

HISTORIC LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
January, 1975

Dr. Bryghte Godbold, Chairman
Director, Goals for Dallas

Ruth Montgomery, Vice Chairlady
Heritage Society

Mary Sloan
Member of Planning Commission

Florentino Ramirez
Chairman Mexican-American Coalition Council
Member of Planning Commission

Ed Hunt
Architect

Jim Van Zandt
Landscape Architect

Jerry Tahu
Planner-Lawyer

Roger Keane
President of Oak Cliff Savings

Ed Beran
Beran-Shelmire Architects

Kay Gallagher
citizen

Virginia Talkington
Historic Preservation League

Julia Scott Reed
Newspaper Columnist

Louise Kahn
Board Member of Dallas Symphony

Phil Huey
ex-officio

Tom Jones
ex-officio

Review and Decision on Landmark Survey

1. Completion of Landmark Survey report by Professor Alexander.
2. Task Force appointed by the Dallas Historic Landmark Committee.
3. Briefing of Task Force by Planning Department Staff on preservation ordinance, criteria, survey report.
4. Task Force review Alexander's report, determine priority of actions.
5. Field trips and studies by Task Force.
6. Meeting with property owners by Task Force.
7. Task Force make recommendation to Landmark Committee.
8. Landmark Committee review Task Force recommendations.
9. Landmark Committee make recommendations to Plan Commission.
10. Plan Commission holds public hearing and submits its recommendations to City Council.
11. City Council holds public hearing and takes action.

Concurrent with this established procedure is the development of a preservation plan by the Landmark Committee and the city staff. After completion of this study, the plan will be included in the Comprehensive Master Plan for the City.

DALLAS HISTORIC LANDMARK SURVEY

Presented by: Drury Blake Alexander
School of Architecture
University of Texas
Austin, Texas
1975

CONSULTANT RECOMMENDATIONS OF LANDMARK SITES AND DISTRICTS

Note: Citation in this report does not confer official landmark recognition. This report will be studied by the Dallas Historic Landmark Committee and recommendations will be made to the Dallas Plan Commission and City Council at a later date.

Landmark Priority Designation

*** = First Priority

** = Second Priority

* = Third Priority

In drawing up this list of landmarks I have used three priorities to indicate my evaluation of their relative importance. These are to be considered only as recommendations to the Historic Landmarks Committee for their guidance. The final determination whether a building is worthy of the designation "historic" is, of course, the responsibility of the Committee. The use of three priority grades is only an indication of the relative value of each landmark according to my judgement, and is to be used at the discretion of the Committee. After a landmark has been designated, there should be no distinction or priority indication.

It should be understood that no judgement is totally objective; each individual has certain prejudices which affect his decisions. My evaluations, subject to such prejudices, were based on my familiarity with the individual buildings, the information that I have regarding the history of the

buildings and those individuals associated with them, and my knowledge of architectural styles. It is my responsibility as consultant architectural historian to recognize and evaluate the importance of a building architecturally, that is as an example of a given style or period, and to determine the building's historic importance in terms of people or events that are associated with the building. The third area of significance, the cultural or social value of the building is more difficult to ascertain. This value may be better assessed by local citizens who are familiar with the popular sentiment attached to the building. A church, for example, may not be architecturally or historically important, but it may, nevertheless, have great meaning to a minority group or a neighborhood for which it is a symbol of identity.

It would be convenient if we could make a chart listing the criteria with assigned values or points for each and then check off those for which a building qualifies. These would then be added up and the score would determine what the priority of the building should be. This, however, is not possible. It would be soon discovered that a building which everyone recognizes as being of prime importance might come out a poor second to one which had very little popular appeal but qualified in other ways. The criteria are too intangible to

lend themselves to a point system of this kind. This is why the final decision must rest in the hands of a committee of citizens serving in the interest of the public.

Although the Historic Landmark Ordinance clearly specifies the criteria to be used in determining a landmark, it is helpful to have some guidelines in establishing priorities. Landmarks and historic sites may be of significance to a neighborhood or district, to the city, or to the nation. They may be important in several ways. They may be important architecturally as examples of a style or period or as examples of exceptionally fine craftsmanship and design. They may be important historically as the site or location of a significant event, the home or address of an important historical personage. And, they may be important as a locale associated with a segment of the population which is distinctive culturally or racially. Each of the landmarks on this list is in some degree significant to the preservation of Dallas' cultural and architectural heritage. The priorities are ranked as follows:

- First priority - landmarks significant on a national scale
- Second priority - landmarks significant to the City of Dallas
- Third priority - landmarks significant to a neighborhood or district

Periodically the Committee will be required to issue certificates of appropriateness for certain alterations to the exterior of a designated historic landmark. This requirement will need to be clearly explained to the public in order to overcome the objection that their rights as property owners are unduly restricted. The question whether they must apply for a certificate every time they need to repaint is frequently raised. With the help of the city attorney or other legal counsel, the Committee should publish a statement designed to allay such fears. In this statement it should be made clear that normal maintenance such as repainting (using the same or similar color scheme), re-roofing, patching, etc., requires no certificate. Likewise, emergency repairs, such as those needed to prevent further damage following a fire, storm, or tornado, should not require a certificate. Any changes, including remodeling, additions, re-landscaping, changing exterior surfaces or materials, and significant changes in colorscheme which will affect the architectural character of the exterior of the building must be approved by the Committee and receive a certificate of appropriateness.

DALLAS HISTORIC LANDMARK SURVEY

***	1.	Adolphus Hotel	1912	1321 Commerce
**	2.	Branden House	1893, 1912, 1923	2800 Hickory
**	3.	Caruth House		7700 Northwest Hwy.
**	4.	Cumberland Hill School	1888	1901 N. Akard
**	5.	Dallas Architectural Club	1923	1711 Live Oak
***	6.	Dallas City Hall	1912	Main & Harwood
**	7.	Dallas Power & Light Bldg.	1930	1506 Commerce
**	8.	Dallas Women's Forum	1906	4607 Ross
*	9.	Elizabeth Chapel	1926	1028 East 10th
**	10.	"El Sibil" (Frank Reaugh Studio)	1928	5th & Crawford
***	11.	Federal Reserve Bank	1921	Akard & Wood
**	12.	Fire Station Museum		3801 Perry
***	13.	First Baptist Church	1891	Ervay & Patterson
***	14.	First Presbyterian Church	1912	Harwood & Wood
***	15.	John A. Gillin House	1958	9400 Rockbrook
**	16.	Higginbotham Bailey Co.		914 Jackson
**	17.	Hodgepodge	c. 1890	2603 Fairmont
*	18.	Hopkins House		1619 Beckley
**	19.	Hord Log Cabin	1845	501 Shelter Place
**	20.	Honest Joe's Pawn Shop		Elm
***	21.	Kalita Humphreys Theater	1959	Turtle Creek
*	22.	The Idle Rich Lounge		1914 Canton
***	23.	Kirby Building	1913	Main & Akard
**	24.	Shennard King Sr. House	1925	3417 Gillisnie

**	25. d	Joe Kovandovitch House	c. 1915	523 Eads
*	26.	Lakewood Library	1937	Lakewood Shopping Center
**	27.	Lone Star Gas Co. Bldg.	1931	301 S. Harwood
***	28.	Magnolia Bldg.	1921	Akard & Commerce
***	29.	Majestic Theater	1921	Elm
**	30.	M. K. T. Bldg.	1911	701 Commerce
***	31.	Neiman Marcus Bldg.	1914	Main & Ervay
*	32.	Ott's Locks		909 Elm
*	33.	R. I. Payne House		4524 Rawlins
***	34.	Pegasus "The Flying Red Horse"		Magnolia Bldg.
**	35.	Sacred Heart Cathedral	1898	Ross & Pearl
***	36.	Sanger Bros. Department Store	1910	
**	37.	Scottish Rite Cathedral	1907	Harwood & Canton
**	38.	Sears Roebuck Club	1913	1409 S. Lamar
***	39.	Security Mortgage and Trust Bldg.		
*	40.	Sullivan House		S. Akard & Beaumont
**	41.	R. L. Thornton House		6941 Gaston
**	42.	W. S. Trigg House		1503 Junius
***	43.	Trinity Methodist Church	1903	McKinney & Pearl
***	44.	Union Terminal	1916	Houston & Young
***	45.	Wilson Building	1902	1621 Main
**	46.	Oak Cliff Viaduct	1912	
**	47.	Dick Forner Farm		Langdon Rd. Rt. 2-406
**	48.	Shingle Style House		3506 Cedar Springs

**	7.2	R. W. Higginbotham House	1913	5002 Swiss
**	7.3	G. C. Greer House	1916	5439 Swiss
***	7.4	A. Lewis, G. N. Aldredge	1917	5500 Swiss
**	7.5	W. J. Lang House	1927	5640 Swiss

*** 8. Warehouse District

*	8.1	Allis Chalmers Co.		
*	8.2	Awalt Furniture Co.		
*	8.3	Southern Supply Warehouse		Market Street

** 9. Wilson Block District

**	9.1	Frederick L. Wilson House	1896	2922 Swiss
----	-----	---------------------------	------	------------

DALLAS HISTORIC LANDMARKS SURVEY

by

Drury B. Alexander

University of Texas, Austin

SUMMARY BY: Department of Urban Planning Staff

INTRODUCTION

To the casual visitor, Dallas is a twentieth century city. Yet, if one looks beyond the glass and aluminum clad skyscrapers or the rows of mansard roofed apartment complexes, it is possible to find evidence of its nineteenth century beginnings. In The Prairie's Yield, an architectural guide to Dallas published in 1962, the authors list eight buildings dating before 1900. Since that guide was published, four of those nineteenth century buildings have been demolished. There are many early twentieth century buildings as well which deserve recognition yet lie neglected.

The purpose of this survey is to show what makes Dallas a unique city, and to suggest ways to preserve those buildings and sites which provide the citizens of Dallas and those who visit here a sense of place, an identity with the past, and a guide to the orderly and responsible planning for future growth.

HISTORY

Dallas has a history spanning 135 years. Its past consists of successive periods, each with a unique character, depending both on the growth stage of the young city and the state of affairs elsewhere in the country. The architecture of the time reflects the life of the people, our predecessors.

1840 - Pioneer Days

John Neely Bryan platted a new town on the Trinity, offering to give free land to newlyweds. For a while, the future metropolis that was to be, comprised only the Bryan Cabin located near the site of the future courthouse square and the Hord Cabin across the Trinity in present-day Oak Cliff. These first cabins still stand, Bryan's quite close to where it originally must have been.

1850 - Farming Village

Dallas grew, but for a while it remained a log cabin village. Then new prosperity and a sawmill came to the farming community. Immigrants from the southern states to the east brought their love for the Greek Revival style they had known there (popularly but incorrectly "Southern Plantation" style.)

• Millermore, now in City Park, is the only example we have from this period.

1860 - Civil War

The decade of the '60's brought Dallas close to ruin, as Civil War and a great fire took their toll. Nothing architecturally remains to remind us of this period in our history.

1870 - The Railroads

With the coming of the railroads, the whole character of the town changed. Never again would Dallas be a farming community - business, trade, and growth, spectacular growth, were in the cards. The wholesale warehouses began to line Main, Elm, and Commerce Streets. Brick was the building material for commercial structures, yet none remain; swept away by the expansion of future decades.

1880 - Trade Center

Dallas became the trade and banking center for the northern half of the state, and due to its business connections with St. Louis and Chicago, it came under their cultural influence. The streets were bustling with commerce and the banks and stores. Store owners and bankers, having become established pillars of the community, began to put buildings of greater dignity and grandeur, built with style and built to last - of stone instead of brick. Their buildings personified the solid and enterprising business community.

1890 - Continued Growth

The mansions were stretched out under the trees along Maple, McKinney, Ervay and "upper" Ross Ave. As evidence of the citizen's pride in their city, they built "Old Red" the county courthouse and many solid churches.

1900 - Twentieth Century

The new century found Chicago's influence dominant, both in Dallas and across the country. The Chicago School was spreading the concept of the new building - the skyscraper. This style was quite popular for the warehouses and commercial buildings which clustered along the railroad tracks on lower Pacific north of the courthouse. The more avante-garde members of the community even built a church - Trinity Methodist - in this style. But a more stately style was preferred for uptown office buildings, with Greek or Roman orders, designed after the classic influence of the Chicago Fair of 1893. All those who could, were moving out of the city into the new suburbs - Highland Park, and recently annexed Oak Cliff, made easily accessible by the first permanent viaduct (now the Houston Street viaduct). Dallas was now a small city.

