



2016 Historic Resources Survey

City of Georgetown, Texas

Report

September 2017

Prepared by:



COX | McLAIN
Environmental Consulting

**8401 Shoal Creek Boulevard, Suite 100
Austin, TX 78737**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Background and Prior Surveys	1
1.2	2016 Survey.....	2
1.2.1	Survey.....	2
1.2.2	Public Involvement.....	3
2	HISTORIC CONTEXT	4
2.1	Early Settlement and City Founding (1848–1900)	4
2.2	Early Twentieth-Century Development (1900–1945).....	7
2.3	Mid-Century Development (1945–1965).....	7
3	METHODOLOGY	9
3.1	Survey Methodology.....	9
3.1.1	Pre-Fieldwork Preparation	9
3.1.2	Field Survey	11
3.1.3	Post-Field Processing	12
3.2	Evaluation Methodology.....	12
4	RESULTS OF THE SURVEY	14
4.1	Overview of Surveyed Resources.....	14
4.2	Architectural Styles and Forms	15
4.2.1	Bungalow.....	16
4.2.2	Minimal Traditional.....	16
4.2.3	Ranch.....	17
4.3	Preservation Priority	17
4.4	Demolitions.....	18
5	RECOMMENDATIONS	18
5.1	NRHP Districts and Boundary Expansions.....	18
5.1.1	Expansion of Current Districts.....	18
5.1.2	Additional Eligible Districts	19
5.2	High-Priority Properties and Contributing Resources in NRHP Districts	21
5.3	Local Landmarks and Resources Individually Eligible for the NRHP	21
5.4	Future Survey	23

5.5 Further Research/ Opportunities..... 23
REFERENCES..... 24

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of Surveyed Resources..... 15
Table 2: Summary of Priority Categorization..... 17
Table 3: Summary of Demolished Resources 18

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Maps

Appendix B: Inventory Table

Appendix C: Inventory Forms

Appendix D: Materials from Mobile Workshop

1 INTRODUCTION

Cox|McLain Environmental Consulting, Inc. (CMEC) was retained by the City of Georgetown in December 2015 to conduct a Historic Resources Survey. This work included (1) an update of the 1984 and 2007 surveys, and (2) a new survey of resources constructed in 1974 or earlier. The new survey was conducted within an area roughly bounded by Interstate 35 to the west, State Highway 130 to the east, the City limits to the south, and Farm-to-Market Road 971 to the north (see **Figure 1** in **Appendix A**). The new survey, which was completed in 2016, documented a total of 1,676 resources.

1.1 BACKGROUND AND PRIOR SURVEYS

The City of Georgetown has partnered with the Texas Historical Commission (THC) on the Main Street and Certified Local Government (CLG) Programs. The City has also established two historic zoning overlays: the Downtown Overlay District, created in 1975, and the Old Town Overlay District, created in 2004. As a CLG member, the City undertakes regular historic resources surveys to systematically identify and document historic-age buildings, structures, objects, and districts. The survey inventory is used by the City's Planning Department to make informed decisions that support new growth and development while maintaining Georgetown's heritage and character.

The City of Georgetown's first historic resources survey was conducted by Hardy Heck Moore, Inc. (HHM) in 1984 and included 902 resources constructed prior to 1935. Most resources were located within the city limits near downtown and the surrounding neighborhoods; however, a small number were located outside the city limits within the Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ). Each resource was photographed; documented using the THC's Historic Resources Survey Form; and assigned a priority of High, Medium, or Low.

In 2007, HHM was retained to conduct the City's second historic resources survey (HHM 2010). As part of this survey, all resources documented during the 1984 survey were re-documented, and all non-residential resources built before 1961 within the then-city limits were documented. Additionally, Hardy Heck Moore documented representative examples of domestic resources in subdivisions platted between 1935 and 1965. This sampling approach was selected because of the large number of residential resources constructed between 1935 and 1965 and because of time and budget constraints. If a subdivision platted after 1935 appeared to have potential eligibility as a historic district, the entire subdivision was documented (e.g., the Nolen Addition). In the 2007 survey, all resources were documented at the reconnaissance level except for properties categorized as High priority in 2007, which were documented with a more detailed form approximating the THC's Historic Resources Survey Form. In addition to the 902 resources from the 1984 survey that were resurveyed, 665 resources were surveyed for the first time, for a total of 1,574 resources. Many of the resources documented in 1984 were found to have been demolished; in these cases, HHM documented the replacement building or vacant lot.

All previously surveyed and newly surveyed resources were assigned a priority of High, Medium, or Low, based on the resource's age; architectural integrity; architectural style, form, or construction method; or association with patterns in history.

1.2 2016 SURVEY

1.2.1 Survey

CMEC was retained to update the 1984 and 2007 surveys and to conduct a new survey of all resources constructed in 1974 or earlier located within the survey boundary, an area encompassing approximately 3,300 parcels (**Figure 1** in **Appendix A**). A High, Medium, or Low priority was assigned to each resource using the same definitions used in the 2007 survey (see **Section 3.2**). The year 1974 was selected as the survey cut-off date, and resources built in 1974 or earlier are, for the purposes of this survey, considered "historic-age." Per the National Park Service, resources must be 50 years old or older to be eligible for listing on the NRHP; however, properties of exceptional importance that are less than 50 years old may be eligible. Generally, historic resources surveys include resources that are at least 40 to 50 years old. The year 1974 was selected as the cut-off date for the 2016 survey because high-resolution aerial images of Georgetown are available from this year, and comparison of the historic aerial images with current aerial images allowed CMEC to determine whether resources are historic-age.

For the 1984 and 2007 survey update, the level of documentation each resource received in the 2016 survey depended on its location within a City overlay, its previous level of documentation, and whether its priority changed. These varying levels and circumstances of documentation were established by the City in the request for proposals for the 2016 survey.

