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Introduction

Munger Place was first opened in 1905 by R.S. Munger. As Dallas' third subdivision, and first deed-restricted subdivision, it was built to attract the elite of Dallas. According to the promotional brochure distributed after 115 homes had been completed in the area, Munger Place was to encompass 300 acres, or 50 city blocks. This study, however, deals with the five residential streets of Junius, Worth, Tremont, Victor and Reigner. Included are the 4800 block of Tremont (Prairie to Fitzhugh); the 4900 blocks of all five streets (Fitzhugh to Collett); the 500-5100 blocks of all five streets (Collett to Munger); the 5200 blocks of all five streets (Munger to Henderson); and the north side of the 5300 block of Junius (Henderson to Dumas). This is essentially the same area as P.D. 97 (part of the East Dallas area rezoned to preserve residential uses), with the addition of a few parcels that P.D. 97 does not include. The area contains 272 parcels of property (about 85 acres), as indicated on maps in this report. Six full blocks, comprising about one-half of Lower Munger Place, were in the very first phase of Munger Place, opened before most of Swiss Avenue.

Historical

The developers of Munger Place strived for uniformity and design consistency along the Munger Place streets, which distinguished the area from its surrounding neighbors. Deed restrictions dealt with required residential land use, minimum costs, setbacks, orientation and height of structures on Munger Place lots. In addition, all blocks were to be 660 feet long, the streets 70 feet wide, and the sidewalks 10 feet wide. All lots were graded from one to four feet above grade. All the streets and the sidewalks in the neighborhood were paved, trees were planted, and the sewers, gas mains, and electric lights were completed in Munger Place before the residents moved in. The minimum price of homes in the area was $2,000. All of the residences had to front on Junius, Tremont, Worth, Victor, or Reiger. The lots were sold only to white people, and no lots were sold for speculation. Adjoining lots were sold for a short time, pending on securing a desirable neighbor to purchase, build, and live on it.

As Dallas continued to grow in size and wealth, newer areas such as Highland Park, Lakewood, and Kessler Park were developed. Taking advantage of topography, these areas used the rolling hills, naturally wooded areas and existing creeks to create winding streets and give Dallas a new picturesque look. Brick became the standard building material for these eclectic homes, so that the predominantly wood-frame Lower Munger Place began to look old-fashioned in comparison.

By 1929, East Dallas (including Lower Munger Place), began to go through some radical changes. Although a number of duplexes, triplexes, and quadraplexes had been built as original developments on
Munger Place lots, they were usually compatible with the predominant single-family homes in scale, setbacks, and building materials. With the World War II housing shortage, a number of single-family homes were converted into multiple-family homes. In 1929, all of the streets in the study area were zoned multi-family with two exceptions. Junius, between Fitzhugh and Dumas, retained single-family zoning, as did Victor, from Collett to Henderson. In 1947, the remainder of Victor was zoned multi-family, and in 1951 Junius (between Fitzhugh and Dumas), was zoned for apartments as well.

The 1950's saw a rather dramatic decline in East Dallas as a single-family neighborhood. Central Expressway was built, severing East Dallas from downtown, Highland Park, and North Dallas, thus spurring rapid growth of upper-income housing to the north. The multi-family conversions in Munger Place and other East Dallas areas were allowed to remain, and the area became largely tenant-occupied with considerable deterioration evident.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's, Dallas entered the apartment era with the two-story garden apartment building type. Gaston Avenue, with its large lots and obsolete mansions, became the focus of Dallas' first "singles" apartment boom. Redevelopment with new garden apartments was seen as the panacea for the declining older neighborhoods of East Dallas, Oak Lawn, and Oak Cliff, and they were "blanket zoned" for apartments in the early 1960's. Gaston and Live Oak were substantially redeveloped to new apartments and a number of smaller new buildings replaced once fashionable homes in Munger Place and East Dallas as a whole.

A few years after the blanket zoning of East Dallas, apartment zoning began to be granted on new land at peripheral locations. Because of the far greater ease of land assembly and development, the possibility of larger projects, and a strong demand, the majority of apartment developers switched from redevelopment to development of new land.