1910 - Civic Improvement

The city was still small enough that many of the civic leaders could live on the same street, in the spacious homes along Swiss Avenue. Concern for civic beauty was at a high point. The new Municipal Building (City Hall) was built at the opposite end of town from the county courthouse. The Adolphus Hotel and Busch (Kirby) Building were the height of commercial elegance, while passengers arrived at the city through the magnificent concourse of Union Terminal, when everyone travelled by rail.

1920 - Residential Neighborhoods

By now, Dallas was too large for the downtown to be the exclusive focus of activity. Although the downtown department stores were still supreme, neighborhood shopping centers and the drug store soda fountain served as social foci for surrounding areas. Knox Street, and Lakewood are characterized by a unique style and scale, although somewhat eroded by newer development.

1930 - Modernism

The '30's is the last decade of historic Dallas. With World War II we enter the modern period to which we are too close to judge. The highlight of this depression decade was the Texas Centennial, held in 1936 at Fair Park. The art deco architecture built for that occasion did not try to be classic, but striving for a modern and jazzy look, a celebration of the machine age, and faith in the future.

CONCLUSION

Dallas is a growing and dynamic city, yet we can encourage further growth while protecting our past. The Dallas Historic Landmarks Preservation Ordinance provides for the inclusion of a Preservation Plan, based in part upon this survey, as part of the Comprehensive Plan for Dallas. Buildings, sites, and districts worthy of preservation can be made a part of the plan, judged according to criteria determining their cultural, social, aesthetic, architectural, and historical importance in Dallas' past.

We have lost much, yet much remains which is worthy of our attention. This survey describes what is existing - it is our civic duty to decide what to do, where it will lead.

If we do nothing, each year will see the deterioration and destruction of more irreplaceable reminders of our city's past. Through creative preservation, we can blend the finest elements of the past with the more contemporary designs of the modern period. This mixture of old and new will provide the visual enrichment that is vital to all great urban places.

PLANS

DALLAS HISTORIC LANDMARKS SURVEY

Submitted to
the Department of Urban Planning
of the City of Dallas

by

Drury B. Alexander

September 14, 1974

This project was funded in part by the Management Information Systems Study, a United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Grant.

DALLAS HISTORIC LANDMARKS SURVEY

A Report on Structures and Sites Which
Constitute a Part of the Historic Re-
sources of Dallas Together with Recom-
mendations for Their Evaluation and
Preservation

Submitted to the Department of Urban
Planning of the City of Dallas

by

Drury B. Alexander

September 14, 1974

Preservation Consultant: M. Wayne Bell

Photographer: Carl O. Bergquist

This project was funded in part by the
Management Information Systems Study, a
United States Department of Housing and
Urban Development Grant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Significant contributions to this study have been made by numerous individuals, groups and organizations. Special recognition is due to the Dallas County Heritage Society, Inc. and, in particular, to its Research Committee, without whose excellent work this study could not have been produced within the allotted time. Acknowledgment is also gratefully made to the Historic Preservation League, Inc. for their support of this project and their pioneering effort to establish the first historic zone in Dallas--Swiss Avenue. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the enthusiastic cooperation and support of the staff of the Urban Design Division of the Department of Planning and Urban Development of the City of Dallas.

CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. HISTORY	4
III. THE ROLE OF THE CITY IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION .	36
IV. EVALUATION CRITERIA	45
V. SOURCES FOR POSSIBLE FUNDING	60
APPENDICES	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR BACKGROUND AND INFORMATION FOR THE COMMITTEE AND THE PUBLIC	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86

I. INTRODUCTION

To the casual visitor, Dallas is a twentieth century city. It gives the impression of newness. And yet, if one looks beyond the glass and aluminum clad skyscrapers or the rows of mansard roofed apartment complexes, it is possible to find evidence of its nineteenth century beginnings. Although Dallas has lost a great deal of its early architecture, fragments of two of its very first buildings can still be found in the reconstructed log cabins of the city founder, John Neely Bryan, and his contemporary, William H. Hord, who settled on the west side of the Trinity. Except for the Old Courthouse and the First Baptist Church, few significant structures remain, but there are many early twentieth century buildings which deserve recognition--buildings which clearly portray the growth of Dallas from a small regional trade center to a great metropolis. In The Prairie's Yield, an architectural guide to Dallas published in 1962 by the Dallas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, the authors list eight buildings dating before 1900. Since that guide was published, four of those nineteenth century buildings have been demolished, and one is presently scheduled for

demolition. There are a few other nineteenth century buildings which were not listed in the guide, but their number is rapidly diminishing.

It is both appropriate and timely that Dallas is now pausing to take stock of its architectural heritage before taking on the complex task of planning for the future. This city adopted one of the first comprehensive historic zoning ordinances in Texas, and the historic survey and preservation recommendations which are presented here will, it is hoped, form the basis for the implementation of that ordinance and for the orderly and felicitous growth of the Dallas of tomorrow.

The purpose of this survey of historic landmarks is to discover what it is that makes Dallas a unique city and to suggest ways to preserve those buildings and sites which provide the citizens of Dallas and those who visit here a sense of place, an identity with the past, and a guide to the orderly and responsible planning for future growth. Every city has a certain character or quality which gives it its identity. Some cities, due to fortuitous circumstances of location, history, or economics, are exceptionally endowed with what might be called civic personality. New Orleans, San Francisco, and Charleston are

obvious examples. The unique character that distinguishes Dallas is not as clearly established in the public mind. Since the physical aspect of a city is of paramount importance in establishing and expressing this individual character, the City of Dallas through its City Council has recognized this fact and has adopted a historic landmark ordinance which will significantly affect the development and preservation of this character. By instituting a program which will promote the preservation and the appropriate use of its historic landmarks, Dallas has the opportunity to halt the destruction of the tangible evidence of its past and to preserve those landmarks which still exist, thus providing the living evidence of the past for the enjoyment and enlightenment of the present and future generations of Dallas citizens.

II. HISTORY

1840

Dallas was founded in 1846 by John Neely Bryan from Tennessee. His first trip to the site of what was to become the City of Dallas was made in 1840. Believing this area of North Texas to be one of promise, he returned in 1841 and made a home for himself in a crude dugout in the bluff until he could build a log cabin. Bryan could be described as the prototype of all of those men of business who came after him to build the city which he founded into the metropolis it is today. He had some experience as a farmer, lawyer and Indian trader, which was helpful in those early years when he was bringing his new town into being. He chose as his grant from the Peters Colony 580 acres situated on a bluff of land overlooking a crossing of the Trinity River where trails from Galveston and East Texas met, evidence that he recognized a good opportunity when he saw one.

As in the case of many of those businessmen who followed him, Bryan's business instincts were tempered with a sense of responsibility which is reflected in the fact

that he gave a lot to each newlywed couple in the town, and his home, a log cabin, served as the first post office and courtroom in Dallas. During the early years of his life in Dallas, Bryan built two log cabins. The log cabin which now sits in the courthouse square is said to contain logs from one of these. It has been designated the Bryan cabin for a sufficient number of years to have become the symbol in the eyes of the public of the founding of the town, and, as such, it now has a validity of its own.

It was Bryan's intention from the beginning to establish a town. For that purpose he brought J. P. Dumas, a surveyor, to his site to lay out the town. The resulting plan was a grid-iron scheme with the orientation slightly off the cardinal points of the compass. The major streets ran east-west with cross streets running north-south. As Bryan's town grew it encountered another town plat which was approximately 30 degrees out of alignment to Bryan's plan. This was the result of an earlier survey, although not at that time developed, by John Grigsby, and the awkward juxtaposition of these two street systems has plagued Dallas from that time to the present.

Unlike most Texas towns which developed as county seats, Dallas did not grow around a courthouse square as

the center and focal point of the town. Bryan did donate one square for the courthouse, the one on which the old courthouse now stands. Rather than being in the center of the town it was one block from the river. This can be taken as an indication that Bryan and the early city fathers expected the city to focus its future growth on the river as a navigable base for shipping and transportation. In spite of repeated attempts to establish navigation on the Trinity, Dallas has never depended on the river for transportation. Consequently, the city grew in the other direction, especially after the first railroad located its station to the east on the opposite side of town. From that time on the city naturally began to spread eastward, and eventually the center of commercial activity shifted away from the courthouse. The city, as a consequence, has never developed a center or focal point which would symbolize the downtown as did some American cities of this era. Nor does any one of the three major streets of the center city, Elm, Main or Commerce, stand out as being more important visually or symbolically and consequently take a place in the minds of the citizens as The street, as for example does Congress Avenue in Austin, Main Street in Houston, or Fifth Avenue in New York.

1850

By 1850, with a population of 430 people, Dallas was architecturally still a frontier settlement. The majority of its structures were log cabins, many of them double log cabins with an open center hall or dog run. By this time a few frame buildings may have been built with lumber hauled from Jefferson and Houston.

The first saw mill was built by Alexander Cockrell about 1855. As a result light frame structures became the major residential building type. At about the same time brick became a commonly used material for commercial structures. Cockrell himself began construction of a three story brick hotel in 1850, although he did not live to see it completed. His wife carried on the building of the hotel which was named the St. Nicholas and remained the leading hotel in Dallas for years.

The Cockrell home on Commerce Street, built in the same year as the hotel, 1850, was very likely the best house in Dallas at that time. As seen in an early photograph in the Barker Library at The University of Texas, the house is a simple, two story, frame, Greek Revival building with a two story gabled portico centered on the front. The portico is supported by square posts and has an entablature

enriched by a dentil cornice running around the house. In the photograph the house appears to be painted a light color, perhaps white or cream, with dark green shutters--in fact, a very typical house of the rather simplified Greek Revival style which prevailed in Texas at that time and which was found in great numbers in Waco, Austin and San Antonio.

It was during the 1850's and 60's that the Greek Revival style reached the frontier communities of the Southwest and was employed for all buildings which attempted a stylistic expression. Churches, public buildings, and the better houses, such as the Cockrell house and the Miller homestead, "Millermore," had characteristics of the style to the extent that they were available and could be afforded. Many of the settlers came from nearby southern states where the Greek Revival style was most popular. They brought with them the memory of those architectural forms with which they were familiar. The chief characteristics of the style are: the use of columns (ranging from the Greek orders to simple square posts capped with a molding), a portico topped by a pediment and centered on the front doors, a symmetrical arrangement of windows about the entrance, and classic details such as entablatures and cornices above doors and windows.

1860

The 1860's, a dark era in American history, brought troubled times for the young town. In addition to the Civil War and its aftermath, Dallas was struck by a major fire and a flood. On the other hand, Dallas was invigorated culturally by the remnants of a utopian community established in 1854 by a group of French Fourierists who called their community La Réunion. The colony was a failure, as were so many of the idealistic utopias established on the American frontier. A number of the colonists moved to Dallas bringing with them a variety of talents as artists, scholars and professionals.

1870

In contrast to the preceding decade, the 1870's were most significant in the growth of the city. Without doubt the most important event in the entire history of Dallas was the arrival of the railroads. The first, the Houston and Texas Central, appeared in 1872. In 1873 the Texas and Pacific came, linking Dallas by rail to the East by way of St. Louis and Chicago and to the South by way of Houston and the Gulf ports. Until this time Dallas could

be reached only after weeks of long and uncomfortable travel in stage coaches; and goods, which had to be shipped from Houston and Jefferson by ox-drawn wagons, took months to arrive. Dallas very quickly became the trade center for a large and rapidly developing agricultural region which included the northern and central portions of the state. Cotton and buffalo hides were two of the most important commodities shipped out of Dallas, while agricultural implements, hardware, saddlery, and dry goods were brought in for distribution throughout the trade region. Warehouses, wholesale and retail stores, and factories were built, thus swelling and pushing the "downtown" or commercial district of the city eastward along the three major streets, Elm, Main, and Commerce. According to A. C. Greene, the outstanding piece of architecture in 1880 was a three story granite distillery which boasted a "bonging clock tower" (Greene, 27).

1880

By the 1880's Dallas had clearly established its character as a trade and banking center for the entire northern half of the state. Large warehouses of farm implement distributors, hardware and dry goods wholesalers,

department stores and bank buildings added their impressive brick and stone facades to the urban scene. Many of these enterprises were branches of St. Louis and Chicago firms. The buildings were often designed by architects from those cities and reflected the prevalent architectural forms and technology of those centers of midwestern American culture.

Of the buildings of this period, only a few remain; now, two of these appear to be doomed--the old Sanger Brothers building and the Trust building. These two buildings were later combined with a larger building to the east to house an expanded Sanger Bros. Store. This imposing complex now houses El Centro College. It is especially sad to see this complex broken up by the demolition of the older buildings in the group as they represent the best examples of Richardsonian Romanesque still standing in Dallas, and as they form a significant historical progression from the Richardsonian of the older buildings to the Sullivanesque of the later Sangers Building--in effect, a comparative view of the two stages of the Chicago School.