- If a resource was previously documented with a THC survey form during either the 1984 or 2007 survey AND the priority did not change in 2016, then it was only re-photographed (hereafter referred to as "Photo Only" properties).
- If a resource was previously documented with a THC survey form during either the 1984 or 2007 survey AND the priority changed in 2016, then it was documented with a THC form (hereafter referred to as "THC Changing Priority" properties). The exception to this was when the priority changed on a utilitarian secondary building.
- If a resource was within either of the City's overlays and was not previously documented with a THC form, it was documented with a THC form in 2016 (hereafter referred to as "THC Form" properties).
- Resources that had been demolished since they were last surveyed were noted and are reported separately in **Section 4.4**. No inventory form was created for these resources.
- For the new survey of resources constructed in 1974 or earlier and that are located outside the overlays, each historic-age resource within the survey area was documented

at the reconnaissance level (hereafter referred to as “Reconnaissance” properties). Specifically, one or more photographs were provided of the street-facing façade; the resource type, style, plan, construction date, and geographic location were recorded; and a preservation priority was assigned. Ancillary buildings were recorded separately only if they were notable in terms of size, style, or age. A more detailed description of the 2016 survey methodology is provided in the Methodology section.

1.2.2 Public Involvement

The City of Georgetown hosted a kick-off meeting for the project in February 2016. Members of the public were notified, as well as the City’s Historic and Architectural Review Commission (HARC). CMEC historians presented the goals and proposed methodology for the survey and invited public input. An email address was established for the project so that members of the public could submit stories, photographs, and other information.

In April of 2016, the City of Georgetown hosted a mobile workshop to educate members of the public about the process of documenting historic resources. The workshop was organized and staffed by historians from CMEC and was structured as a “classroom” learning session followed by a field session. Attendees learned how to complete the THC’s survey form and received tips on spotting alterations and taking digital photographs. After the classroom session, the group worked together to document a small area in Georgetown. The workshop was intended to provide the community with valuable skills as well as to promote historic preservation and a deeper understanding of the importance of local surveys. Materials from the workshop are included as **Appendix D**.

Following the review of the draft inventory forms by the City Planning Department, the forms were posted to the City’s website for review in July 2017. The owners of every property documented in the survey were mailed letters, which stated their property’s priority; provided instructions for accessing the forms online; and included an invitation to the public meeting on July 13, 2017. On this date, the City hosted a series of meetings. CMEC historians were available for half-hour appointments during the day to meet one-on-one with members of the public. Those who made appointments brought in historic photographs and books, shared the history of their properties, asked questions about the survey and the implications of designation, and provided more precise information about construction dates and alterations. In the evening, CMEC historians presented the findings of the survey to the public in Georgetown City Council chambers. Members of the planning department staff and CMEC historians were available to answer questions from attendees. The PowerPoint presentation was posted to the City’s website and shared with local stakeholders. In the weeks following the presentation, members of the public continued to contact the City and CMEC with additional questions and information. The public input has been incorporated into this report and the attached forms.

2 HISTORIC CONTEXT

2.1 EARLY SETTLEMENT AND CITY FOUNDING (1848–1900)

The area that is now Williamson County was originally the western part of Milam County, which was an expansive region with a distant county seat. Wanting a more centralized government, a group of settlers successfully lobbied the Texas Legislature for a new county separate from Milam County. Williamson County, named after Robert Williamson, an early political leader and judge, was established March 13, 1848. At the time, the area had an Anglo population of approximately 250 settlers who relied primarily on subsistence farming (Odintz 2016; Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). Williamson County's first officials were tasked with selecting a location for the county seat within five miles of the county's geographic center (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). The site was selected after George Glasscock offered to donate 173 acres for the new city if it was named in his honor (Georgetown Heritage Society and Valenzuela 2013).

Georgetown, as it was called, was well-situated on high land at the confluence of the San Gabriel River's three branches, with fertile Blackland Prairie to the east that was ideal for farming, and grasslands to the west that were suitable for ranching (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000; Georgetown Heritage Society and Valenzuela 2013). It was platted as a 52-block grid with a public square in the southeastern quadrant. Narrow lots surrounded the square, creating a commercial center, beyond which lay residential lots (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). This design, named the Shelbyville Square, was replicated widely across the state of Texas because of its simplicity and effectiveness in creating a central focus for the community (Veselka 2000). On July 4, 1848, just four months after the county was established, Georgetown's first lots were sold (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000).

The population of the city in 1850 was estimated at 200 people, and growth was slow for the next two decades (Texas Almanac c. 2000). Most early buildings were log construction and temporary in nature, including the first courthouse, which was a one-room building erected in 1849 one block east of the town square (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000; Williams and Landon 1976). Supported by the local agricultural and livestock industries, more permanent commercial buildings constructed of locally sourced limestone began to replace log buildings. The first such building was a new courthouse, erected in 1857 on the square (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). Though solidly vernacular in design and construction, with its central location in the square and sturdy walls, the building was nonetheless a symbol of the county's stability and potential (Scarborough 1973). The city's only early expansion occurred in 1854 with the Glasscock Addition, a residential area located south and east of the original 52-block grid (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). Twenty-nine resources dating to the nineteenth century are extant in this neighborhood.

It its early years, Georgetown's economy was heavily based in agriculture, with farmers primarily growing wheat and corn on small farms on the fertile land to the south and east of the city.

Commercial activity centered on the courthouse square, and businesses were largely service-based and reliant on the activity from the courthouse. There were few industrial or manufacturing businesses at the time (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000).

The Civil War and Reconstruction years stifled Georgetown's growth and development, but the 1870s were a turning point for the city (HHM 2010). This change is largely attributed to two events. The first was the establishment of Southwestern University in 1873, one of the first institutes of higher education in the region. The university, along with county affairs, proved to be one of Georgetown's most stable economic drivers. The second major event from this period was the arrival of the railroad in Georgetown (HHM 2010).

Williamson County's first railroad opened in 1876 in the southern part of the county; residents of Georgetown watched as the communities along the line (e.g. Taylor) boomed while those communities that were bypassed vanished (Scarborough 1973). In response, Georgetown's leaders quickly organized to establish and finance the construction of the Georgetown Railroad, which would connect the city to the International and Great Northern Railroad in Round Rock. Completed in 1878, the route, which is no longer extant in its original location, terminated just southwest of the business district. The arrival of the railroad improved living conditions and transformed the economy and appearance of the city (Scarborough 1973).

With improved access to transportation, Williamson County's farmers were able to buy farm machinery and ship crops to larger markets. They began growing cotton, which was a more lucrative product than corn and wheat. Soon, cotton gins and processing plants sprang up throughout the county, including Georgetown, and Williamson County was the top cotton producer in Texas by the 1890s (Scarborough 1973; Georgetown Heritage Society and Valenzuela 2013).