By the late 1960's, all of these forces resulted in classic neighborhood decline for East Dallas, including Lower Munger Place. About 1970, the scale began to tip the other way, with the Swiss Avenue Historic District, the East Dallas Interim Comprehensive Plan, the East Dallas Community Design Committee (originally established by the City Planning Commission), and the East Dallas Demonstration Project, all helping to "bring back" East Dallas.

The Historic Preservation League (H.P.L.), grew from its initial Swiss Avenue focus to a concern for all of old East Dallas, and eventually other parts of the City. Lakewood Bank's leadership in re-investing in their area led other banks and savings and loans to get involved. The Lakewood Shopping Center Plan, the formation of the East Dallas Community Design Committee (now independent of the City Planning Commission), concentrated code enforcement and later the Neighborhood Housing Services in the Mount Auburn area, the real estate promotion of the area by Lakewood Bank and the H.P.L. - these were all contributing to the East Dallas
LOCATION AND CONTEXT
The dramatic revitalization of Lower Munger Place is one of its most noticeable manifestations.

The tremendous East Dallas rezoning effort, involving hundreds of signatures on petitions, was a culmination of this process, resulting in a special zoning district, P.D. 97, for most of Lower Munger Place. P.D. 97 reduces the multi-family zoning down to the existing residential uses, (single-family, duplex, or multi-family), permits only single-family uses on vacant lots, and stipulates that if duplexes or multi-family structures are converted to single-family uses or demolished, the property retains only single-family development rights.

The Developer

R.S. Munger gained a reputation throughout the Southwest for his pioneer manufacturing of cotton gins, beginning in the 1880's. The Continental Gin Company, which Munger formed, prospered and became the largest manufacturer of its kind in the United States. The Continental Gin Company located in Birmingham, Alabama, where Munger observed restricted residential districts which seemed to be successful. Munger decided in 1900 to devise such a district for Dallas. By 1902, he began to assemble the 300 acres for this area, and by 1905, he completed his plans, finalized the land purchases (of 140 acres), and opened the area for public sale. Collett H. Munger, his son, became the general Manager for the project.

Because of its proximity to the central business district, Munger Place was an attractive place to live for many professionals of Dallas, as well as the social and political elite. The area was open farmland at the east fringe of Dallas' growth. The Lakewood Country Club (1913), which Munger helped to establish, as well as the nearby White Rock Reservoir (a popular fishing and picnicking site), were also selling points for Munger Place.

In view of all the physical attractions of Munger Place, many of the elite of Dallas were among the first residents there. The following list is representative of these early residents.

Slaughter, Christopher Columbus: One of the most prominent figures to reside in the area was Colonel Christopher Columbus Slaughter, who lived at 4834 Tremont. Born February 9, 1837, he was the first child of the new Republic of Texas to be born of American parentage. A man of great enterprise, Slaughter was involved in many operations in the fields of business, philanthropy, and livestock. In 1873 he organized the City National Bank of Dallas, and he later served this concern as president. Slaughter aided in establishing the American National Bank in 1884, which later consolidated with the National Exchange Bank to become the American Exchange National Bank, a strong financial concern in the South. Until his death, Slaughter served as first Vice-President of this organization. He helped found and endow a number of Christian colleges, such as Baylor University, and was involved in many philanthropic enterprises. A great Texas cattle baron, Slaughter accumulated enough
land to have been considered the world's greatest individual land owner. In the field of cattle raising, he was a leading figure. He helped organize the Cattlemen's Association of Texas. He also worked to develop better beef stock in Texas. He introduced 2000 head of Hereford cattle to the state in 1897, and later purchased two champion bulls, Ancient Briton and Sir Bredwell. Through these endeavors, Slaughter earned his various titles as financier, King of the Cattlemen, and Texas' greatest philanthropist.