1890

The growth of Dallas in the 1890's is quite obviously the result of the arrival of the railroads in the

1870's which brought about the rapid delivery of goods manufactured in the east and midwest and the shipment of agricultural products in return. The connection to St. Louis and Chicago began a relationship with these two midwestern cities which lasted well over a half century and involved cultural as well as economic influences. This connection with the midwest and the east established Dallas as the style center of Texas in terms of architecture, furniture, and clothing--a foretelling of the role Dallas plays today with its Decorative Center, Furniture Mart, Apparel Mart and the World Trade Mart.

Of the handful of nineteenth century buildings left standing in Dallas, two of the most significant are the Dallas County Courthouse, "Old Red," and the First Baptist Church. They are alike in many respects. Both were begun in 1891, and both are bold architectural statements which reflect the convictions of their builders. The courthouse is an example of the Romanesque style popularized by Henry Hobson Richardson in Boston and Chicago, whereas the church is a free mixture of Gothic and Romanesque forms which recalls the work of Frank Furness of Philadelphia. The work of Furness, which is now receiving due recognition, was characterized by a bold and free interpretation of

medieval forms. The courthouse, built of granite and red sandstone, was designed by Orlopp and Kusener from Kansas City. It is a descendant of H. H. Richardson's public buildings such as the many libraries and town halls he built in Massachusetts in the preceding decade. The courthouse stands today missing only the central clock tower and some gargoyles which were removed some years ago when it was feared that they might be hazardous.

The First Baptist Church by Albert Ullrich is rendered in red brick and stone. It has something of the boldness of Frank Furness in the overscaled arches and Gothic details which enliven the facades. Although neither of these buildings could be classed as outstanding national examples of their style, they are of prime importance to Dallas as two representative buildings, which by their richness of color, form, and detail, add significantly to the quality and texture of downtown Dallas.

Another important building of this decade was the Oriental Hotel, built in 1893. This, too, was in the popular "Romanesque" style with a corner turret, massive arches, and architectural enrichment in the best Richardsonian manner. The Oriental Hotel, which long reigned as the finest hostelry in the city, stood where the Baker Hotel

is now. Many celebrities who visited Dallas during the 1890's were entertained here.

As the commercial area expanded, the residential area began to extend beyond the original plat of Bryan's town. The first fine residential suburbs were developed in the '70s and centered about Cumberland Hill, along "upper" Ross Avenue, and in an area called the Cedars on Ervay. The "showplace" of the late 19th century was the Dilley Mansion on Maple Avenue, built in 1890 for George Dilley at a cost of \$40,000. The house, which is no longer standing, had shingled turrets, Moorish arches, and very elaborate detail. Maple Avenue was by this time a very fashionable residential street leading out of the center of the city. Another important residential street of that time was McKinney, which led out to the northeast from downtown.

1900

The twentieth century brought important changes in the architecture of Dallas. The principal influence was still Chicago, and that influence now stemmed from two sources, the Chicago School of architecture and the Chicago Fair of 1893. These two sources influenced the architecture

of Dallas and the entire nation for a quarter of a century. The Chicago School is the name given to the style of architecture which originated in Chicago in the 1880's and was the direct response to the new building type known as the "skyscraper." The high-rise buildings were a new, American phenomenon made possible by steel construction and the elevator and answered the rapidly growing demand for office space in the center of the city. In Chicago such architects as William LeBaron Jenney, Adler and Sullivan, and Burnham and Root were pioneering a new style of architecture to reflect and accommodate this new building type.

Soon after the turn of the century, the style was introduced to Dallas. Two of the very finest examples are still standing--the John Deere Plow Co., later known as the Kingman, Texas Implement Co. building, and the Parlin and Orendorff Implement Co., now the Purse and Co. Building. The Dallas architects of these two buildings, Hubbell and Greene, and J. A. Padgett, respectively, quite clearly owe their inspiration to the most famous of all of the Chicago School architects, Louis Sullivan. A comparison with Sullivan's Wainwright building in St. Louis will show a similar vertical division into three sections--a base, a shaft, and a cornice. The broad expanse of unbroken wall framing the

central panel of windows is found in Sullivan's work and might also be compared to the Larkin Building of Frank Lloyd Wright, which was built a few years later. Both facades present a very strong compositional device in the treatment of the windows by collecting them into a central panel which runs up through the center of the facade and is boldly framed by the solid corner massing and the deep cornice above, all of which suggests a sort of triumphal arch motif. The John Deere building possesses a handsome band of interlaced ornament of a typical Sullivan-esque filigree pattern which frames the ground floor openings. It is unfortunate that the bays on either side of the ground floor entrance have been filled with a concrete tile grill which detracts from the fine cornice detail above. The Parlin and Orendorff Implement Co. building now stands alone on the north side of Founders Plaza creating a singularly handsome focal point for that axis of the plaza in front of it. Both of these buildings are extremely important for the contribution they make to the quality of the Founders Plaza and the courthouse area.

A third building of this first decade of the twentieth century, which is equally as important as the previous two, and which is also representative of the

Chicago influence in Dallas, is Trinity Methodist Church. Although the Chicago School is generally associated with the skyscraper form, its architects designed many other building types including churches, residences, schools, and public buildings. The architect of Trinity Church, J. E. Flanders, was obviously familiar with the work of Sullivan, Wright and other Chicago architects, and was remarkably sensitive in his handling of the elements of the Chicago School. Trinity Church is an admirable example of this style and ranks with the John Deere and Parlin and Orendorff buildings as the most important Dallas buildings of the first decade of the twentieth century. The overall composition of Trinity Church is a handsome assembly of forms dominated by the entrance tower which is well balanced by an imposing gabled cruciform roof. Two small towers are tucked into the reentrant angles of the cross plan and fill out the perimeter to form a square. The detailing is equally well handled with a successful balance between plane surfaces and architectural enrichment, some of which is decidedly Sullivanesque, as in the intricate filigree pattern of the cornice of the lower towers. Subtleties of design are seen throughout the building as in the continuation of the vertical elements that frame the

opening in the tower on through the cornice emerging as pinnacles at the base of the pyramidal roof.

The interior is likewise thoughtfully designed in the form of a spacious auditorium with the choir and pulpit filling a stage-like rostrum. The organ chamber is framed by a very deep, rich band of Sullivanesque ornament much like a great proscenium arch and reminiscent of the proscenium of the Auditorium Building in Chicago. The other outstanding feature of the interior is the window treatment. Brilliantly colored, painted glass windows fill the large Gothic pointed-arched windows on two sides of the sanctuary. These Gothic forms are rather startling intrusions into what is otherwise a building that is primarily classic in character.

Many events which occurred in the first decade of the twentieth century reflected or fostered the rapid growth of the city. Among these were the beginning of the Inter-urban systems in 1902, the annexation of Oak Cliff in 1903, the opening of Munger place in 1905, and of Highland Park in 1907. Oak Cliff was developed by T. L. Marsalis and J. S. Armstrong who bought land in Hord's Ridge which they subdivided into residential lots in 1887.

After a disastrous flood in 1908, which destroyed the only public bridge across the Trinity to Oak Cliff, a

viaduct was built which was the longest concrete bridge in the world when completed in 1912. This Oak Cliff viaduct is now the Houston Street viaduct and one of fourteen bridges which at present span the Trinity in Dallas. The Oak Cliff viaduct opened that part of the city to expansion as a residential adjunct to the city.

Another building of the first decade which is not as advanced stylistically as the Deere and Parlin and Orendorff buildings but which does reflect the main stream of American architecture is the Wilson building. It was designed by Sanguinet and Staats of Fort Worth and built in 1902. With eight floors it was the tallest building in the state and was acclaimed for the solidity of its construction as well as for the richness of its design. In its design it reflects the influence of the Chicago Fair in the extremely rich Renaissance Revival detail of the exterior. It could almost be referred to as Baroque in its sculptural richness. The term Baroque, however, must be reserved for the Adolphus Hotel built in 1912.

By the second decade of the twentieth century, Dallas recognized the need for a city plan and hired George E. Kessler of Kansas City and St. Louis. The plan which he produced reveals the important influence that the Chicago

Fair had on American city planning. Kessler proposed plazas and thoroughfares, a civic center and parkways which would have given Dallas a much stronger visual image than it has as yet achieved. Kessler's comprehensive plan was only partially carried out, but those features which were built are generally considered to be the most admirable and successful features of Dallas today. Dealy Plaza, the entrance to the city from the west, Ferris Plaza in front of Union Terminal, and Turtle Creek Parkway are examples of his influence, if not in each case a direct interpretation of his plan.

1910

The period from 1910 to 1920 was one of rapid growth both in the continuing spread of residential suburbs and in the construction of important public and commercial buildings in the downtown area. In both types of buildings the Midwest continued to exert its influence on Dallas architecture. The finer houses built during the decade were usually spacious and hospitable without being overly pretentious in terms of historic or stylistic detail. They typically were placed in the middle of a large lawn, raised above street level and, if possible, were generally

symmetrical with some emphasis on the front door which was centered on the facade with wide windows balanced on either side. Most often a large porch with deep overhanging eaves provided a comfortable open space for leisure hours and a means of visual communication with one's neighbors. The low pitched, hipped roofs with wide overhanging eaves were characteristic of the Prairie Style which was so brilliantly expressed in the work of Frank Lloyd Wright. The Higginbotham House on Swiss by Lang and Witchell is a very close adaptation of Wright's Prairie Style, recalling the Robie House in Chicago in its materials (dark red brick) and in its irregularly broken, strong horizontal lines.

The public and commercial buildings, on the other hand, shifted away from the Chicago School and Louis Sullivan's search for new forms of expression, and returned to the academic eclecticism of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, which was given a great boost by the Chicago Fair. Certainly a greater variety of sources was brought into the architects' repertoire with the classic orders in one form or another maintaining their hold on architectural design.

One of the most important buildings of this period is the Adolphus Hotel designed by the St. Louis firm of Barnett, Hayes and Barnett. The hotel was built in 1912.

for Adolphus Busch of St. Louis and reveals the continuing influence of that city on Dallas' architectural and economic life. The building, in Neo-Baroque style, is without doubt the richest architectural expression in the city. Combining stone, dark red brick, slate and copper, the design is a paradigm of a Beaux-Arts composition. The bold display of architectural sculpture on this building is a significant asset to the city, the value of which will become more apparent when the Akard Mall is complete and the Adolphus can be appreciated in all its splendor as the visual termination of an important link between the center of the city and the convention center. In addition to the Adolphus, Mr. Busch employed the same architectural firm to design an office building for Dallas. The Busch Building, which later became known as the Kirby Building, on Main at Akard was completed in 1913. This skyscraper is rather unique in that it is a very early use of the Gothic style for high rise buildings--a style which of all the eclectic styles is perhaps better suited to the form of the high rise due to the possibility of expressing and even emphasizing the vertical lines of the structure. Cass Gilbert's Woolworth Building in New York was built at the same time and is acclaimed as one of the earliest skyscrapers to use

this style. As both buildings were designed at the same time it is unlikely that the Woolworth Building was an influence on the Busch Building which makes it all the more important as one of the two innovative buildings in this style. It is pointed out in The Prairie's Yield that the deep reveals of the windows not only provide a sun-control device but also give the building a rich, three-dimensional quality in contrast to its metal and glass curtain-walled neighbors (Prairie's Yield, 28).

In contrast to the Adolphus and Busch Buildings, most of the public and commercial buildings of the teens are more reserved in their architectural expression, utilizing a form of classicism ranging from the elegant Roman of the First Presbyterian Church to the French Renaissance inspired City Hall. This classicism is first seen in the Scottish Rite Temple, Built in 1907 by Hubbell and Greene. Its use of dark brick in combination with stone is an indication of its early position in the development of this classicism, or more correctly, Renaissance Revival style. The later buildings, such as the above mentioned First Presbyterian Church and City Hall, display a more sophisticated understanding of the style, for example their more correct limitation to all stone exterior walls. The church

is a most carefully detailed Roman Revival with a characteristic dome and a Corinthian portico. Its location establishes the church as a major element in the visual order of the eastern end of downtown as it links visually with the City Hall. Together they form an important node in the city. The City Hall, built in 1912, the same year as the First Presbyterian Church, was designed by another St. Louis firm, Mauran, Russell and Crowell, with C. D. Hill of Dallas, the architect of the church, associated with them. The City Hall is an example of Beaux-Arts classicism of the highest order, not just within the context of Dallas, but by national standards as well. The mansard roof, a French Renaissance form, surmounts a finely detailed classic facade which is representative of the very best Beaux-Arts design. At the west end of the downtown, the Union Terminal faces Ferris Plaza and creates another important node within the central urban area. The Terminal contains within its white glazed brick facade an impressive waiting room or concourse once considered a necessity for train stations. Few of these great spaces are still in use, and many of the finest interior spaces of the early twentieth century have been demolished, for example the finest of them all, Pennsylvania Station in New York. As was so often the case,

the waiting room of the Dallas Terminal is the most impressive large scale interior space in the downtown area. Hopefully it will be retained, either to be restored to its original use or for some other suitable purpose.