As the county's cotton industry was developing, so too was its cattle industry (Scarborough 1973). Many cattle trails crossed Williamson County and fed into larger trails like the Chisholm Trail, Western Trail, Dodge City Trail, and Shawnee Trail (Scarborough 1973). Several routes passed through Georgetown, including one that ran directly down Brushy Street (now Austin Avenue). Herds of cattle passed the courthouse and commercial district, with cattlemen frequently stopping to purchase supplies (Georgetown Heritage Society and Valenzuela 2013). Moving north, herds crossed the San Gabriel River just west of the current Austin Avenue bridges (Georgetown Heritage Society and Valenzuela 2013).

As a result of the strong economic growth, the population of Georgetown increased rapidly in the 1870s, from an estimated 320 people in 1870 to 1,354 in 1880. This pace continued into the twentieth century, and by 1900, the population was 2,790 (Texas Almanac c. 2000). A flurry of development activity accompanied this growth.

A new, architect-designed, Italianate-style courthouse was erected in 1878, replacing the vernacular building from 1857. Hitching posts and sidewalks were installed around the square in 1881, and these improvements, coupled with the new courthouse's size, height, ornamentation,

and siting, transformed the appearance of the square (Scarborough 1973). Commercial building owners soon began updating and replacing their properties as well. A review of the city's early Sanborn maps shows that most of the commercial district's buildings were still one-story and wood frame in 1885, though a small number of two-story stone buildings had been erected by this time (Sanborn Map & Publishing Co. 1885). When the next Sanborn map was published nine years later, the square would have been markedly different in appearance, as nearly all the frame buildings had been replaced with two-story stone buildings (Sanborn-Perris Map Co. 1894). Because a greater variety of goods were available via the railroad, these new buildings were accentuated with materials and embellishments popular during the time; the buildings were given high-style Italianate and Queen Anne designs intended to lure customers inside (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000; Francaviglia 1996). In addition to the specialty stores and service industries that lined Georgetown's square, notable commercial developments of the late-nineteenth century included new planing mills; a brick and lime kiln; several factories, including an ice factory; and limestone quarries (Georgetown Heritage Society and Valenzuela 2013).

Residential building activity also increased, and between 1870 and 1910, 13 new residential additions tripled the size of Georgetown (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). The river provided a barrier to the north and west, so the city grew south and east, and the town square, which was originally sited in the southeastern quadrant of the city, had become more centralized (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). Many of Georgetown's most recognizable and significant commercial and residential buildings date to the period of growth from the 1870s to 1900. Charles S. Belford, a local contractor and lumberman, got his start during this period, and he quickly gained a reputation for constructing quality buildings in a variety of popular styles. He would become one of the city's most prolific early builders, and many of his buildings are extant today, including a concentration in the Belford National Register Historic District. C. S. Griffith operated a competing lumber company in town, established in 1894; the rivalry between the two firms has been credited with elevating the level of craftsmanship of Georgetown homes (Moore and Hardy 1984). Griffith is believed to have constructed homes at 1002 Ash Street, 1009 Elm Street, and 1216 Main Street (Moore and Hardy 1984). As Georgetown grew into the twentieth century, a consequence of its building activity was that many farms that were once on the outskirts of town became enveloped by development and were often destroyed (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000).

In all, 151 surveyed resources were constructed prior to 1900 and represent Georgetown's earliest patterns of development. The oldest documented resource is the c. 1860 Johnson Farmstead, a stone I-house on Westinghouse Road, outside of the historic core of the city. The majority of the pre-1900 resources were constructed in the last two decades of the nineteenth century.

2.2 EARLY TWENTIETH-CENTURY DEVELOPMENT (1900–1945)

Georgetown's economy stalled at the turn of the century, in part because other communities in eastern Williamson County along the main railroad routes had established a firm hold on the cotton industry (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). As Georgetown's cotton economy diminished, the population declined slightly between 1910 and 1920 (Texas Almanac c. 2000). Agriculture was, nonetheless, still an important industry, and it, along with retail businesses, education, and county government, continued to sustain Georgetown's economy. Several notable buildings were constructed in the early 1900s, including Southwestern University's Administration Building and Mood Hall and several local school buildings, including a 1923 high school by Austin-based architects the Page Brothers (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). Most prominent, however, was the erection of the county's final courthouse, a domed, Beaux Arts style building completed in 1911 by the Page Brothers. The building replaced the 1878 courthouse and was situated in the center of the courthouse square within a parklike setting.

As the population grew and the city expanded, there was an increased need and demand for improved infrastructure (Georgetown Heritage Society and Valenzuela 2013). The first major improvement occurred in 1892 when iron bridges were erected over the North and South Forks of the San Gabriel River (Scarborough 1973). Prior to the construction of these bridges, people crossed the water by climbing down the banks and walking across log bridges or logs spanning the width of the river (Scarborough 1973). City and county roads continued to be rather primitive and unpaved into the 1930s, when road improvements were financed by the Works Progress Administration (WPA) program (Scarborough 2008). After this point, Brushy Street (later renamed Austin Avenue), which was located along the Meridian Highway/U.S. 81, saw an increase in automobile-oriented development, including filling stations, restaurants, and motor courts (HHM 2010; Moore et al. 2016). This street became a primary route through downtown.

By 1940, the population of Georgetown was 3,682 and the county's population was 41,698. Most people continued to reside in the eastern portion of the county in the communities along the railroad (Texas Almanac c. 2000; Odintz 2016). Georgetown and its neighbor, Round Rock, were small, rural hamlets in comparison (Scarborough 2008). There are approximately 775 resources documented in the survey dating from 1900 to 1945.