Love, Thomas B.: Another leading figure of Munger Place, who lived at 5123 Victor, was Thomas B. Love. A partner in Love and Rutledge, Attorneys at Law, he was associated with many important legal matters in Dallas after 1899. Love was also involved in politics. A member of the Democratic National Committee, he also served in the state legislature for six years, during which time he was elected Speaker of the House. During World War I, Love spent over a year in Washington in the role of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Hill, Charles D.: With his home at 4936 Junius, the architect Charles D. Hill was a major Dallas figure who resided in Munger Place. Having studied architecture at the Art Institute of Chicago, Hill moved to Dallas in 1905. Here he organized C.D. Hill Company which was later to be responsible for the designing and construction of many important buildings throughout Texas. These structures included the Municipal Building and Auditorium, Galveston; The Dallas Country Club; the First Presbyterian Church, Dallas; the Dallas City Temple; the South Texas Commercial National Bank Building, Houston; Austin College, Sherman; the Lakewood Country Club, Dallas; the Tennison National Bank; the Oak Lawn Methodist Church, Dallas; the Sumptor Building, Dallas; and many others.

McFarland, S.J.: McFarland, who later lived at 4936 Junius as well, was a leading financier in the Southwest and a major community figure. He was Vice-President of the Security National Bank, Dallas, organizer of the Bank Trust Company, Dallas, and the Vice-President of the Guaranty State Bank, Dallas. McFarland also served as President and Director of the First State Bank of Seagoville, the Farmer's Trust State Bank of Moody, and the Citizen's State Bank of Richardson. In the capacity of Vice-President and Director, he was affiliated with the Citizen's State Bank of Bullard, the Merchants' and Planters' State Bank of Windsborough, the First State Bank of Killeen, and the First State Bank of Tatum. McFarland was also a leading church figure and chairman of the Board of Trustees for Texas Christian University and Carr-Burdette College. He was also chairman of the Board of Education of the Christian Church in Texas.

Hughes, Owen Thomas: Living at 4917 Junius was Owen Thomas Hughes, partner in and President of Hughes-O'Rourke Construction Company. This organization was responsible for the construction of many noted buildings such as the First National Bank Building, the Praetorian Building (one of the first skyscrapers in Texas), the Dallas Union Terminal, the Masonic Temple, the Lone Star Gas Office Building, and the Scottish Rite Cathedral.
Baldwin, George Isham: Baldwin, President of Western Engineering Company, resided at 5006 Junius. After studying civil and mechanical engineering at Chicago, Baldwin's first position in Texas was with the Munger Cotton Gin Company in Dallas. In 1900, he started the Western Engineering Company, which erected cottonseed oil mills throughout the South and Southwest.

These are just a few of the many prominent figures who lived in Munger Place. Others include:

Gibbs, W.L.: 5201 Reiger, Vice-President of Clem Lumber Company.

Olmstead, Harry: 4921 Junius, Vice-President of Southwest Paper Company.

Clem, Rowe: 5001 Junius, President of Clem Lumber Company.

Durham, J.S.: 5000 Tremont, General Manager of J.I. Aldridge Company.

Bethard, Albert D.: 5003 Victor, Vice-President and General Manager of Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railroad.

Gratigney, Belmont W.: 5011 Victor, Vice-President and General Manager of Bush & Gert Piano Company of Texas.

Knox, W. Frank: 5107 Junius, President of Gulf, Texas and Western Railroad.

Murray, T.V.: 5105 Victor, President of Dallas Optical.


Head, W.B.: 4841 Tremont, Chairman of the Board, Texas Power and Light, and Vice-President of the Union Trust Company.