1920

The last important example of Beaux-Arts Classicism in Dallas was built in the twenties, the Federal Reserve Bank, 1921, by the Chicago architects, Graham, Anderson, Probst and White. This is a building of great dignity and refinement, reflecting in its noble Tuscan order the stability and importance of the institution it houses.

The decade of the twenties brought a wide range of influences and opened many new sources for the architects and their clients. No longer were St. Louis and Chicago the principal sources of architectural style. In residential architecture the popular magazines provided the major source of stylistic ideas, while the professional architectural journals, presenting the work of the leading architects of the U.S. and Europe, guided the local architects in their designs for public and commercial buildings. In residential architecture Georgian, Spanish Baroque and English Tudor were favored. In commercial and public

architecture the choice of stylistic expression was somewhat more limited. The simplified classic forms and Renaissance revival predominated; here and there a bolder client would accept a richer treatment in Spanish Baroque done in stucco embellished with tile or terra cotta.

The development of neighborhood shopping centers is an important result of the rapid expansion of residential subdivisions during the twenties. As new subdivisions were developed, the need for neighborhood drug stores, grocery stores and other shops was handled by well planned shopping centers in which a unified architectural treatment was carried out, often with considerable attention to architectural detail, signs, and planting. Although most of these shopping centers have suffered changes, particularly in terms of signs and street level refacings, many of them still retain a considerable amount of their original charm. Examples of these shopping centers are the Knox Street stores, the Lakewood Shopping Center and the Highland Park Shopping Center, the latter, of course, not in the city of Dallas. Unlike the vast shopping malls of today, these were strictly neighborhood shopping centers and provided both shopping facilities and social arenas for their neighborhoods. They did not compete with the large department

stores downtown, and that area continued to serve as the major shopping district of the city.

1930

By 1930 Dallas was abreast of the national architectural fashion. That fashion, however, had reached a nadir in terms of aesthetic quality. Eclecticism was the basis of the architect's training and practice. Residential architecture conformed to one of several accepted historic modes: Georgian, "Colonial" and Spanish Baroque being the most popular. There were a few architects who were attempting to achieve a more logical solution to architectural problems, particularly in residential architecture. David R. Williams accomplished notable successes in his planning and design of houses and a very forward looking residential subdivision which will be described in more detail later. In his residential designs, Williams approached the problem with imagination and freedom from the restrictions of style, developing an architectural expression based on regional building traditions and the nature of materials as well as good craftsmanship.

For commercial and public buildings throughout the United States the concept of modernism had become

acceptable by 1930. This most often took the form of the Art Deco style popularized by the Paris Exposition of 1925. Two of the best examples in Dallas are the Dallas Power and Light Building and the Lone Star Gas Company Building. Both of these buildings were designed by Lang and Witchell. The Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago in 1933 gave the style and modernism in general a further boost. Once again a Chicago fair had its effect on the architecture of the entire country. Three years later, in 1936, the Texas Centennial Exposition took place in Dallas. With the kind of boosterism which had made Dallas the banking, insurance and merchandising center it was, the leadership of Dallas captured the Centennial for Dallas, much to the chagrin of the other large cities in Texas. For this event the fair grounds, which Dallas had for some time called the State Fair of Texas, were enlarged and filled with many new buildings. Although the state had not fully recovered from the depression, the Centennial seemed to give the people, weary of years of austerity, something to take their minds off their troubles and the promise of a better future.

As was the case with the Chicago Fair of 1893 and 1933, the planning of the grounds and the design of the buildings was apportioned to local architects. As a means

perhaps of assuring recognition by the professional journals and national press, a prominent eastern architect, Paul Cret of Philadelphia, was brought in as a consultant for the overall planning. The Chicago Century of Progress Exposition of 1933 had introduced modernism to the United States, and by 1936 Texas was quite ready to be excited by architectural forms which were new and unfamiliar. Although not as original and daring as the Century of Progress, the Centennial introduced a style of architecture novel to most Texans. The plan of the fair in fact was quite conservative. It was centered on an axial esplanade which stretched from the entrance gates to the monumental Hall of State, a canal of water with fountains accentuating its center and a series of balancing arched entrances to the exhibition buildings flanking the central axis. The style of the fair might be classified as late Art Deco and would have been termed "modernistic" at that time. Its character is quickly read in the architectural details, for the composition of the masses of the buildings was strictly symmetrical and Neo-Renaissance in outline with the exception of a few elements such as the tower on the Hall of State. By removing the modern decor and replacing it with pilasters and cornices, it would have hardly been distinguishable from

the eclecticism of the 1893 fair in Chicago or the 1915 San Francisco Exposition. The Centennial, however, did not introduce the Art Deco style to Dallas. As early as 1930 Lang and Witchell had designed a very fine building for the Dallas Power and Light Company in a most sophisticated example of Art Deco. A year later they produced the Lone Star Gas Company Building in the same style. The elevator lobby of the latter building is one of the finest interiors in the Art Deco style remaining intact.

1940

The 1940's were marked by World War II, and significant building was curtailed during most of the decade. The years following the war have produced vast changes in public attitudes and private needs, all of which are reflected in the architecture of today. The architecture and planning from 1950 to the present is much too close to us for an objective evaluation, and thus we leave for future historians the task of sorting and evaluating the landmarks which have been created from the end of World War II to the present. We have included two buildings of this period due to the fact that they were designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. Wright is the one American architect

whose place in the history of architecture is unquestioned, and Dallas is fortunate in having two examples of his work.

THE ARCHITECTS

Of those architects who contributed significantly to the quality of the city, one firm is clearly the leader in the number of buildings they built over a very long period of time and in the quality of their work throughout the life of the firm. This is, of course, the firm of Lang and Witchell. The senior member of the firm, Otto H. Lang, came to Dallas in 1888 as an engineer in the office of the Texas and Pacific Railroad. He was born in Freiburg, Germany, in 1864 and was educated at the technical school in Karlsruhe. He was 24 years old when he came to Dallas, directly from his native Germany, and by 1903 he opened his office as an architect. Two years later he took a young man by the name of Frank O. Witchell as his partner. The two of them maintained a successful practice for 32 years. Lang continued to practice for four years after Witchell retired, finally retiring himself in 1942.

Frank O. Witchell, the junior member of the firm, was born in England in 1897 and was brought to the United States at the age of two when his parents settled in San

Antonio. Witchell had no formal training in architecture, but he worked for the firm of Sanguinet and Staats as a designer and draftsman from 1898 until 1905. This means that he was working in that firm's Dallas office (they were a Fort Worth firm, but did business all over the state) during the time that the Wilson Building was built and may have been involved in its design, if only as a draftsman. Certainly there was no firm in Texas in which an aspiring young architect could have gotten better experience, for Sanguinet and Staats was the leading firm in Texas during those years around the turn of the century.

From its beginning in 1905 until the 1930's the firm of Lang and Witchell consistently displayed an amazing ability to keep abreast of the new ideas that appeared during this formative period in American architecture. They quickly absorbed the lessons of the Chicago School and in 1910 they designed the new Sanger Brothers Store in a very elegant Sullivanesque manner. By 1913 they turned to Frank Lloyd Wright for their inspiration in designing the Higginbotham residence on Swiss Avenue and also for the Sears Roebuck Club. In 1930-31 they produced two of Dallas' finest Art Deco buildings, the Dallas Power and Light Company Building and the Lone Star Gas Company Building.

Dudley M. Greene, who was their chief designer for many years, undoubtedly brought new and fresh ideas into the firm. It is remarkable that this firm over a span of thirty years maintained an ability to move with the times and continually to produce buildings of high quality in the current architectural mode.

Of the many Dallas architects of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century who deserve recognition, only a few can be singled out here. They are: Hubbel and Greene, who did the John Deere building and the Scottish Rite Cathedral; J. E. Flanders, whose Trinity Methodist Church is admired today; J. Edward Overbeck, who contributed many public and commercial buildings to the Dallas scene; C. W. Bulger, who designed the Praetorian Building and many Baptist churches throughout the state; and C. D. Hill, the architect of the First Presbyterian Church.

The history of Dallas architecture would not be complete without mentioning David R. Williams, certainly one of the most colorful personalities who ever enlivened the artistic circles of Dallas. At a time when most architects were content to borrow their forms and their ideas from the distant and romantic past, Williams was carefully

studying early Texas houses to learn the secret of their charm, the reasons for their forms, their responses to materials such as wood and stone, and to the technology and craftsmanship available, and their adaptability to the Texas climate. The result was a house type, low-keyed in manner, which nevertheless had much character and individuality. His houses were generally long, spreading forms with low pitched, gabled roofs, wide overhanging eaves and with porches running across the front or down the side. In later years Williams would say that he had introduced the ranch house style which builders all over the country have so grossly misused in the popularization of the form. Williams' houses, however, have a timeless quality which is associated with the nineteenth century houses of Central Texas, a subtle blend of several cultures including German, Spanish and a touch of classicism from the Greek Revival of the Anglo-American.

In addition to his innovations in residential design Williams produced a new concept in neighborhood planning. His design for Greenway Park, 1926, provided a common park or green for all of the residential lots in each block. It was designed so that each house could face onto the common green in the center which was devoted to

recreation and pedestrian circulation, and the automobile traffic was handled by the encircling streets.

An architect who was taught by and inspired by Dave Williams is O'Neil Ford, now of San Antonio. Ford has carried into his contemporary designs many of the concerns and ideals of his mentor--concerns for materials, for indigenous forms, for craftsmanship and for contextual relationships. These concerns seem as relevant today as when Williams gave them expression forty years ago.

III. THE ROLE OF THE CITY IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION

"The pace of urbanization is accelerating and the threat to our environmental heritage is mounting; it will take more than the sounding of periodic alarms to stem the tide.

"The United States is a nation and a people on the move. It is in an era of mobility and change. Every year 20 percent of the population moves from its place of residence. The result is a feeling of rootlessness combined with a longing for those landmarks of the past which give us a sense of stability and belonging.

"If the preservation movement is to be successful, it must go beyond saving bricks and mortar. It must go beyond saving occasional historic houses and opening museums. It must be more than a cult of antiquarians. It must do more than revere a few precious national shrines. It must attempt to give a sense of orientation to our society, using structures and objects of the past to establish values of time and place.

"This means a reorientation of outlook and effort in several ways.

"First, the preservation movement must recognize the importance of architecture, design and esthetics as

well as historic and cultural values. Those who treasure a building for its pleasing appearance or local sentiment do not find it less important because it lacks "proper" historic credentials.

"Second, the new preservation must look beyond the individual building and individual landmark and concern itself with the historic and architecturally valued areas and districts which contain a special meaning for the community. A historic neighborhood, a fine old street of houses, a village green, a colorful marketplace, a courthouse square, an esthetic quality of the townscape-- all must fall within the concern of the preservation movement. It makes little sense to fight for the preservation of a historic house set between two service stations, and at the same time to ignore an entire area of special charm or importance in the community which is being nibbled away by incompatible uses or slow decay.

"Third, if the effort to preserve historic and architecturally significant areas as well as individual buildings is to succeed, intensive thought and study must be given to economic conditions and tax policies which will affect our efforts to preserve such areas as living parts of the community.

"In sum, if we wish to have a future with greater meaning, we must concern ourselves not only with the historic highlights, but we must be concerned with the total heritage of the nation and all that is worth preserving from our past as a living part of the present."

The above quoted material is from the conclusions to the findings in a Report of a Special Committee on Historic Preservation under the auspices of the United States Conference of Mayors with a grant from the Ford Foundation in a publication entitled With Heritage So Rich. These statements broadly define the objectives and the tasks of historic preservation. There are areas of responsibility that are far beyond the capabilities of individual preservationists. There has been an accelerated federal involvement in the preservation activities heretofore undertaken primarily by the private sector. There is a gap between the governmental involvement and the private involvement that can and should be the responsibility and charge of the city. Although incapable of shouldering the entire responsibility of preserving the heritage of the city, the city itself does have several courses of action which it can take, all of which will greatly benefit the establishment and preservation of the landmarks of the city.

