Historical Preservation in Texas Vol. I.*, Austin, Texas, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The National Register program in Texas: Nomination Guidelines*, n.d.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. *Sources of Preservation Funding*, 1979.

## ***Sites and Districts***

---

Dunsavage, Lyn and Virginia Talkington. *The Making of a Historic District: Swiss Avenue, Dallas, Texas. Case Studies in Historic Preservation #2.* Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1975.

Massachusetts Historical Commission. *Establishing Local Historic Districts*, 1976.

National Trust for Historic Preservation. *A Guide to Delineating the Edges of Historic Districts.* Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1976.

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places. *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. *How to Complete National Register Forms*, 1977.

## ***Surveys and Inventories***

---

Biloxi, City of. *The Buildings of Biloxi: An Architectural Survey*, 1976.

Bureau of Governmental Research. *Plan and Program for the Preservation of the Vieux Carre: Historic District Demonstration Study*, 1968.

Cambridge Historical Commission. *Survey of Architectural History in Cambridge: North Cambridge and Survey Index*, 1977. (Fifth in a series).

Environmental Research Group. *South Philadelphia Historical Sites Survey*.

Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc. *Historic Savannah*, 1969.

Page, Charles Hall & Associates, Inc. *Amarillo Historic Building Survey*, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Las Vegas Historic Preservation Inventory and Planning Guidelines*, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Phoenix Historic Building Survey*, 1979.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Splendid Survivors.* Text by Michael R. Corbett. Prepared for the Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage. San Francisco: California Living Books, 1979.

Providence City Plan Commission. In cooperation with the Providence Preservation Society and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. *College Hill: A Demonstration Study of Historic Area Renewal*, 1967.

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Register of Historic Places. *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*, 1977.

## ***Technical Information***

---

Architectural Conservation Trust for Massachusetts and Architectural Heritage Foundation. *The Revolving Fund Handbook: A Practical Guide to Establishing a Revolving Fund and the Development Through Adaptive Reuse of Historic Properties.* Boston: The Architectural Conservation Trust, 1979.

Kelso, Harry B. with Joy Kelso. *Preservation and Maintenance of Brick Streets.* Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Historical Society Southwest Prologue Series, n.d.

Maryland Historical Trust. *Preservation Easements*, 1975.

National Trust for Historic Preservation. *Preservation and Building Codes.* Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1975.

The Old House Journal. Monthly magazine available by subscription or individually. (The Old House Journal, 199 Berkeley Place, Brooklyn, NY 11217.

Preservation League of New York State. *A Practical guide to Storefront Rehabilitation*, 1977.

Stephen, George. *Remodeling Old Houses Without Destroying Their Character.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. *Preservation Briefs.* Short informational reports on technical subjects such as energy conservation, roofing, and repointing mortar. Available free from HCRS or the Texas Historical Commission.

Ziegler, Arthur P., Jr.; Leopold Adler, III; Walter C. Kidney. *Revolving Funds for Historic Preservation.* Pittsburgh: Ober Park Associates, 1975.

[Blank Page]

no page #

**This plan document was prepared by a joint venture of Blayney-Dyett and Charles Hall Page & Associates, Inc., under contract to the City of Austin, Texas.**

**Charles Hall Page & Associates, Inc.**

Robert Bruce Anderson  
Anne E. Baggerman  
Michael R. Corbett  
Charles B. Miller  
Charles Hall Page  
Jack W. Schafer  
Robin Thomas Sweet

**Daniel R. Mandelker**

Legal Subcontractor

**Acknowledgements**

Assistance by the following agencies and organizations is gratefully acknowledged:

City of Austin Planning Department  
Austin-Travis County Collection  
The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc.  
Texas Historical Commission

**Photograph and Illustration Credits**

Historic plans and photographs were obtained from the Austin-Travis County Collection of the Austin Public Library. Drawings in the Introduction are from the Historic American Buildings Survey. All other photographs and drawings are by Charles Hall Page & Associates, Inc.