There were also physicians such as Dr. Isak J. Morris who lived at 4914 Victor, and Dr. John Henry Dean, son-in-law of C.C. Slaughter, who lived at 4834 Tremont. Besides Hill, there were two other architects in the district. Severin L. Stielvig lived at 5025 Junius, and J.W. Nail resided at 5016-18 Victor. John Fay, a leading Dallas saloon keeper, lived at 5124 Victor, and band leader Ferdinand Riek resided at 4934 Tremont.
Architectural Style

The architectural character of the houses in Munger Place has been touted, both in the Historic Preservation League's Munger Place study and in the application for the National Register, as being an outstanding example of Prairie Style architecture, deriving from the work of Frank Loyd Wright and his followers around the turn of the century. The term Prairie School is properly used to describe this important movement in early modern architecture, which is most notably represented by the work of Wright and others in Oak Park, Illinois. Many of the houses of Munger Place, particularly in its first phase along Swiss Avenue, were distinguished by being of contemporary design, rather than the historical, or eclectic, modes more prevalent in large expensive Dallas homes of the time. But few can be called true examples of Prairie School design.

A thorough three-part study of the architectural style and history of all the houses in the Swiss Avenue Historic district has just been completed as three related masters degree theses at the University of Texas at Arlington under the supervision of Dr. Jay Henry, (Architectural Historian). Dr. Henry is a specialist in Prairie School architecture, and has several publications on Prairie School architecture in Texas. Authors Judith Dooley, Robert Canavan and Particia Taylor Canavan conclude, with Dr. Henry's concurrence, that only one house in the Swiss Avenue Historic District is truly Prairie School in style, the Higgenbotham House at Swiss and Munger, designed by Lang and Witchell, and inspired by Wright's Robie house in Chicago. Many of the houses, however, were modern, and show some influence of the Prairie School or the earlier Chicago School, such as ornate Sullivanesque decorative panels or friezes. Consequently, they have devised a basic typology of Progressive, to describe the modern or Prairie School-influenced houses, and Eclectic, to describe the historical modes, such as classical, Georgian, or Tudor.

In this examination of the architectural style of the houses in Lower Munger Place, the lead of the Swiss Avenue study was followed, dividing those structures built during the main period of Munger Place's development before 1920 into Contemporary and Eclectic (historical) modes. The broader term "contemporary" is used rather than the more exacting "progressive", so houses could be included which were in the non-historical, or non-eclectic style of their day, even though relatively traditional. Many large frame houses in this contemporary mode could be found in other Dallas neighborhoods and substantial neighborhoods throughout the mid-west.

The term originated to describe these houses in the HPL's Munger Place study was Prairie Style, which suggests a blending of true
Architectural Styles of Lower Munger Place

Defaced - Munger Place Period

Victorian

Munger Place Period - Eclectic

Post War Redevelopment

Prairie School Influence
Architectural Styles of Lower Munger Place

Munger Place Period - Contemporary

Prairie School Influence

Munger Place Period - Eclectic

Nondescript

Prairie School

Transitional
Prairie School influences with the essentially vernacular, balloon-framed, mid-western, single-family house. However, since the term Prairie Style is so easily confused with the recognized style of the Prairie School, from which it is rather distinct, it was decided to simply say Contemporary, Munger Place Period. Within this contemporary category, a few houses have been noted which show true Prairie School influence.

In addition to the Contemporary, Eclectic, and Prairie School influenced modes of the Munger Place Period, several other very broad categories of architectural style and period were used to describe those structures not belonging to the Munger Place Period at all. The terms Victorian or Transitional, Post-Munger, Post-War Re-development, and Nondescript, cover these structures. Each of these stylistic categories is illustrated by several examples on the facing page.

Eighty-four percent (84%) of the structures are in a style of the Munger Place Period. Seventy-three percent (73%) are in the Contemporary mode, including four percent (4%) (9 structures) showing Prairie School influence.

Certainly it can be seen that the importance of the architectural style in Lower Munger Place lies not in the significance of any one house, but in the total compatibility and harmony of the entire area. Lower Munger Place is highly intact, with few intrusions. The deed restrictions of Munger have helped to tie the eclectic architecture of Lower Munger Place together in a cohesive, logical manner. In part, this is due to common setbacks, building heights, orientation on lots, and building skin conformity. The homes are uniformly spaced, and create a sense of balance and harmony.