2.3 MID-CENTURY DEVELOPMENT (1945–1965)

Georgetown's economy picked back up again in the years following World War II, though at a steadier pace than in earlier decades (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). The county was still heavily agricultural; however, cotton farming was declining as a result of over-production, soil depletion, and a boll weevil infestation (Odintz 2016). Agricultural interests diversified as farmers began growing sorghum and wheat and raising poultry. Traditional livestock rearing was still common (Odintz 2016). The city's economy was further supported by Southwestern University, which embarked on a significant expansion effort in the post-war years, in part to meet demand from returning soldiers utilizing the GI Bill (HHM 2010). The city also grew in size in the post-war

years, as 14 new subdivisions were added, featuring modern planning principles with wide streets, uniform setbacks, separation of residential and non-residential uses, and consistent architectural design. Single-family residences were typically built in the Ranch style and advertised as having the latest in modern conveniences and design (HHM 2010). Some neighborhoods were more modest with small lot sizes and Minimal Ranch houses, and others, such as Country Club Estates, the Nolen Addition, and East Lynn Additions, were built with spacious lots and homes.

Despite the post-war development activity, Georgetown was still a small community of 5,218 people in 1960, and the surrounding area continued to be heavily agricultural (Scarborough 2008; Texas Almanac c. 2000). Two major infrastructure projects would change this, resulting in a period of explosive growth and development that continues into present day. The first was the opening of I-35 just west of Georgetown's business district in 1965. This meant that, for the first time, downtown Georgetown was no longer situated on a preeminent north-south artery. Development activity quickly shifted toward the interchanges of the new highway and away from Austin Avenue and U.S. 81. This was intensified in the following years, when plans were made to construct a dam over the San Gabriel River to prevent flooding and secure a water supply for the cities of Georgetown and Round Rock (Scarborough 2008). The dam, completed in 1979, created Lake Georgetown, a reservoir west of I-35. The surrounding ranch land was quickly tapped by investors for the development of new subdivisions, who marketed the idyllic setting with easy access to I-35 and Austin, which, without today's traffic, was just a short 25-minute commute. In the years leading up to the dam's completion, approximately 4,000 acres just west of I-35 changed hands from ranchers to developers (Scarborough 2008). Georgetown and Round Rock, which is also along I-35 to the south, were suddenly popular bedroom communities. For the first time in its history, the population of Williamson County was shifting west.

Georgetown's historic commercial district and Austin Avenue's automobile-oriented businesses suffered from the new competition to the west and the improved access to all Austin had to offer. Storefronts were often shuttered but, remarkably, very few buildings were destroyed (HHM 2010). The exception to this occurred in the "Ridge," a predominantly low-income, minority neighborhood located in the area roughly bounded by 19th Street to the south, the historic business district to the east, and the San Gabriel River's South Branch to the west and north (The Williamson County Sun 1967a). Here, the city initiated a federally funded, 152-acre urban renewal effort, coined the "South San Gabriel Urban Renewal Project," intended to clear and rehabilitate sub-standard housing, redevelop the area for residential purposes, improve streets and utilities, and develop parks and recreation areas (The Williamson County Sun 1967b). The result was widespread demolition and relocation of the Ridge community starting in the late 1960s (Texas Historical Commission c. 2000). Though a number of new buildings were erected and streets and infrastructure improved, many projects never came to fruition, as evidenced by the number of block-sized parking lots that fill the space today. A related project documented in the 2007 and 2016 surveys is the Stonehaven Apartments development, operated by the

Georgetown Housing Authority. This housing development was built with the goal of housing residents who were displaced by urban renewal (Williamson County Sun 1970).

Residential, commercial, and industrial growth continued at a rapid pace after 1960 and into the 1970s and 1980s (Scarborough 2010). Starting in 1982, Georgetown embarked on another transformative urban planning and economic development initiative. This time, through participation in the National Trust for Historic Preservation's Main Street Program, the goal was to preserve and revitalize the city's historic downtown, which sat shuttered and dilapidated, but largely intact (McKnight 2002). The city's financial institutions offered low-interest loans to rehabilitate the district's Victorian buildings, and within two years more than half the commercial district had undergone restoration projects. Infrastructure improvements followed, and soon businesses began filling the storefronts (McKnight 2002). In 2005 and 2006, the courthouse underwent a significant restoration, bringing it back in appearance to its original design (Texas Historical Commission c. 2006). Today, Georgetown's square is once again a lively commercial center with a distinct sense of history.

Georgetown's population grew from 5,218 people in 1960, prior to the construction of I-35 and the dam, to 9,468 by 1980, and explosive growth continued into the twenty-first century as the Austin metro region expanded to the north (Texas Almanac c. 2000). With a population of 63,716 in 2015, the U.S. Census Bureau announced that Georgetown was the fastest growing city in the country with a population of 50,000 or more (United States Census Bureau 2016).

There are approximately 604 resources dating from the 1945 to 1965 time period documented in the survey. These properties are primarily residential resources, most commonly executed in the Ranch and Minimal Traditional style/form.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The following section describes the methodology used for field survey and property evaluations. Field survey methods included preparations before conducting survey work, on-the-ground fieldwork activities, and post-field processing.

3.1.1 Pre-Fieldwork Preparation

3.1.1.1 Previous Survey Data Review and Analysis

CMEC was provided with a copy of the 1984 and 2007 surveys. For the 1984 survey, CMEC scanned in copies of the paper survey forms as well as the photograph negatives. The scanned PDF forms were optimized using text-recognition software to make the documents searchable. From the 2007 survey, CMEC was provided with a copy of the survey report (including inventory forms), a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet summarizing the results of the survey, and GIS data points. CMEC mapped the location of the surveyed resources from 2007 and joined each surveyed

property to parcel-based Williamson County Appraisal District data. The location of resources surveyed in 2007 was corrected when necessary.

CMEC also integrated data regarding existing NRHP districts, NRHP-listed properties, and Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL) into the 2016 survey. While these designations are only displayed on the inventory forms for properties receiving THC-level documentation, this information was linked to all properties documented in the survey in the master electronic database and GIS files. It should be noted that a property's location within an existing NRHP district was documented, but the contributing or non-contributing status to the existing NRHP district was not assigned, as that information was not readily available and may or may not have been part of the original nomination(s).

3.1.1.2 Aerial Imagery Review

Next, CMEC obtained a high-resolution aerial image from 1974, the cut-off year for the survey. By comparing the 1974 image to current aerial photography as well as examining select properties using Google StreetView, CMEC attempted to determine whether the same building(s) present today were present in 1974, indicating a historic-age resource. For properties where tree cover obscured development, or there were other uncertainties, the resource was flagged for review in the field.