The City of Dallas has adopted a Historic Landmark Preservation Ordinance which establishes a Historic Landmark Preservation Committee who shall designate structures and sites for landmark status. The ordinance as written provides for the inclusion of a Preservation Plan into the Comprehensive Plan of the City. Once established, the Preservation Plan will identify the historic landmarks in the city and will become a part of the planning considerations of virtually every city agency. Plans for proposed streets and roads, utility service, new subdivision development and zone establishment, redevelopment of blighted areas, public housing projects, health facilities and all other growth determinants will be provided with clearly defined areas worthy of preservation.

The ordinance outlines the responsibilities of the Committee and hence of the city in promoting historic preservation. Several areas of responsibility shall be discussed.

1. ZONING

A review of the zoning throughout the city should be evaluated and where existing zoning is not conducive to the preservation of the area, changes in zoning

should be requested. A careful evaluation of the preservation area may reveal that either more restrictive or more permissive zoning may result in a greater economic feasibility for the use and preservation of an area.

2. CODES

While building codes are established to protect the welfare of the individuals, quite often these codes are drawn up for entirely newly constructed buildings and have requirements which are not feasible or even possible in the rehabilitation of landmark structures. Alternative solutions to allow for optimum architectural integrity and safety to the public should be permissible when historic structures are involved. However, at no time should questionable relaxation of the code be permitted which might endanger the welfare of a person or of personal property.

3. MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS

Beautification and improvements to historic areas can be executed on publicly owned and controlled land. These improvements should be studied with the atmosphere and intent of the preservation area as control

of the development. A plan which is overdeveloped can be just as injurious to a historic area as no development at all. Street widths, sidewalk widths, planting and landscaping and street lighting and street furniture are all aspects which should be considered. Rerouting of heavy traffic from preservation areas can enhance the value of the area and thereby directly affect the success of the preservation effort. Any effort by the city which will enhance the integrity of the landmark will increase the value of the property and thereby encourage private participation.

4. TAX INCENTIVES AND EXEMPTIONS

At the present time only charitable organizations are exempt from ad valorem taxes in the State of Texas. There was a provision under the new Constitution Revision that allowed cities the option to aid preservation efforts at the private level by tax abatement. However, that document did not materialize and only those properties of a charitable nature can participate. The principles of assessment or rate reduction, assessment or rate freeze, temporary exemption scaled over a period of time, or refund are practiced in some states and this is a great

incentive for investment in historic properties. Unfortunately the city cannot participate in such a program at this time.

5. FUNDING

With the exception of Seattle, Washington, no major city in the United States has attempted a city controlled revolving preservation fund. The general consensus of opinion is that the perpetuation of the fund is almost wholly dependent upon city allocated funds, and that because the city is not a charitable organization private philanthropy is not fully utilized as it might be through the private sector. An ideal situation for private funding within a city is the establishment of a public foundation, either through a historical organization or special interest group, with the express purpose to receive donations and disburse grants and loans for historic preservation. The Committee could make recommendations to the foundation for projects which have received certificates of appropriateness and which are in accord with the City Preservation Plan. This type of funding is used in San Antonio by the San Antonio Conservation Society and in Austin by the Austin Heritage Society.

Other sources of funds are available through both governmental agencies and private foundations, and it should be the charge of the Committee to keep a current record of such sources of funding and to make that information available to individuals involved in private preservation projects.

6. PRESERVATION INFORMATION

The Committee can be of invaluable assistance to the owners of historic properties through an educational program. After sites have been identified as possessing historic or architectural significance, the owner of the property should be made thoroughly aware of the value of the property to the heritage of the city. The owner should have detailed information of the criteria which qualified the structure for landmark status as well as additional information concerning the valuable assets of the building and suggested care and preservation of each part of the property, from the grounds to each significant architectural detail. Counseling with the owner should begin immediately after landmark designation and not after the owner has performed maintenance of the property which may unknowingly weaken the integrity of the structure.

Public information should not be limited to the owners of buildings, but should also include other occupants or residents within an area as well as the general public. Of particular emphasis should be the dissemination of information to the business community. One of the greatest industries of a city is tourism, and historic preservation is a prime factor in tourist visitation. Frequently the added cost of historic preservation is more than returned through the stimulation generated by preservation efforts. Even banks and lending agencies are beginning to recognize the economic feasibility of historic preservation in the business community. Cities such as Denver, Savannah, Charleston, New Orleans, Annapolis, Colonial Williamsburg, Georgetown, San Francisco and countless others benefit greatly from the far reaching aspects of the preservation efforts within the city.

In general, the major role of the city in historic preservation is to aid and promote the involvement of the entire population in a sense of pride and an interest in preserving the tangible elements of the heritage of the city and its people.

IV. EVALUATION CRITERIA

In a pioneering ordinance adopted by the City Council of the City of Dallas, Chapter 19A, Historic Landmark Preservation, the basic criteria to be used in determining historic landmarks are clearly set forth. The framers of this ordinance very wisely established a broad spectrum of qualifications for the designation of historic landmarks. These qualifications will provide those responsible for making the designations the opportunity to exercise their discretion in choosing, from the widest possible range of items, those landmarks which will preserve and enhance the physical and cultural environment of Dallas.

The criteria established in the ordinance (19A-4) include cultural, historical, architectural, aesthetic and social values. In developing a method of evaluation the ordinance has been expanded with examples of each of the criteria so that the Committee will have clear and adequate guidelines for making the final designations for each landmark.

Along with the criteria guidelines, the Committee should also be concerned with the immediate or surrounding

environment as to its possible inclusion as landmark designated property in order to protect the integrity of the landmark from future developments or deterioration.

Section 19A-4.(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.

The value of a site or structure as tangible evidence of a growth and character determinant of the city, area, state or nation need not be the foundation or development of a new concept in a discipline such as religion, politics, education, social science, etc. but may be merely the continuation of an established cultural pattern within these same disciplines. Fair Park exemplifies a site intimately related to the cultural development of Dallas and Texas.

Section 19A-4.(b) Location as the site of a significant historic event.

The site of a historic event should be considered for landmark status if the event can clearly be shown to be significant in establishing political or social concepts, furthering scientific discovery, or related to events which broadly influenced the history of the city,

state or nation. The Dallas County Courthouse Square as the political seat of the area, as well as being the site of the earliest buildings in the city, serves as an example of this criteria.

Section 19A-4.(c) Identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City.

The identification of a site with a person who significantly contributed to the cultural development of the city could include birthplaces, residences, places of work (such as laboratory, studio, pulpit, office, etc.), and the site of burial of that individual.

Section 19A-4.(d) Exemplification of the cultural, economic, social, or historical heritage of the City.

Certain structures or sites, although not architecturally significant, may have contributed to the heritage of the city through their cultural, social, economic or historical role. These may have been religious institutions, business establishments or recreational facilities, which would include the warehouse district, the financial area or the Cotton Bowl and the Fiesta Theater, to name a few.

Section 19A-4.(e) Portrayal of the environment of a group of people in an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style.

A site which reveals the life style of a particular group of people may be singled out for landmark status or may be part of an entire area which exemplifies this life style. These structures need not be architecturally significant, but should be integral to the overall physical appearance of the whole, each contributing to the next to portray the character of such a neighborhood or community. Swiss Avenue, and its physical layout and development, is an excellent example of this criteria.

Section 19A-4.(f) Embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen.

Consideration for landmark status should be given to structures which exhibit architectural expression of an acceptable building style or technique characteristic of a period. Although these may not be considered beautiful by contemporary standards, they may represent an era in either cultural history or architectural history. These could range from the early structures (log cabins, dugouts, etc.) to the fashionable style of a recognized architectural period as exemplified by Trinity Church, one

of Dallas' first expressions of the Chicago School of architecture.

Section 19A-4.(g) Identification as the work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has influenced the development of the City.

Although the work of any architect or builder influences the development of a city, certain of these may be shown to have influenced building trends or to be architecturally significant. The works of nationally recognized masters in the field would certainly contribute to the architectural quality of the city as do the works of local architects or builders who have received recognition through awards or publications. The works of master architects F. L. Wright and Philip Johnson as well as the firm of Lang and Witchell would be included under this criteria requirement.

Section 19A-4.(h) Embodiment of elements of architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship which represent a significant architectural innovation.

In selecting architectural works for landmark designation, the various outstanding qualities which make the structure significant should be considered. Those works would primarily employ excellence in the design

process, including scale, proportion, fabric, texture, sensitive use of materials, imaginative form, spatial concepts, careful detailing and excellence of craftsmanship. These qualities should be reviewed in an attitude of understanding of the time of construction or implementation of the design. One example employing many of these qualities is the Kalita Humphreys Theater.

Section 19A-4.(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.

Certain areas may be identified not because of their cultural relationship but because of their contribution to an architectural quality expressed in an area. Each structure may not individually be architecturally outstanding but in a group becomes an integral part of an architectural statement. Such areas would include Fair Park, the warehouse district or Swiss Avenue.

Section 19A-4.(j) Unique location of singular physical characteristics representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community or the City.

Certain sites may be considered for landmark status when they merely represent a visual compliment to

the city. Natural features which have become identified with an area, as well as developed parks, open spaces, streets, etc. may be determined to be of value for preservation. Such examples in Dallas include Turtle Creek banks and parkway, as well as other parks and open spaces throughout the city.

Section 19A-4.(k) Archeological value in that it has produced or can be expected to produce data affecting theories of historic or prehistoric interest.

Any site known to have yielded or to be likely to yield archeological information should be included as a landmark. The sites of early settlements, such as La Réunion and the early Swiss settlement, are examples in that they were sites of occupation prior to the great growth of the city.

Section 19A-4.(l) Value as an aspect of community sentiment or public pride.

Any significant project which benefits the public and expresses the attitude of the city through public sentiment or public pride should be eligible for landmark status. Sentiment or pride evidenced in such projects need not necessarily be a city project but could be the effort of an individual or group. The public expression

of sentiment in the erection of the JFK memorial, the Robert E. Lee equestrian sculpture or the reerection of the Junius St. columns would meet this qualification for consideration.

In addition to the ordinance criteria, it will be necessary to assist in the preservation of the structure or its surroundings by making value judgments not just for landmark designation but also for proposed work affecting the site.

Because in Dallas there is a noted absence of historic continuity which is singularly expressive of the city's past, value judgments which protect historic sites must be made on individual landmarks or areas designated as landmark districts. A relationship of one building to another is established just by proximity. The relationship can be evaluated through a careful analysis of the factors which establish the overall effect of the compatibility of one building to another, both historically and architecturally. The landmark which is isolated from other buildings of its same era still possesses a relationship to its surrounds and the quality of that relationship beyond the historic aspect will encourage the related use and general architectural character of its neighboring buildings

including color, detail, texture, rhythm, scale, proportion, height, weight and directional expression. While these factors are present in some form in any adjacent structure, they will also be introduced in some form on any new structure proposed in proximity to the historic landmark, and the continuity of the area of the landmark may be threatened. It therefore becomes necessary that a certificate of appropriateness is desirable not only for work to be executed on the landmark itself but also for proposed work adjacent to the landmark. Although the ordinance does not require review by the Committee of building permit applications for structures adjacent to landmarks, it would be advisable that such review be required by the building official and that the ordinance be amended to include such a review. Work to be performed within districts designated as historic landmarks will automatically receive review by the Committee for issuance or denial of a certificate of appropriateness.

Unlike cities such as Savannah, Charleston, Annapolis, New Orleans and countless others which can be readily identified by a historic and stylistic unity, Dallas possesses a wide diversity of identifying characteristics. Therefore the careful investigation of the

determinant architectural factors which qualify a building for landmark status must be analyzed for each individual landmark.

1. THE CONSIDERATION OF COLORS AND TEXTURE

The compatibility of one building to another is greatly influenced by color and texture of the adjacent structure. Certain colors and textures of building materials may relate the structures to each other and a specific period. While certain areas may be predominately of material of similar texture and colors, such as shingle siding or brick or wood siding, the introduction of a foreign material could interrupt the continuity of the character which this factor establishes. Such an area in Dallas is the predominately red brick construction of the warehouse district. Materials for new structures in such an area should be sympathetic to the identifying continuity factor.

2. THE CONSIDERATION OF HEIGHT STANDARDS

In a similar manner a fairly uniform height pattern may be an identifying characteristic of a style

and an intrusion of that height standard could adversely affect the landmark. This should not be interpreted as suggesting prohibition of adjacent structures extending above a typical and established height, but should alert the Landmark Commission that the established height is violated and that a structure of a different height demands special consideration.