Lower Munger Place, rather than being judged strictly on the basis of its architecture, should be viewed as an intact example of an early 1900's upper-middle class neighborhood in Dallas, and the result of the first application of deed-restrictions in Dallas.

**Uniformity, Design Consistency**

One of the most significant features giving a strong design identity to a district is its uniformity, its consistency. Some variation from structure to structure adds richness and interest to a district. But the repetition of similar building volumes, yard and streetscape conditions, materials, and architectural style give a district coherence, harmony, and a strong design identity. This is particularly true when this uniformity distinguishes the area from surrounding areas. As was discussed earlier, the uniformity along the block throughout Munger Place was the major source of its design impact. Unlike most Dallas neighborhoods of its day, Munger Place was characterized in most areas by open yards and constant setbacks on a block; by uniformly two-story building height; by all-brick or all-wood houses on a block;
and by one or two street trees in an open, unobstructed boulevard strip in front of each yard. Uniformity of major design elements was what most essentially characterized Munger Place, and even to the casual observer, makes Lower Munger Place streets look "somehow different, more impressive" than their surroundings.

In order to look at uniformity, the predominant design type was considered a design standard against which uniformity could be measured. In building skin, the predominant material, and therefore the design standard, is wood. In architectural type, it is Munger Place Period styles. In building height, it is 3 stories. In boulevard condition, the standard is 1 or more trees. Then each blockface was rated as to percent of conformity to those design standards. For example, three blockfaces of Tremont show 100% conformity to the design standard of wood building skin because all structures in those blocks are wood skinned.

Lower Munger Place as a whole conforms 65% to the standard of wood building skin with a distribution shown on Map 4. Victor (73% wood), Worth (69%), Teemont (68%) and Reiger (62%), are near or above average. Junius, with its many brick houses and brick apartment buildings is only in 48% conformity with the wood standard.

Lower Munger Place as a whole conforms 84% to the standard of architectural types being of the Munger Place Period. Map 5 illustrates conformity to the predominant architectural type. Victor is the most consistent (94% conformity), followed by Worth (87%), Tremont (86%), Junius (74%), and Reiger (62%).

By standard of two-story building height shown on Map 6 Lower Munger Place as a whole is 91% consistent. Junius is most consistent in this regard (98% two-story structures), followed by Victor (92%), Tremont (90%), Worth (89%), and Reiger (86%). This simple feature of consistent two-story building heights is one of the most distinguishing features of Lower Munger Place.

Looking at the design standard for boulevard condition of one or more trees, shown on Map 7, Lower Munger Place as a whole shows only 59% conformity. Junius shows the highest degree of consistency (77%), followed by Victor (65%), Worth (64%), Tremont (54%), and Reiger (35%).

Some of these design elements may be more important to establishing uniformity than others. However, if considered to be of equal weight, they can be combined to obtain an overall indication of design uniformity. Combining the four design standards, Lower Munger Place as a whole shows 75% consistency. Victor shows the highest consistency (81%), followed by Worth (77%), Tremont and Junius (74% each), and Reiger (64%).
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Design Authenticity

Two aspects were recorded here: 1) The degree of design authenticity the structure had as of August, 1978. Design authenticity means either the structure's original design, or a design consistent with the style and time of that structure and seen in other contemporary Munger Place structures. 2) The "authenticity trend" of restoration activity on the structure, i.e., has restoration made the structure more authentic, less authentic, or unchanged in authenticity?

An authenticity index was developed for each structure built during the main period of Munger Place's development. On each parcel, 17 features of the structure, yard, or boulevard in front of the parcel were checked for authenticity. Three of these features were combined into one, and two of these features were given a "weight" of 2. This resulted in a maximum possible authenticity score, or index, of 16.

Structures classified as "Victorian or transitional", "Post-Munger", "Non-descript or defaced", or "Post-War Redevelopment" were not examined as to design authenticity, since they are wholly outside the range of authentic Munger Place designs. In effect, they were rated "0".