3.1.1.3 Categorization and Field Map Creation

A CMEC identification number (ID) was assigned to every previously surveyed parcel and all parcels within the survey area. CMEC historians completed an analysis for every parcel in the survey boundary to determine:

- Whether the resource had been surveyed before;
- Whether the resource was historic age (some properties proved to have been erroneously categorized as historic age in a previous survey);
- The level of documentation from previous surveys (THC form or not); and
- Whether the resource was located in either of the local overlay districts.

Based on this information, each property was assigned to one of three levels of documentation 1) a new photograph, 2) a Reconnaissance-level documentation form, or 3) a THC-level documentation form. The field maps were keyed appropriately based on the needed documentation type for each property. Resources outside of the 2016 survey boundary that had been recorded in previous surveys were documented in 2016 with photograph updates only, unless the property was changing priority (in which case the resource was documented with a THC form).

3.1.1.4 *Tablet Form Design*

Before conducting fieldwork, CMEC and teaming partner SWCA created a custom tablet-based data collection form that included fields from the THC form. This form was loaded on to tablets for field data collection.

3.1.2 *Field Survey*

A team of professionals from CMEC and SWCA, led by Principal Investigators Emily Reed and Heather Goodson, conducted the field survey. Fieldwork for the resources within the survey area was conducted in the spring and summer of 2016, and fieldwork for the resources outside the survey area was conducted in November 2016 and January 2017.

At least one photograph of each resource's street-facing façade was taken, except when limited by right-of-entry or obscuring vegetation. When visible from the right-of-way, outbuildings (garages, shed, etc.) were also photographed. Photographs taken with the tablets were automatically linked to the resource's record.

The amount of data collected in the field for each resource varied depending on whether it was a THC Form, Reconnaissance, or Photo Only property. For THC Form properties, structural and material information was recorded, as well as property type, use, style, plan, and any visible alterations to the exterior. For Reconnaissance properties, type, style, and plan were documented. For Photo Only resources, no additional data was collected in the field; if a review of the photographs indicated that recent alterations might warrant a change in priority, and therefore THC Form documentation, the resource was revisited.

Secondary buildings were documented in the 2016 survey with a separate inventory form if they were previously documented in a separate record on the 1984 or 2007 surveys. For all newly surveyed parcels, secondary buildings were documented separately only if they were more substantial buildings, such as a carriage house, barn, or a stylized detached garage, for example. A commonplace detached garage or shed would be photographed when visible from the right-of-way, and the photo was included in the record of the primary building. When a parcel included more than one resource and each resource was documented with an individual inventory form, an alphabetical character was appended to the CMEC ID. For example, the main house and freestanding carriage house on parcel number 55555 would be designated as 55555A, and 55555B, respectively.

Parcels flagged for further review based on the aerial imagery analysis were evaluated in the field. Parcels that appeared to be vacant lots or to contain post-1974 development were noted as such and were not photo-documented. Notes were also made regarding information obtained from neighbors and members of the public encountered during the survey, including construction dates for buildings and neighborhood history.

3.1.3 Post-Field Processing

After fieldwork was complete, a qualified architectural historian reviewed the collected data for each record for accuracy and completeness, and one or more photographs was selected for each resource. Historical information was added to records where relevant. For resources being recorded with a THC Form, a brief architectural description was written during the post-field processing period.

To determine the existence of alterations, historians primarily relied on professional judgment, as well as Google Street View, Google Earth imagery, and comparison to previous survey photos and descriptions. For year built dates, Sanborn maps, online building improvement data from the Williamson Central Appraisal District, and notes from previous surveys were used to supplement professional judgment.

In consideration of integrity and historical associations, each resource was assigned a 2016 survey priority of High, Medium, or Low (based on the definitions outlined in **Section 3.2**). For resources that did not clearly fall into one category, historians discussed the priority with each other and, where needed, the City's Historic Preservation Officer. For resources that were previously surveyed, the 2007 and 1984 survey IDs and priorities were inserted into the 2016 survey form for reference. The source of this data was an Excel spreadsheet from the 2007 survey, which was provided to CMEC by the City of Georgetown.

To provide a more complete record for Photo Only properties, which were only to be documented with a photograph and a preservation priority in 2016, CMEC inserted 2007 survey data into the 2016 record, including the plan, style, and year built. The 2007 year built data was reviewed for accuracy and updated where applicable.

Draft survey records were prepared for review by Georgetown's Historic Preservation Officer, and, later, for public review. Owners of surveyed resources were notified of the survey via mail and invited to discuss the findings in a series of meetings on July 13, 2017. During these meetings, members of the public had the opportunity to provide additional information about surveyed properties. Records were updated to reflect any new information, and the information was confirmed via research where possible.

3.2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The 1984 and 2007 survey assigned High, Medium, and Low priorities to each property. No documentation was identified defining these categories for the 1984 survey. The definitions of these categories included in the 2007 survey (and repeated in the scope for the 2016 survey) are provided below.

LOW

Properties categorized as **LOW** are neither individually eligible for listing in the NRHP nor potentially contributing resources within a historic district. Resources of historic age were considered **LOW** priority if they could not be associated with

a significant architectural style, building form, construction method, or trend in local history. Also, resources of historic age that had been severely altered to the extent that their architectural and historic associations were no longer understandable, or that new alterations overwhelmed the visual interpretation of the original or historic appearance, were assigned a LOW priority.

MEDIUM

Resources assigned a MEDIUM preservation priority do not possess sufficient architectural or historical significance to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); however, they would likely be a contributing resource if located within a historic district that is eligible for the NRHP. MEDIUM priority properties are valuable resources that add to the area's overall character and contribute moderately to an understanding of local history or broader historical patterns. Some MEDIUM priority resources are typical examples of common building forms or architectural styles from the late-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century, such as the folk Victorian- styleL-plan house or the Craftsman bungalow. The category of MEDIUM priority may also encompass significant properties that have experienced deterioration or have undergone moderate alterations that detract from their integrity.