3. THE CONSIDERATION OF SCALE AND PROPORTION

Isolated landmarks as well as historic districts have a quality recognizable in relationship to the observer which establishes the scale and proportion of the building. These may be expressed in the overall building mass or by the individual units of the structure such as door and window openings or building materials. It can readily be seen that alteration or removal of these identifying elements would damage the integrity of the landmark itself, and similarly that the introduction of new elements of differing scale or proportion could cause equal damage to the landmark.

4. THE CONSIDERATION OF ARCHITECTURAL
DETAILING, DIRECTIONAL EXPRESSION
AND MASSING

Certain structures and even whole neighborhoods or districts often possess characteristics which identify them as unique architectural types. This uniqueness of architectural character is developed primarily through the detailing of the exterior of the structure and may be evident in roof lines, eaves and cornices, lintels and arches, masonry work, applied decorative elements, stylistic adaptations, etc. The Swiss Avenue District in Dallas is an example of this architectural characteristic. Buildings can also develop architectural character by means of the directional expression which the shape of the building suggests, either vertical, horizontal or nondirectional. Removal or alteration of any of these architectural factors which comprise the character of the building or neighborhood would result in the wrecking of the architectural significance of the structure. Where additions to landmark structures or areas are contemplated, the new work should complement these elements but need not necessarily, and probably should not, duplicate exactly the earlier work. The Landmark Committee should demand of a new design careful attention to the incorporation of similar

balance of facade proportion and rhythm of solids to voids as well as compatibility of detailing and directional expression and land use planning.

5. THE CONSIDERATION OF LANDSCAPING,
PARKING, PAVING AND GRAPHICS

Although not a direct architectural element of a structure, the landscaping, graphics and access to the structure do contribute or detract from the integrity of the landmark. Whenever possible the preservation of period landscaping design, plant material and garden scale should be encouraged. Where districts occur a continuity of the area should be consistent with the overall site appearance. Great open front lawns and private rear gardens such as those in the Swiss Avenue District are as much a part of the character of the area as are the structures themselves. The preservation of that sense of character should dictate the consideration of any request to the Committee to grant variance of the appearance of an individual site and thus the entire area.

Careful consideration of an alteration of traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, should also be directed toward the landmark property. The relocation of walkways,

driveways and parking areas can affect the appearance, not necessarily adversely however. The Committee should carefully consider requests to alter or to add these exterior site design elements, thus insuring against damage to the historic integrity of the landmark. Where parking on the site is to be expanded to accommodate more vehicles, the portion of the site to be lost for the expansion as well as the method for screening will require equally careful consideration. The introduction of screening devices, whether built fences or planting, should relate sensitively to the existing landscape elements and the architectural statement of the landmark. The preservation of the site in as near an original condition as possible should be encouraged with relaxation of that requirement only when the continued preservation of the site is endangered if variance is not permitted. Frequently, either because of available means for preservation or because of the area use change surrounding the landmark, it may be necessary to establish acceptable adaptive uses for structures or areas. Such is the case of the Warehouse District, where many of the structures no longer function as warehousing facilities. Adaptive uses for some areas will be more difficult than others and in many cases, permissive adaptive

uses could severely damage the historic and/or architectural integrity of the landmark. Besides parking and public access, perhaps the most damaging addition to a historic site can be the graphics. The Committee should maintain careful surveillance of all graphic material at historic sites in an attempt to hold it to a bare minimum and to keep it in the spirit of the landmark.

Because the number of historic districts will be comparatively small in the city of Dallas, being far outnumbered by isolated historic structures, there will be the constant threat of new construction adjacent to the historic site which may damage the integrity and even the use of the historic site. This growth and rebuilding is vital for the life of the city and certainly for the livelihood of the central business district; therefore, it must not be discouraged but must receive cooperation and assistance from the Committee to enhance the structures or areas which are deemed worthy of preservation because of their interpretive value in depicting the heritage of the city.

V. SOURCES FOR POSSIBLE FUNDING

Except during the federal programs following the depression of the twenties, there has never been adequate funding for historic preservation efforts. In Europe historic preservation is a major responsibility of government, whether the project is municipally or privately owned. However, there is great reluctance in the United States for government to participate in funding of private preservation efforts. Not until the Preservation Act of 1966 had Congress made a firm commitment to assist in restoration costs, and these matching funds, when available, are limited to structures listed on the National Register. Several states have adopted legislation and funding for assistance for private preservation projects, and fewer cities have assumed that responsibility at the municipal level. Unless the cost of rescuing a historic building is less than its marketable value, conservative businessmen are rarely interested in the preservation venture. Most local historical societies and special interest groups cannot undertake the financial burden. Therefore, philanthropy continues to be the greatest source for preservation funding either in the private or public sector.

Primarily because of inadequate funding, our local landmarks continue to succumb to the growth of the cities.

Funding from any of the aforementioned sources can be divided into two major categories, each capable of having included in its contract a multitude of intricate requirements and control stipulations.

1. LOANS

Whether from a private lending agency, federal assistance program or private source, the principle of a loan is the advancement of cash and a scheduled pay back. Many local preservation organizations have placed money in a revolving fund which is constantly being replenished by payments from the borrower. While the revolving fund has been extremely successful by nonprofit organizations, its use by municipalities appears to have several drawbacks which are discussed under the section on the roll of the city.

Lending agencies have historically not acted favorably to loans for the restoration of a structure. Their major loan efforts are usually directed toward new development rather than redevelopment, and since restoration costs of a structure often exceed the immediate

marketable value, such projects have not received favorable support. A historic structure renovation loan, secured not by the value of the property itself, but by pledges of the underwriters of the project, was recently granted by an Austin, Texas lending agency. Under such a loan the ability of the underwriters to cover any default of payment was the ingenious and rather devious involvement of a lending agency in historic preservation. More often than not, bank loans for preservation projects are based on the owners ability to recover a loss rather than on a predicted market value of the completed project. The economic value of preservation is discussed under the roll of the city.

2. GRANTS

A grant for a project, generally referred to as a grant-in-aid, may also be made by either governmental or private organizations, but it differs from a loan in that a grant is not a repayable type of assistance. A grant is in effect a gift of a sum of money and may have any number of contractual contingencies as the grantor may wish to attach. Quite often a grantor may require that the recipient contribute a proportionate share of the

total project cost. This practice is commonly referred to as a matching grant-in-aid, and may allow the recipient to include assessed value, donated personal services and other contributions as sources of the matching amount. Federal agencies offering grant assistance carefully stipulate that no other federal funds may be used to match a federal grant.

Grants will eventually deplete their source unless it is added to through appropriation, philanthropy or accrued interest on capital. Therefore, the small private organization usually perpetuates its funds through a revolving fund procedure, limiting its grants to other than restoration projects.

3. FEDERAL FUNDING

At the present time any federal funding is limited to properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places, regardless from which agency such expenditures may be made for historic preservation. The agency principally involved in historic preservation is the Department of the Interior, especially through the National Park Service, which has carried the image of federal concern with preservation since its establishment.

in 1916. Other agencies with preservation programs are the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Some Department of Commerce grants have been used for preservation purposes. The historic preservation programs under each of these agencies vary greatly from time to time.

The most constant funding agency is the Department of the Interior, National Parks Service, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation. Grants-in-aid through that agency are for up to 50 percent of the project cost. These funds are made available to the states and in Texas administered by the Texas Historical Commission. Funding through OAHP differs from HUD funding in that a private property can receive assistance provided it is listed on the National Register.

Several areas under the control of the Department of Housing and Urban Development provide funding for historic preservation projects; however, these funds are available only for municipally owned properties. In the past funding for historic preservation has been available through the divisions of Urban Renewal, Model Neighborhoods, Model Cities, Open Space, etc.; however, only projects with prior commitments are being funded at this time with no projected date for renewal of any of the programs.

The National Endowment for the Arts has funded two programs related to historic preservation, the City Edges and the City Options Programs, but these were primarily demonstration projects and not actual restoration endeavors.

4. STATE FUNDING

All state appropriated funds related to historic preservation can only be used for state owned property or to purchase for state ownership. State owned historic sites are administered by the Parks and Wildlife Department Historic Sites Branch except for a few isolated instances where the property is under the charge of another state agency, such as the Texas Historical Commission, a state university or college or historic property at the site of a state agency operation.

The Texas Historical Commission is the state liaison agency for the administration of the Preservation Act of 1966, which does annually apportion to the states funds for historic preservation projects on a matching basis. Applications for this funding must be made through that state agency, and these funds have been gravely inadequate to meet the needs of the preservation efforts in either the public or private sector.

5. PRIVATE FUNDING

The greatest portion of money being put into historic preservation projects continues to flow from the private sector, either through special interest organizations, private individuals, or foundations. As mentioned earlier, local historical societies or organizations may have a revolving fund for assistance to historic preservation projects; however, these funds are usually limited and therefore do not participate outside of the local boundaries of the organization. There are many foundations throughout the state which have very broad bases for grant or loan considerations. The best source for these foundations is the current publication, The Foundation Directory, 3rd edition; Marianna O. Lewis, editor; The Foundation Library Center; Russel Sage Foundation, publisher; New York, N.Y.; 1967. Another source directed only to in-state foundations is Foundation Philanthropy in Texas by James Howard, The Institute of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin. One of the most outstanding foundations in Texas in the field of historic preservation has been the Moody Foundation. Current information regarding foundations with historic preservation interests can be obtained from the Texas Historical Commission at Austin.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX 1

Preservation News, Revolving Fund Makes First Sale.
Vol. XIV, no. 2, February, 1974

The Lafayette Square Restoration Committee of St. Louis recently received a \$25,000 loan from the National Trust's National Historic Preservation Fund for the committee's initial purchase and restoration of a 100 year old house. The loan was put into a revolving fund from which the committee can draw for the purchase and renovation of historic properties. The borrowed money is then replaced through the resale of the improved houses. Local credibility of the restoration committee has steadily increased since the National Trust's participation, resulting in a St. Louis bank granting the committee a \$25,000 loan to augment the funds from the Trust.

The restoration committee is interested mainly in purchasing the houses and repairing their exteriors, but a partnership venture is being worked on with a local redeveloper who will use his own funds to refurbish the interiors.

Preservation News, Interior Grants Total Record \$10.5 Million. Vol. XIV, no. 1, January, 1974.

The U.S. Department of the Interior announced a record-breaking \$10.5 million in historic preservation matching grants in November. The funds support preservation work in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam and the National Trust. Last year's grants were nearly \$6.7 million; the increase of approximately 57 percent in the funds, which are appropriated by Congress, represents an increased awareness of preservation and of the needs for the upcoming Bicentennial. Each grantee's allocation will be awarded as a single grant, until now, the money has been awarded on a project, rather than a program basis. The historic preservation grants are administered for the Interior Department by the National Park Service, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation. The monies assist in the preparation of historic surveys and plans as well as actual brick and mortar preservation projects.

Preservation News, Endowment Offers City Grants. Vol. XIII, no. 11, November, 1973.

The National Endowment for the Arts has announced a second grant program in its series on urban design and planning. City Options grants will concentrate on those special settings within a city that make it unique. In the City Edges program that was announced in the spring of 1972, the National Trust was one of 37 groups to receive a grant. The grant of \$32,000 will be used to fund a study that will make a definitive analysis of a representative sample of historic districts throughout the country.

The City Edges program grant to the National Trust is one of 12 awards made to projects related to historic preservation. Funds allotted under the program for preservation projects total \$402,309. Recipients of the City Options grants will be selected next spring. Interested applicants should write directly to City Options, Architecture plus Environmental Arts, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C. 20506.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON REVENUE SHARING
Preservation News, Seattle to Use Revenue Sharing for \$600,000 Reservation Fund. Vol. XIII, no. 5, May, 1973.

The City Council and Mayor Wes Ehlman have authorized \$600,000 for the establishment of a historic preservation revolving fund; also \$4.5 million is to be allotted for a housing rehabilitation trust fund. It is anticipated that the City of Seattle will establish an office to distribute the revenue sharing funds to the two historic districts within Seattle and to the city as a whole. Furthermore, the city is helping to create two new public corporations for the Pioneer Square historic district and the Pike Place Market; these corporations will be able to obtain money from the revolving fund which they will either use to make loans or buy, restore and sell buildings. There is also the possibility that some of the \$600,000 can be used to buy income-producing property in order to replenish the revolving fund. Legal advantages of the corporation include: exemption from real and

personal property taxes; corporation income is nontaxable for federal income tax purposes; gifts to the corporation are tax exempt; and interest on the bonds issued by the corporation are exempt from taxes as a municipal obligation.

NATIONAL REVENUE SHARING

Preservation News, Implications of Revenue Sharing, by James Biddle. Vol. XIII, no. 5, May, 1973.