The degree of authenticity for each blockface is shown on Map 8. Munger Place as a whole has an authenticity index of 11.43 (71% of maximum possible). Tremont (12.69), Victor (12.08) and Worth (11.78) are all above average in authenticity, while Junius (10.28) and Reiger (9.54) are below average in authenticity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>No. of Structures</th>
<th>Authenticity Index For Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUNIUS STREET</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTH STREET</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREMONT STREET</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTOR STREET</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIGER STREET</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL LOWER MUNGER PLACE</td>
<td>2685</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>11.43 (71% of maximum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In determining an authenticity index for a whole street, all structures were counted (including those outside the range of authentic Munger Place designs) but vacant lots were not counted. This means that the presence of vacant lots will not lower the authenticity index, but the presence of non-authentic structures will lower the index. The negative design impact of vacant lots is accounted for in the intactness index.
The second aspect, the authenticity trend of renovation activity, is intended to indicate how authenticity of design has been affected by the recent renovations. Any major building feature restored to authenticity counted +1. Any major inauthentic feature done by the renovator, or retained by the renovator from an earlier alteration counted as -1. In determining an average score for the authenticity trend of renovation, only those structures were counted where renovation was underway or complete. Of course, non-authentic structures (e.g. Victorian, Post-Munger), were not included in calculating this index. The authenticity trend of renovation is shown by blockface on Map 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHENTICITY TREND OF RENOVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POINTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREMONT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL LOWER MUNGER PLACE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of all M.P. period restorations (47%) (44%) (9%)

*This total is less than the 87 total number of renovations because 8 of those renovations are structures not of the Munger Place period architectural styles, including 5 move-ins.

This indicates a strong and consistent tendency toward increased authenticity in the restorations of Munger Place period structures. Forty-seven percent (47%) of these restorations increase authenticity. 44% do not affect authenticity, and only 9% reduce authenticity.

It should be noted here that only those renovations which have occurred in the last year (between 1977 photos and August 1978 field work) could be recorded as increasing authenticity, since we have no record of authenticity before their renovation prior to the 1977 photos. On the other hand, restorations before the 1977 photos which retained an inauthentic feature were able to be seen and recorded as such in August, 1978. Therefore, a number of pre-1977 restorations would have rated higher in increasing authenticity if comparative data had been available.
Architectural

Dramatic evidence of extensive renovation is spread throughout Lower Munger Place, as shown on Map 11. Only two of the 16 blocks in the study area have no evident renovation activity. One of these two, the Tremont block, is already at an excellent level of maintenance. Of the 272 parcels, 237 have structures. Eighty-seven (87) of these structures (37% of the 237), have completed renovation or are now under renovation. Worth Street has the highest concentration of renovation activity (53% of its structures); the other four streets have about a third of their structures renovated or being renovated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PARCELS</th>
<th>VACANT PARCELS</th>
<th>PARCELS WITH STRUCTURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIUS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTH</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREMONT</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTOR</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGER</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAJOR RENOVATIONS - LOWER MUNGER PLACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>RENOVATIONS</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUPLEX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-FAMILY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two patterns emerge when we look at the location of these renovations as shown on Map 5. Only 15 of the renovations stand alone in their blocks. The other 72 renovations adjoin other properties being renovated either next door or back-to-back.

The other pattern in renovations is that virtually all of the renovations are for single-family houses. Seventy-nine (79) of the eighty-seven (91%) are for single-family use. Only four (4) are multi-family (with 3 or 4 units only). At least two (2) of the duplexes and two (2) of the multi-family structures are owner-occupied or intended for owner-occupancy.
Certainly, many of these had been converted to multi-family use and were restored to single-family use. The demand for renovated structures is almost exclusively for single-family houses ultimately destined for owner-occupancy. Lower Munger Place still has 65 multi-family structures, representing approximately 425 dwelling units. Fifteen of these buildings are post-war apartment buildings, and another two are buildings older, but larger than four units, and so unlikely to be renovated for owner-occupants. Since these are scattered throughout the neighborhood, their renovation (or at least their maintenance), will be an important issue affecting the overall housing renovation.