HIGH

HIGH priority properties are either eligible for listing in the NRHP or designation as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHLs), or have previously been listed in the NRHP or are designated as an RTHL. These resources are good examples of architecture, engineering, or crafted design. They retain a high degree of their original contextual and architectural integrity and, if altered, changes are in keeping with original design, scale, and workmanship. These properties contribute significantly to local history or broader historical patterns and are considered to be the most significant resources within the city. Some properties in the HIGH category are notable because they represent noteworthy examples of a common local building form, architectural style, or plan type that exhibits particularly exceptional craftsmanship or design qualities. Others are among the city's oldest properties and may be missing certain architectural element and/or have been subject to a moderate amount of changes; nonetheless, because of their age, they are still significant within a local context. A number of properties with HIGH ratings remain as excellent examples of relatively rare vernacular/folk architectural forms that represent Georgetown's early development.

In accordance with the Request for Proposals issued by the City of Georgetown for the current project and the agreed-upon scope, CMEC also utilized the same priority definitions for the 2016 survey. CMEC historians considered both significance and integrity when assigning the preservation category. A priority justification statement was also provided for every resource on the inventory form (for example “lacks integrity,” or “lacks integrity and significance”).

For properties that had been previously surveyed, CMEC considered whether the previous preservation priority should be changed. Changes in priority in 2016 were primarily attributed to alterations made since the time of the 2007 survey that had diminished the integrity of the structure. Some properties were also upgraded in priority based on a reconsideration of significance allowed by almost a decade of perspective since the prior survey. For example, several Ranch style resources were upgraded from Low priority in 2007 to Medium priority in 2016 if the resources retained integrity and contributed to the character of the neighborhood.

CMEC also noted that the practice of the 2007 surveyors seemed to have been to assign the same preservation priority to all resources on a parcel when more than one resource was present. This resulted in garage buildings being assigned a High priority if the garage was on the same parcel as a High priority residence. In collaboration with the City of Georgetown Historic Preservation Officer, CMEC historians proposed providing individualized preservation priorities for each resource on a property. As a result, several previously surveyed ancillary buildings changed priority based on the individualized approach.

CMEC also categorized the resources within the City's two historic overlays as contributing or non-contributing. All High and Medium priority properties within the overlays are considered contributing resources. Low priority historic-age resources, non-historic age resources, and vacant lots are considered non-contributing resources.

4 RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

The following section discusses the results of the survey, including an overview of the surveyed resources, the most common architectural styles and forms, preservation priorities, and demolitions since the previous survey. An inventory table of all surveyed resources is included in **Appendix B**, and individual inventory forms for resources are provided in **Appendix C**.

4.1 OVERVIEW OF SURVEYED RESOURCES

In total, 1,676 resources were documented during the 2016 survey and assigned a preservation priority. This includes 1,661 buildings, 12 structures, 2 objects, and 1 site. Most buildings are single-family homes or commercial buildings. Other building types include educational, municipal, religious, agricultural, and municipal. Documented structures include bridges, dams, a water tower, etc.; objects include a statue and a memorial; and the site is an archeological ruin.

Within the survey area, 1,762 parcels were not documented because they do not have historic-age resources or are vacant lots. Additionally, 144 resources that were documented in 2007 as not historic age were not documented in the 2016 survey. CMEC historians surmised that these resources were documented in 2007 because a resource had been documented in that location during the 1984 survey but was no longer extant in 2007. These resources were coded as "NH07" properties in the 2016 survey and were not photographed or assigned a priority because they are not historic age. Forty-five resources that were documented during the 2007 survey with a

historic-age year-built date were determined by CMEC historians to be not historic-age (built in 1975 or later). These resources, which are coded “Photo Only (E07),” were documented as Photo Only properties at the request of the City, but were not assigned a preservation priority because they are not historic age.

Fifteen historic-age resources were not recorded because they are not visible from the right-of-way or are too obscured by foliage to evaluate; 9 of these had been documented previously. Additionally, 6 previously surveyed cemeteries were re-photographed in 2016 but not assigned priorities because no historic-age buildings or structures are present.

Finally, as further described in **Section 4.4**, 66 previously documented resources have been demolished since they were last surveyed. An additional 14 resources documented during the previous surveys either did not have accurate geographic data and could not be located, or the resources were believed to have been demolished, but demolition could not be confirmed from aerial photographs. These resources are listed as “Possible demolitions” in **Table 1**.

Category	Count
Priority Assigned	1,676
Buildings	1,661
Structures	12
Objects	2
Site	1
Priority Not Assigned	2,052
Not historic-age / vacant parcels	1,762
Previously surveyed, acknowledged in 2007 as not historic-age	144
Previously surveyed, but determined in 2016 to be not historic-age	45
Not visible from right-of-way	15
Cemeteries	6
Demolitions	66
Possible demolitions	14

4.2 ARCHITECTURAL STYLES AND FORMS

This section pertains to residential buildings, as the vast majority of the recorded resources were single-family homes. Each historic-age property in the district was categorized based on form and style, using the categories provided on the THC form. The THC Historic Resources Survey Manual was utilized, as well as the following sources: *Common Houses in America's Small Towns: The Atlantic Seaboard to the Mississippi Valley* (Jakle et al. 1989) and *A Field Guide to American Houses* (McAlester 2015). The most common forms and types observed in the district are described below.

4.2.1 Bungalow

The term “bungalow” has been used to describe small, single or one-and-a-half story dwellings with moderately irregular floorplans, overhanging eaves, and prominent porches. Bungalows may have front-gabled, side-gabled, cross-gabled, or hipped roofs and almost always have either full or partial width porches. The Craftsman style is often applied to this form; characteristic features of this style include decorative beams or braces under gables, exposed rafter tails, battered columns and piers for porch supports, and grouped windows.



A front-gabled Craftsman Bungalow on Ash Street

The bungalow was the dominant form for houses built in the US between the turn of the twentieth century and the 1920s. This form was popularized in Southern California and may have originated in India in the nineteenth century. The bungalow appeared in Georgetown after World War I and remained a popular style into the 1950s. In all, 76 bungalow-plan buildings were documented during the 2016 survey.

4.2.2 Minimal Traditional

The “Minimal Traditional” house form was developed beginning in the mid-1930s as a response to changes in the housing market due to the Great Depression. The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) was established in 1934 and provided low-interest mortgages. In order to protect their investment, the FHA provided guidelines for effective house designs. The efficient designs also meant that these houses could be constructed rapidly to meet demand from returning World War II veterans. Minimal Traditional houses are characterized by their compact form and minimal architectural detailing. Identifying features include a low or moderately pitched roof, one-story height, and eaves with little or no overhang. In all, 100 Minimal Traditional residences were documented during the 2016 survey.