". . . whether revenue sharing will be beneficial or detrimental to historic preservation is still unknown. Revenue sharing was conceived as a method to put fiscal resources and responsibility for their distribution at a level of government more directly responsible to the people, allowing a community to deal with its individual problems. Funds come from federal income tax returns and are distributed quarterly."

". . . revenue sharing procedures are causing grave concern among preservationists. The new HUD legislation does not specifically make projects subject to the criteria and the review procedures under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 or the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Thus, state and local governments are not required to consider the effects of their projects on National Register properties . . ."

". . . legislation does not bind recipients of funds to provisions of NEPA, which requires a detailed statement of the environmental impact of proposed federal actions, including discussion of adverse effects and of alternatives.

The problem is the definition of "federal action"--whether projects carried out with monies returned by the federal government will be considered federal and thus under the restrictions of these acts."

". . . it is important that we educate ourselves to the benefits and shortcomings of the legislation and help develop educational materials to explain how revenue sharing can protect and enhance cultural properties. It is vitally important that state and local officials be encouraged by preservationists to cooperate in implementing environmental legislation.

NATIONAL REVENUE SHARING

Preservation News, HUD Revenue Sharing Leaves Many Questions. Vol. XIII, no. 5, May, 1973.

Opposition is developing to the Better Communities Act, which uses revenue sharing funds, designed to replace the HUD grant programs such as urban renewal, open space and historic preservation loans. Lack of preservation and environmental safeguards is the reason for this opposition. If the bill does not include preservation and environmental safeguards, the matter will have to be decided in the courts which could take years.

NATIONAL TRUST'S NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND AWARDS

Preservation News, Preservation Fund Makes Loans, Grants. Vol. XIII, no. 5, May, 1973.

\$140,000 from the National Trust's National Historic Preservation Fund was awarded to five groups in different parts of the country. The Heritage Hill Foundation in Grand Rapids, Michigan and the Historic Fredericksburg Foundation in Fredericksburg, Virginia both received a \$25,000 loan to aid in the establishment of a local revolving fund. In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation received a loan of \$85,000 to be used in the acquisition of the Old Allegheny Post Office. Grants ranging from \$1,350 to \$2,210 were received respectively by the Greater Portland Landmarks of Portland, Maryland and the Utah Heritage Foundation in Salt Lake City to facilitate the refinement of local or statewide revolving funds.

"The National Historic Preservation Fund was established by the National Trust in 1971. The fund's principal purpose is the encouragement and assistance of private efforts at preservation by acquisition of buildings through the establishment of revolving funds."

The National Trust offers to its nonprofit member organizations matching grants, matching and nonmatching loans and guarantees.

NATIONAL NATIONAL TRUST GRANTS
Preservation News, Interior Announces Grants. Vol. XII,
no. 11, November, 1972.

The U.S. Department of the Interior has awarded nearly \$6.7 million in historic preservation grants to the National Trust, 47 states, the District of Columbia and American Samoa. The fiscal 1973 matching grants represent a 33 percent increase over last year's allocations. The National Trust's apportionment of \$1,313,375 will be used for technical assistance and educational programs, capital development at the National Trust's 12 historic properties, maintenance and administration of the properties and acquisition of new properties.

The grants are made by the Interior Department under the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and are administered by the department's Office of the National Register of Historic Places. The money is to be matched by the recipients and will be used for surveys, planning, acquisition and actual restorations of historic properties. The grants are based on the needs of each state as submitted each year by the State Liason Officer in the required State Historic Preservation Plan.

NEW YORK NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL ON THE ARTS GRANTS
Preservation News, New York Council Makes Arts Grants.
Vol. XII, no. 9, September, 1972.

Seventeen preservation-related groups will receive more than \$175,000 in grants from the New York State Council on the Arts. The Queens Historical Society received \$8,000 for an architectural survey; the Rensselaerville Historical Society received \$700 for a feasibility study of restoration of the town's Grist Mill; the Essex Community Heritage Organization received \$3,516 for two fellowships for architectural students to develop a title search and recording system for Essex and for hiring an architect to give advice on restoration problems and for recopying and filing 19th century photographs and glass plate negatives; and the New York State Historical Association at Cooperstown received \$20,000 for graduate fellowships.

NATIONAL MATCHING GRANTS

Preservation News, Matching Grants-Making Federal Money Grow. Vol. XII, no. 5, May, 1972.

The National Trust urged that the Park Service's request of \$10 million for "Preservation of Historic Properties" be granted. Over \$6 million of this is for matching grants to the states and the National Trust. Of this amount the National Trust has requested \$2,250,000 for the following programs:

- (1) Technical assistance and educational programs;
- (2) Acquisition and development of Trust properties;
- (3) Maintenance and administration of Trust properties;
- (4) Emergency financial assistance for the preservation of nontrust properties.

Other National Park Service programs which would be funded in this budget request include: (1) Maintenance of the National Register of Historic Places and administration of the grant-in-aid program; (2) Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; (3) Historic Sites Survey; (4) Historic American Buildings Survey; (5) Historic American Engineering Record; (6) Archaeological investigations and salvage program.

NATIONAL NATIONAL TRUST CONSULTANT SERVICE GRANTS

Preservation News, Trust Awards 17 Grants for Consultant Services. Vol. XII, no. 3, March, 1972.

Grants totaling \$10,400 matched by the recipient organizations for professional consultant services, only, rather than for actual restoration projects. Assistance in two major court cases helped defray the costs of litigation. In addition to the financial support, the National Trust has provided advisory services and submitted an amicus curiae brief in one of the cases. Recipient organizations include: Kodiak Historical Society, Kodiak, Alaska; Owyhee County Historical Society, Murphy, Idaho; Midwest Old Settlers and Threshers Association, Inc., Mount Pleasant, Iowa; Historic District Commission, Annapolis, Maryland; Society for the preservation of New England Antiquities, Boston, Mass.; Friends of Jefferson College, Inc., Washington, Miss.; St. Joseph Historical Society, Inc., St. Joseph, Missouri; Canaan Historic Commission, Canaan, New Hampshire; Hudson Valley Philharmonic

Society, Inc., Poughkeepsie, New York; Landmark Society of Western New York, Rochester, New York; Rensselaer County Historical Society, Troy, New York; City of John Day, Oregon; Greenville County Historical Preservation Commission, Greenville, South Carolina; Newberry County Community Hall Commission, Newberry, S.C.; Association for the Preservation of Tennessee Antiquities, Memphis, Tenn.; Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Memphis, Tenn.; Green Springs Association, Gordonsville, Va.

NATIONAL INTERIOR GRANTS

Preservation News, Interior Grants Total \$5 Million.

Over \$5 million in grants-in-aid for historic preservation have been awarded by the U.S. Department of the Interior to the National Trust, 45 states and the District of Columbia. The money will be used for surveys and planning and for the actual costs of acquiring and developing historic properties.

APPENDIX 2

Sources of Survey Information

National Trust for Historic Preservation
784 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Texas State Historical Survey Commission
P.O. Box 12276
Austin, Texas 78711

Historic American Building Survey
Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
801 19th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Office of the Texas State Archaeologist
111 East 19th Street
Austin, Texas 78705

Texas State Department of Parks and Wildlife
Executive Director
John H. Reagan Building
Austin, Texas 78701

Texas Society of Architects
Perry-Brooks Building
Austin, Texas 78701

American Institute of Architects
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

American Society of Planning Officials
1313 East Sixtieth Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

American Institute of Planners
917 15th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Institute of Texan Cultures
The University of Texas System
Hemisfair Grounds
San Antonio, Texas

Texas State Historical Association
Sid Richardson Hall 2-306
University Station
Austin, Texas 78712

Directory of Texas Museums
Texas State Historical Survey Committee and
Humble Oil and Refining Company
Public Relations Department
Houston, Texas 77001

Texas Commission on the Arts and Humanities
Goodman Building
Austin, Texas 78711

APPENDIX 3

A List of Public and Private Agencies
Active in Historic Preservation

Texas State Historical Survey Commission
Box 12276 Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Texas Historical Foundation
Fred H. Moore, President
Robert L. Watson, Executive Director
Box 12243, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
J. R. Singleton, Executive Director
Reagan Building
Austin, Texas 78711

Texas Conservation Foundation
Glen Biggs, Chairman
First National Bank
San Antonio, Texas 78205

State Antiquities Committee
Dr. Fred Wendorf, Chairman
Southern Methodist University, Box 122
Dallas, Texas 75222

Texas Archeological Society
Dr. Dee Ann Story
Texas Archeological Research Laboratory
Balcones Research Center, Route 4, Box 189
Austin, Texas 78756

Texas State Historical Association
Box 8059
University Station
Austin, Texas 78712

Dallas Historical Society
Hall of State, Fair Park
Dallas, Texas 75226

Railroad Historical Society of the Southwest
211 North Ervay Building
Dallas, Texas 75201

The Texas Society of Architects
Perry-Brooks Building
Austin, Texas 78701

Texas Landscape Association, Inc.
3005 Silverleaf
Austin, Texas 78757

Texas Architectural Foundation
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

APPENDIX 4

Revolving Funds

"Broadly defined for Preservation groups, a Revolving Fund is, in cash or other equities, a line of credit or any combination of these owned and administered by a nonprofit organization for the express purpose of purchasing and restoring architecturally significant structures. It can also be cash lent by a nonprofit organization to individuals or organizations for the same purpose. All proceeds from rentals, sales, interest and dividends must be returned to the fund in order to replenish it. Thus the fund revolves. Generally, such funds are used in specific (local) areas and districts." Benefits:

(1) It focuses an organization's attention and resources on specific project designations of maximum importance in achieving broad preservation goals.

(2) It attracts donors who see their money at work immediately and continually. Donations seem perpetual and are easier to resolicit for fund expansion. Donations are, of course, tax deductible.

(3) It can act as a substitute endowment to which administration costs and overhead can be charged.

(4) It focuses preservation activity upon the maintenance of older buildings for continuous use in the active community.

(5) The quickest way for an organization to gain political stature is to contribute to real estate by buying and restoring, selling and renting property. A fund offers a quick device for an organization to attain this stature.

Five Revolving Fund Types

(1) A fund is used to purchase, restore the facade alone and then sell the property. The view of the preserved facade interests private buyers and the general public who are often eager to apply their imagination to the building's interior. This type is roughly that used currently by the Historic Charleston (S.C.) Foundation.

(2) The fund purchases, promotes and publicizes (both through its own organization and through selected real estate firms) and then sells the property to private individuals with a Deed Covenant to insure preservation and/or restoration, to well defined degrees. This method has proved of great success for the Historic Savannah Foundation.

(3) The fund is used to buy, restore or renew both inside and out (depending on the structure). The

property is then rented rather than sold, because the property cannot be sold at this time for what has been invested and because renting is a means of fund income. The Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation has developed this fund type for use mostly in inner-city areas. The Foundation "makes a commitment to the people who live in the areas where it acquires property and tries to develop residences for all income levels within the same neighborhood."

(4) A fund is not used to buy, restore or sell, but to lend. The foundation aids in getting Rehabilitation Loans for individuals and owners and has its own experts who examine properties and make renewal cost estimates. If the owner or individual cannot obtain a bank loan for some reason (too old, too many obligations, etc.), the foundation fund makes the loan. This fund example is that in use by the Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc., in Pittsburgh, a nonprofit group established by the American Institute of Architects, the Homebuilders Association of Western Pennsylvania, the local Chamber of Commerce, the North Side Civic Development Council, the Pittsburgh Landmarks Foundation and assorted local banks.

(5) The Development Revolving Fund, a civic group (nonprofit), interests a local contractor in

rehabilitating an area and then lends him the money which a bank, in most cases, will not do. The contractor who pays the usual interest rate for his loan gets a lucrative project which it would not otherwise have and the foundation achieves rehabilitation. This fund device is used by the Action Housing Development Fund, also in Pittsburgh. This group is not interested in historic districts or in architecture per se, but rather in creating good housing. Unlike preservation groups, the Action Fund "thinks big" in developing large, multiblock areas of rehabilitated housing. This fund must therefore be large, and indeed runs well over one million dollars. However, the Development Fund gets its money partly from foundation grants and also by borrowing. "Action Housing relies on corporations to allocate money on call. Suppose the fund needs \$50,000; Westinghouse, for one, has allocated to the fund, say, \$200,000, which it keeps in house until called for. Action Housing borrows a share of the \$50,000 from Westinghouse at 4 percent a year and lends it at 8 percent (to the contractor). The difference pays the total operating costs of the fund." There is no reason why this fund type could not also serve preservation whereby a group could interest a contractor in restoring, preserving or rehabilitating

(or all three in mixed degrees) a 12-block area in a city or town and lend him the money from a varied revolving fund.