Looking only at those renovations which have been completed, three trends are evident. First, all of the completed renovations are single-family structures. Second, the quality of the renovations is generally quite high. In almost all cases, the renovations are also restorations, in which inappropriate corrections are removed and defaced portions are repaired to their original design. Third, Junius and Worth Streets lead the other streets in completed renovations. The completion of more renovations on Junius indicates that renovation activity occurred first on Junius, and has spread to the other streets from there.

General Condition

About one-half of the structures in Lower Munger Place are in good general condition. In addition, another 25%, which are in various levels of condition, are in the process of renovation. Totally, 76% of the structures in the area are either in good condition, or are being renovated. Twenty-four percent (24%) are in fair or poor condition. The structures in good condition or under renovation are spread throughout the area, with Worth Street about 70% under renovation and the other streets are about 80% under renovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL CONDITION OF STRUCTURES - LOWER MUNGER PLACE</th>
<th>VACANT PARCELS</th>
<th>TOTAL PARCELS</th>
<th>GOOD OR UNDEP RENOVATION</th>
<th>FAIR OR POOR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARCELS</td>
<td>PARCELS</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>UNDER* RENOVATION</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIUS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28(61%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTH</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14(31%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREMONT</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36(61%)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTOR</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26(54%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIGER</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18(46%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>122(51%)</td>
<td>59(25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Structures recorded as "under renovation" will be slightly fewer than those recorded elsewhere, since some were complete enough to be in "good" condition.
Currently, 48% of the structures in Lower Munger Place are owner-occupied, and 52% are absentee-owned. However, for all 272 properties, including vacant lots, 42% are owner-occupied, 21% are owned by other Munger Place owner-occupants, for a total of 63% owned by Munger Place residents. A remaining 38% are owned by non-residents. Of the 181 structures in good condition or under renovation, 54% are owner-occupied. Of the 56 structures in fair or poor condition, only 27% are owner-occupied and 73% are absentee-owned. 154 structures (65%) are now owner-occupied or intended for owner-occupancy.

Owner-occupancy of housing units is generally considered desirable in a neighborhood. It increases stability, simply because owner-occupants can move much less easily, and therefore, less frequently than tenants.

Owner-occupancy relates to better maintenance, although it is not true that any particular owner-occupied house will be better maintained than an absentee owned house. It tends to be true that a high proportion of owner-occupancy corresponds to a high level of maintenance. Even within Lower Munger Place, Junius Street, with the highest owner-occupancy (65%), has the highest proportion of structures in good condition (61% tied with Tremont). Worth, with the lowest owner-occupancy (33%) has the lowest proportion of structures in good condition (31%). This hardly bodes ill for Worth Street, however. Twenty-four of Worth Street's 45 structures (53%) are renovated or underway, making it the most actively renovating street in Lower Munger Place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Condition and Owner-Occupancy</th>
<th>All Structures</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied Structures</th>
<th>Absentee-Owned Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Condition</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>76 (62%)</td>
<td>46 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Renovation</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good or Under Renov.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>98 (54%)</td>
<td>83 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Cond.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Cond.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair or Poor</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15 (27%)</td>
<td>41 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at renovation and owner-occupancy, it is apparent that of the 22 completed renovations, most (73%) are owner-occupied. Of the 65 renovations underway, however, only 40% are owner-occupied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RENOVATIONS AND OWNER-OCCUPANCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovations Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Renovations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intactness**

One of the factors studied in this report is the degree of area intactness - the degree to which original development remains. The degree of intactness was calculated from the field information. A parcel was counted as intact when the original structure was on the lot, regardless of how the structure itself may have been altered. Even those parcels with structures identified as belonging to periods other than "Munger Place period", were counted as intact parcels if they seemed to be the original structure on the lot. A parcel was counted as not intact only when it was a vacant lot, or was occupied by a moved-in structure, or by post-war development (apartments of the 1950's and 1960's). It should be noted that post-war apartment buildings often occupy 2 or more of the originally developed lots, but were only counted as one parcel. Therefore, such a parcel is only counted as one not-intact parcel, rather than reflecting the 2 or 3 demolished houses it replaced. Consequently, the degree of intactness will be slightly higher than if we were able to count whether all original structures remain.