Minimal Traditional house on Hutto Rd

4.2.3 Ranch

Following World War II, the Ranch form became popular nationwide. The Ranch form was developed in Southern California in the mid-1930s and was one of the small house types built under FHA financing guidelines in the 1940s (McAlester 2015). As the FHA guidelines became more flexible after World War



Ranch house on E. 6th Street

II, the Ranch gained increasing popularity. It is characterized by a horizontal one-story shape and low-pitched roof, with the front entry typically located off-center. A garage is often attached to the main façade. Many different types and sizes of windows are found on Ranch houses, including windows manufactured in standard sizes using production methods developed during the war. Entries are almost always recessed, either into the front façade or under a porch. Porch supports, if present, are often simple wood posts or wrought iron. Early smaller examples of the Ranch form may be referred to as Minimal Ranch and generally lack a broad overhanging roof and other elaborations (Jakle 1989; McAlester 2015). In all, 441 Ranch style buildings were documented during the 2016 survey.

4.3 PRESERVATION PRIORITY

The City of Georgetown requested that the documented resources be categorized as High, Medium, or Low priority, as defined in **Section 3.2**. **Table 2** below summarizes the recommended categorization of historic-age resources.

Table 2: Summary of Priority Categorization		
Category	Count	Percent
High	191	11%
Medium	588	35%
Low	897	54%
Total	1,676	100%

Over 200 resources documented during the 2016 survey had a priority change since the last time they were surveyed. As noted in **Section 3.2**, in most instances a resource was downgraded because of recent alterations to the exterior. In other cases, the resource was upgraded in priority because of a better understanding of the history or significance of a building, or because a building had been restored since the last survey.

4.4 DEMOLITIONS

The 2007 survey identified 163 resources that had been demolished between 1984 and 2007. The 2016 survey identified 66 resources that had been demolished between 2007 and 2016.

Table 3: Summary of Demolished Resources		
2007 Preservation Priority	Count	Percent
High	2	3%
Medium	29	44%
Low	32	48%
Not Assigned	3	5%
Total	66	100%

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the scope of this survey was primarily limited to documentation and categorization of resources, future research, documentation, and designation opportunities abound.

5.1 NRHP DISTRICTS AND BOUNDARY EXPANSIONS

5.1.1 Expansion of Current Districts

Consider a boundary expansion of the currently NRHP-listed University Avenue—Elm Street Historic District.

The City of Georgetown has four National Register Historic Districts: Williamson County Courthouse Historic District, University Avenue—Elm Street Historic District, Belford Historic District, and Olive Street Historic District. With the exception of Olive Street, which was listed in 2013, all of the districts were listed in the 1970s and 1980s. In the decades since their listing, the properties within the districts have been modified, and the settings around the districts have changed. Additional properties have also become historic-age, potentially justifying an expanded period of significance and/or boundary.

CMEC historians reviewed the current NRHP boundaries, as well as the properties in the vicinity of these districts that are currently outside of the NHRP boundaries. CMEC also reviewed the recommendations in the survey report for the 2007 survey by HHM. In the areas surrounding the Williamson County Courthouse, Belford, and Olive Street Districts, CMEC did not observe significant concentrations of intact, historic-age resources to justify an expansion of these districts.

The University Avenue—Elm Street District, however, appears to have potential for a boundary increase, as was also noted following the 2007 survey. At the time it was listed (1979), the district was centered around five high-style residences built between 1889 and 1900 with Queen Anne, Eastlake, and Georgian Revival styles. The district includes properties on Myrtle Street that are

currently considered non-contributing. The Booty-McAden House was destroyed by fire in 2006 and was reconstructed in 2009. Although this resource may no longer be considered contributing to the district, the other contributing resources retain integrity. A review of the surrounding area indicated that there are several High and Medium priority properties in the blocks to the southeast that date to the early twentieth century. The Medium priority properties on Myrtle Street within the current district that are currently categorized as non-contributing to the NRHP district should also be re-evaluated for potential contributing status. The area of the potential boundary increase is depicted on **Figure 2**, although additional research would be required to confirm the boundary and contributing/non-contributing resources. The area of proposed expansion is smaller than that recommended following the 2007 survey, based on professional evaluation of the current integrity and cohesiveness of the surrounding architectural fabric.

5.1.2 Additional Eligible Properties

Consider listing the Blue Hole Recreation Area in the NRHP

The study area was also evaluated for the potential for additional NRHP eligible districts, including those areas recommended for further study by the 2007 survey. Although CMEC historians did not find that any of those areas (Forest Street or Nolen Addition) were potentially eligible for the NRHP (primarily due to alterations and infill development), the Blue Hole recreation area is recommended as eligible for the NRHP.

Two swimming areas have been created by the two dams in the San Gabriel River at Blue Hole Park (Resources 123615B and 123615C). Resource 123615B is known as the “Imhoff Dam,” which is approximately five feet tall and constructed of concrete. The smaller, downstream dam (Resource 123615C) is known as the “Kiddie Dam” and is also constructed of concrete. Local history credits Louis P. Imhoff with the construction of Resource 123615B in the 1930s. The Kiddie Dam is believed to have been constructed contemporaneously with or slightly later than the Imhoff Dam. Research did not identify further details about the specific association of the dam with Mr. Imhoff, but the connection is noted in oral history interviews on record with the Williamson County Historical Commission: “Old Mr. Imhoff, who had a machine shop a block from that, was the instigator of damming up the Gabriel” (Hoffman 2017). The Imhoff Dam is noted as having been constructed in 1932 in Donna Scarbrough Josey’s book *Georgetown: Then and Now* (2014). A 1933 article in the *Georgetown Megaphone* (a newspaper published by Southwestern University students) corroborates this date; the article describes the Imhoff Dam as having been constructed during the previous summer (*Georgetown Megaphone* 1933).

No alterations to the dams were observed or identified in research. Information from City of Georgetown staff indicated that the south bank of the San Gabriel River in the Blue Hole Park area near the Austin Avenue bridge was modified following a flood in 2007. The flood resulted in the deposit of a large volume of gravel along the banks of the river. The City graded the area and added Portland cement to stabilize the bank on the south side of the river. A pedestrian low-water crossing was constructed shortly thereafter, c. 2008. Although the appearance of the

riverfront has been modified by improvements in the past decade, research did not indicate that either of the dams have been altered, and the swimming hole area still conveys the same sense of place as it has since the 1930s.