From pp. 61-63 of Progressive Preservation

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR BACKGROUND AND INFORMATION
FOR THE COMMITTEE AND THE PUBLIC

- Alexander, Drury B. Texas Homes of the 19th Century. Austin, Texas. The University of Texas Press, 1966.
- The A.I.A., Dallas Chapter. The Prairie's Yield: Forces Shaping Dallas Architecture from 1840 to 1962. New York. Reinhold Publishing Corp., 1962.
- Bacon, Edmund N. Design of Cities. New York. Viking Press, 1967.
- Crosby, Theo. The Necessary Monument, Its Future in the Civilized City. Greenwich, Conn. New York Graphic Society, 1970.
- Dealy, Ted. Diaper Days of Dallas. Nashville, Tenn. Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Fleming, John; Honour, Hugh; and Pevsner, Nikolaus. The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture. Baltimore, Md. Penguin Books, 1966.
- Greene, A. C. Dallas, The Deciding Years--A Historical Portrait. Austin, Texas. The Encino Press, 1973.
- Historical Preservation. The National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. Washington, D.C.
- Hosmer, Charles B., Jr. Presence of the Past. New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965.
- Huxtable, Ada Louise. Will They Ever Finish Bruckner Boulevard? London. The Macmillan Co., 1970.
- Jacobs, Jane. The Life and Death of American Cities. New York. Random House, 1961.

Preservation News. The National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. Washington, D.C.

Rains, Albert, and Henderson, Laurence G. With Heritage So Rich. New York. Random House, 1966.

Rasmussen, Steen Eiler. Experiencing Architecture. New York. Technology Press of MIT and John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.

Walker, Stanley. The Dallas Story. Dallas Times Herald, 1956.

Whiffen, Marcus. American Architecture since 1780: Guide to the Styles. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press, 1969.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Album of Beautiful Colored Views of Dallas, Texas. Printed in Germany for the Metropolitan Book Co., Dallas, Texas. n.d.
- Alexander, Drury B. Texas Homes of the 19th Century. Austin, Texas. The University of Texas Press, 1966.
- American Illustrating Co. Greater Dallas Illustrated, 1908.
- A.I.A., Dallas Chapter. The Prairie's Yield: Forces Shaping Dallas Architecture from 1840 to 1962. New York. Reinhold Publishing Corp., 1962.
- Art Work of Dallas. 12 Volumes. Chicago Gravure Ill. Co., 1910.
- Bacon, Edmund N. Design of Cities. New York. Viking Press, 1967.
- Bard, Albert S. "Aesthetics and the Police Power." The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 15, no. 3 (1956).
- Brown, John Henry. History of Dallas County, Texas from 1837 to 1887. Dallas, Texas. Milligan, Cornett, and Farnham, printers, 1887.
- Brown, Theodore M. "The Importance and Use of Surveys." Historic Preservation 15, no. 4 (1963).
- Bullock, Orin M., Jr. The Restoration Manual. Norwalk, Conn., 1966.
- Carroll, Margaret. Historic Preservation through Urban Renewal. Washington, D.C. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Urban Renewal Administration, January, 1963.

- Chicago, Ill. Historic American Buildings Survey, Chicago and Nearby Illinois Areas. J. William Rudd, Compiler. Park Forest, Ill., 1966.
- Clark, Robert Lanier. Times Have Changed: A Discussion of Municipal Politics and Elections in the City of Dallas. Dallas, Texas, 1959.
- Cochran, John H. Dallas County, A Record of Its Pioneers and Progress, Being a Supplement to John Henry Brown's History of Dallas County. Dallas, Texas. A. S. Mathis Service Publishing Co., c. 1928.
- Cockrell, Monroe Fulkerson. Alexander Cockrell I. Home at Southeast Corner of Commerce and Broadway, Dallas, Texas: Earlier Site of the Bryan Double Cabin. Evanston, Ill., (?) 1948.
- Codman, John. "Law for the Preservation of a Historic District." Historic Preservation 14, no. 2 (1962).
- _____. "A Law for the Preservation of an Historic District." Planning 1964. Chicago, Ill. American Society of Planning Officials, 1964.
- _____. "Preservation of Historic Districts by Architectural Control." Chicago, Ill. American Society of Planning Officials, 1956.
- Costonis, John J. Space Adrift: Landmark Preservation and the Marketplace. Urbana, Ill. University of Illinois Press, 1974.
- Crosby, Theo. The Necessary Monument, Its Future in the Civilized City. Greenwich, Conn. New York Graphic Society, 1970.
- Curtis, John O. "Moving Historic Buildings." Journal of the American Institute of Architects 43 (March 1965).
- "Dallas a City of Art and Commerce." The Western Architect 20, no. 7 (July 1914).

- Dallas Advertising League. The World of Advertising in Dallas, 1968.
- Dallas Automobile Club. Official Redbook and Guide, 1913.
- Dallas City Directory 1912-13. Dallas, Texas. Worley, 1912.
- Dallas Democrat. Illustrated Annual, 1902.
- Dealey, Ted. Diaper Days of Dallas. Nashville, Tenn. Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Dictionary of Architectural Abbreviations. New York. Odyssey, 1965.
- Dorsey, Views of Dallas, 1910-1914. n.p., n.d.
- Doxiadis, C. A. Urban Renewal and the Future of the American City. Public Administration Service. Chicago, Ill., 1966.
- Federated Womens Club. History of Dallas. Vols. 1-3, 1898-1956.
- Feiss, Carl. "Criteria for Historic District Selection." Historic Preservation 14, no. 2 (1962).
- _____. "Historic Town Keeping." Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 15, no. 4 (1956).
- _____. "Preservation of Historic Areas in the United States." Historic Preservation 16, no. 4 (1964).
- Fleming, John; Honour, Hugh; and Pevsner, Nikolaus. The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture. Baltimore, Md. Penguin Books, 1966.
- Fornell, Earl W. The Galveston Era. Austin, Texas. The University of Texas Printing Division, 1961.
- Gowans, Allan. Images of American Living: Four Centuries of Architecture and Furniture as Cultural Expression. Philadelphia, Penn. J. B. Lippincott Company, 1964. A comprehensive view of American architecture, up to the present with careful attention to non-English areas.

- Graduate Research Center of the Southwest. Goals for Dallas, 1966.
- Graham, Roy E., and Jones, Ben E., III. Progressive Preservation: A Guide to the Understanding and Implementation of the Preservation of Historical Architecture in Texas. Austin, Texas. The University of Texas at Austin, 1972.
- Grants for Historic Preservation: Information for Applicants. HUD Guide, MPD 6250. IA. Washington, D.C., August, 1970.
- Greene, A. C. Dallas, The Deciding Years--A Historical Portrait. Austin, Texas. The Encino Press, 1973.
- Historic Preservation. The National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. Washington, D.C.
- Historic Savannah. Savannah, Ga., 1968. 247 pp., illus., plans. Available from Historic Savannah Foundation, Box 1771, Savannah, Ga. 31402. \$17.50. Publication of an extensive survey of Savannah's historic district including a HABS catalogue for the city.
- Hosmer, Charles B., Jr. Presence of the Past. New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965.
- Hunter, Martha L. Dallas Women's Forum, History 1906-1931. n.d.
- Huxtable, Ada Louise. Will They Ever Finish Bruckner Boulevard? London. The Macmillan Co., 1970.
- Interurban Guide Co. The Interurban Guide of Dallas. Dallas, Texas, 1913.
- Jacobs, Ginger C. "Dallas Jewish Population," 1954. Unpublished.
- Jacobs, Jane. The Life and Death of American Cities. New York. Random House, 1961.

Johnson, T. F.; Morris, J. R.; and Butts, J. G. Renewing America's Cities. Washington, D. C. The Institute of Social Science Research, 1962.

Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians. Vol. 1, 1941 to date. Society of Architectural Historians, 1700 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 19103. All copies, either in the original or a reprint edition, are available.

"Keep Your Town's Historic Landmarks." Changing Times: The Kiplinger Magazine 19 (September 1965).

Kerr, Robert J., Jr. "Historic Preservation--A Pragmatic Approach." Journal of the American Institute of Architects 41 (April 1964).

Kessler, George E. A City Plan for Dallas. Report of the Parks Board, 1916 (?).

Keyes, Langley C., Jr. The Rehabilitation Planning Game: A Study in the Diversity of Neighborhoods. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press, 1969.

Kimball, Justin Ford. Our City Dallas: A Community Civics. Kessler Plan Association of Dallas, 1927.

Langston, Frank. Dallas, Log Cabin to Metropolis: A Narrative History with Pictures of Dallas' First 125 Years. Dallas, Texas 1967.

Leslie, Warren. Dallas, Public and Private: Aspects of an American City. New York. Grossman Publishers, 1964.

Lever, Jill, and Harris, John. Illustrated Glossary of Architecture 850 to 1830. London. Faber and Faber, 1966. Very useful, for many of the terms defined are keyed to a photograph of the object.

Lewis, Marianna O., ed. Foundation Directory. New York. The Russel Sage Foundation, 1967.

Lindsley, Philip. A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity. Chicago, Ill. Lewis Publishing Co., 1909.

- Massey, J. C. The Architectural Survey. Preservation Leaflet. Washington, D.C. The National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- McKnight, Thembo Lee. Manufacturing in Dallas, a Study of Its Effects.
- Memorial and Biographical History of Dallas County, Texas. Lewis Publishing Co., 1892.
- Miner, Ralph W. Conservation of Historic and Cultural Resources. Chicago, Ill. American Society of Planning Officials, 1969.
- Morrison, Hugh. Early American Architecture, from the First Colonial Settlements to the National Period. New York. Oxford University Press, 1952. 619 pp., illus., maps, plans, bibliography. Perhaps the most useful single work on early American architecture.
- Morrison, Jacob H. Historic Preservation Law. New Orleans, La: Pelican Publishing Company, 1957. 2nd Edition, Washington, D.C. National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1965.
- Murtagh, William J. "New Twists in Financing Historic Preservation." Journal of the American Institute of Architects 45 (March 1966).
- Neighborhood Conservation and Property Rehabilitation, a bibliography. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department HUD.
- Preserving Historic America. Washington, D.C. Publication of Department HUD, June, 1966.
- Preservation News. Washington, D.C. The National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States.
- Rains, Albert, and Henderson, Laurence G. With Heritage So Rich. New York. Random House, 1966.
- Rasmussen, Steen Eiler. Experiencing Architecture. New York and Cambridge, Mass. Technology Press of MIT and John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.

- Robert, Owen Barney. The Romantic Story of Dallas, 1948.
- Rogers, John William. The Lusty Texans of Dallas. New York. Dutton, 1951.
- Santerre, George Henry. Dallas' First Hundred Years, 1856-1956. Dallas, Texas. Book Craft, 1956.
- Saylor, Henry H. Dictionary of Architecture. New York. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1952. Paper bound ed., 1963. 221 pp., illus., \$1.75. The use of an architectural dictionary is recommended in studying historic buildings; this excellent one is concise, up to date, and readily available.
- Schatzel, Susan A. "Public Historic Preservation in Texas." Texas Law Review 49, no. 2, January, 1971.
- Schweinitz, Dorothea de. "Historic Preservation without Federal Aid: Georgetown, D.C." Historic Preservation 16, no. 1 (1964).
- Scully, Michael. Dallas, Texas Centennial Exposition Center, 1936. Dallas, Texas. Turner Co., 1935.
- Standard Blue Book of Texas. Dallas, Texas. A. J. Peeler and Co., 1912.
- Stark, Ann. "A History of Dallas County." The University of Texas at Austin, Unpublished thesis, 1935.
- Story, Elver Scott. 88 Eventful Years. Dallas Civic Federation of Dallas, 1954.
- Thometz, Carol. The Decision Makers: The Power Structure of Dallas, SMU Press, 1963.
- Tunnard, Christopher, and Pushkarev, Boris. Man-made America: Chaos or Control? New Haven, Conn. Yale University Press, 1963.
- Von Eckardt, Wolf. A Place to Live: The Crisis in the Cities. New York. Delacorte Press, 1967.

Walker, Stanley. The Dallas Story. Dallas Times Herald, 1956.

Whiffen, Marcus. American Architecture since 1780: Guide to the Styles. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press, 1969.

Withey, Henry F.; FAIA; and Withey, Elsie R. Biographical Dictionary of American Architects (deceased). Los Angeles, Calif. New Age Publishing Co., 1956. 678 pp. This book contains brief biographies and lists major works of nearly 2000 architects. Though out of print and by no means definitive, it is a basic source.

Wood, Marilyn. "A History of the Jewish Involvement in the Dallas Community." Unpublished thesis, 1967.

Yearbook of the Dallas Architects Club and Catalogue of its First Exhibition. Dallas Architects Club, 1922.