The thirty-two blockfaces in the study area ranged from 100% intact (11 blockfaces) to a low of 25% intact. The degree of intactness by blockface is shown on Map 14.

Lower Munger Place as a whole is 79% intact, with Junius Street being average (79%), Worth, Victor, and Tremont a little above average (Worth - 82%, Tremont - 82%), and Reiger Street being well below average (65%), due primarily to blockfaces R1 and R6, between Fitzhugh and Collett, which together are only 33% intact.
Designation Merit

The following section will discuss each of the twelve designation criteria as they are appropriate to Lower Munger Place. Essentially, this section is a summary of the narrative information provided in the previous sections.

A. Character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City of Dallas, State of Texas, or the United States.

Quite possibly this criteria is one of the twelve criteria most completely fulfilled by Lower Munger Place. As discussed in the Cultural section, Lower Munger Place has been a source of pride for East Dallas residents. Because it was the first deed-restricted subdivision in Dallas, resulting in a cohesive, distinctive area, and a place of residence for Dallas' early social, political, and professional elite. Lower Munger Place served as the first physical movement to social stratification in Dallas where the elite clearly set themselves apart from the rest of Dallas. Lower Munger Place (as Dallas' third subdivision), also marked the fringe of the Eastward expansion of Dallas.

B. Location as the site of a significant historical event.

Not applicable.

C. Identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the city.

R.S. Munger, the developer of Lower Munger Place, significantly contributed to the development of the City of Dallas with this first planned and deed-restricted subdivision. R.S. Munger also gained notoriety through his pioneer manufacturing of cotton gins. He also was quite influential in the development of the Lakewood Country Club, an institution in Dallas since 1913. Also, because of the exclusiveness of the entire Munger Place Development (including the Swiss Avenue Historic District), R.S. Munger managed to attract many of the prominent citizens of Dallas in the political, social, and economic worlds.

D. Exemplification of the cultural, economic, social, or historical heritage of the city.

Certainly, with Lower Munger Place being the first planned, deed-restricted subdivision in the City of Dallas, it was a predecessor to the first zoning ordinances in the City. Again, Lower Munger Place attracted the elite of Dallas, firmly and graphically establishing a clear distinction (in terms of residential location) between upper and lower class residents of Dallas.
E. Portrayal of the environment of a group of people in an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style.

Lower Munger Place is truly indicative of an upper middle class neighborhood in the Southwest in the early 1900's. The architectural style of Lower Munger Place is a mixture of several different styles, and this eclectic blend suggests architecture contemporary for the period.

F. Embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen.

Not applicable.

G. Identification as the work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has influenced the development of the city.

Not applicable.

H. Embodiments of elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which represent a significant architectural innovation.

Not applicable.

I. Relationship to other distinctive buildings, sites, or areas which are eligible for preservation according to a plan based on historic, cultural, or architectural motif.

Lower Munger Place is a part of the total Munger Place Development, of which Swiss Avenue has already received City Historic Designation.

J. Unique location of singular physical characteristics representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the city.

Lower Munger Place, being the first planned, deed-restricted subdivision in Dallas, is uniform and consistent in many features. The building height and orientation, setbacks, cost, building skin, and landscape features were designed to present a unified and distinctive image to the rest of the City. Munger Place truly "stands out" from its surrounding, and does portray a distinctive image.

K. Archeological value in that it has produced or can be expected to produce data affecting theories of historic or prehistoric value.

Not applicable.
L. Value as an aspect of community sentiment or public pride.

The high rate of renovation activity, as well as the drive by the residents of Old East Dallas for National Register Nomination (granted 9/13/78), is indicative of the pride of the residents in Lower Munger Place. Most of the renovations have also been restorations - something totally self-governed, which indicates inordinate attention to detail.