Documentation from the City of Georgetown's Parks Department regarding the date of the official dedication of the land as Blue Hole Park was not immediately available, but the results of newspaper searches indicate that it likely became a city park in the late 1970s. A 1975 article noted that a park in the Blue Hole area was being considered under the auspices of the Georgetown Urban Renewal Agency (The Williamson County Sun 1975). A 1977 article noted the efforts of a group of teenagers to clean up the area "in order to create a city park" (The Williamson County Sun 1977). Independent of its official status as a designated city park, the "Blue Hole" has been a swimming hole and gathering place for Georgetown residents for over one hundred years, even pre-dating the 1930s dams that more explicitly defined the area. The Blue Hole is referred to by name in newspaper articles dating to as early as 1896, when it was noted as the place of several baptisms (The Williamson County Sun 1896). Additional clippings from 1898 and 1906 also noted baptisms in the Blue Hole (The Williamson County Sun 1898, 1906). An article in the Georgetown Megaphone from 1915 described the spot as a place where "the stream becomes both wide and deep and forms what is known as the 'Blue Hole,' where the waters seem as clear and sparkling as any artesian pool." The 1915 article mentions the gathering of scores of men engaging in rope swinging and diving. Oral history subjects recalled that swimming across the river in the location of the Blue Hole was viewed as a rite of passage. "A boy was accepted when he could swim across Blue Hole and swim back without stopping" (Hoffman 2017). The identity of the city of Georgetown is closely linked with the San Gabriel River, and it enjoys widespread renown for the Blue Hole swimming and recreation area. The recreational area surrounding the "Blue Hole" is therefore recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of Recreation for its role as a popular recreation area in Georgetown for over 100 years.

The proposed boundary for this property is shown in **Figure 3**. The City has indicated that they do not have right-of-way/parkland delineation documents, and the Williamson County Appraisal District parcel that encompasses the Blue Hole area is extremely large. Therefore, CMEC historians have recommended the following NRHP boundary. On the west, the boundary includes the treeline that comprises the western extent of the viewshed from users of the Blue Hole area. To the north and south, the boundary includes the banks of the river and a buffer of trees that serve to screen the swimming and recreational area from other land uses. On the south side of the river, the boundary includes the current primary public access point to the recreation area via Rock Street. On the east, the proposed boundary is the centerline of the bridge carrying Austin Avenue over the south fork of the river. The bridge provides a delineation of the viewshed from the Blue Hole looking east. The bridge also appears to serve as the boundary between Blue Hole Park and Veterans of Foreign Wars Park; as noted above, the City has not identified boundary lines for the parks in this area. The boundary was proposed in order to encompass the primary use areas (swimming holes, access points, recreational open space).

5.2 HIGH-PRIORITY PROPERTIES AND CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES IN NRHP DISTRICTS

The review standards currently in place for the overlays should also apply to high-priority properties and contributing properties within existing and future NRHP districts.

Currently, Georgetown City Code calls for review of alterations and demolitions within the two local historic overlay districts. Outside of the overlays, only demolitions are subject to review. In the 2016 survey, 27 High-priority properties were documented in the area outside of the overlays. There also appears to be at least one instance of a contributing property to an NRHP district that is outside the overlays (1708 Olive Street). Future NRHP districts may be outside of the local overlays entirely. Rather than expanding the boundaries of the overlays, CMEC recommends that proposed alterations to High-priority properties and contributing properties within existing and future NRHP districts also be subject to review, regardless of their location within an overlay.

The recommendation regarding contributing resources in NRHP districts could be accomplished by revising the definition of “contributing” structures in the code. This proposed revision would also formalize the recommendation that only High- and Medium-priority properties within the overlays be considered contributing resources. Additionally, the code should be revised to use more general language, such as “historic resources” rather than “historic buildings,” to be inclusive of all types of historic resources, and “the currently adopted survey” rather than citing specific surveys, thus obviating the need for code edits each time the survey is updated. A potential code revision is suggested below.

Historic ~~Structure~~Resource, Contributing. A ~~building~~ resource in a designated historic overlay district ~~and/or National Register District~~ that supports the district's historical significance through location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. ~~Buildings~~ Resources in these areas identified as ~~low~~, medium and high priority ~~structures~~ in the ~~1984 and 2007~~ currently adopted Historic Resources Survey of Georgetown, Texas ~~by Hardy, Heck & Moore, as amended~~ and properties categorized as contributing resources in National Register Districts, shall be considered contributing Historic Resources ~~Structures~~ for purposes of this Code. ~~For the purpose of demolition only, resources~~ buildings or structures listed ~~assigned a high or medium priority~~ in this survey and that are located outside of a historic overlay district shall be considered contributing historic ~~structures~~resources.

Historic ~~Structure~~Resource, Non-Contributing. A ~~resource~~ building in a designated historic overlay district ~~and/or National Register District~~ that does not support the district's historic significance through location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. ~~Buildings~~ Resources that are ~~assigned a low priority or are~~ not identified ~~documented~~ in the ~~1984 and 2007~~ currently adopted Historic Resources Survey of Georgetown, Texas ~~by Hardy, Heck & Moore, as amended~~, shall be considered non-contributing historic ~~structures~~resources for purposes of this Code.

5.3 LOCAL LANDMARKS AND RESOURCES INDIVIDUALLY ELIGIBLE FOR THE NRHP

Establish the City's first local landmarks and create program/process for future designations, and pursue NRHP listing for High priority resources that are not already NRHP designated.

Although the City of Georgetown's code provides a definition of local landmarks, none have been designated as such to date. The definition of a landmark according to City code is as follows:

"The City Council shall make the findings that one or more of the following criteria for designating a building, structure or site within the City limits a local Historic Landmark is met:

- A. Character, interest, or value of the building, structure or site because of its unique role in the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, County, State or Nation;
- B. Occurrence of a notable historical event at the building, structure or site;
- C. Identification of the building, structure or site with a person or persons who contributed notably to the culture and development of the City, County, State, Nation, or society;
- D. Distinctive elements of architectural design, detail material, or craftsmanship that make it an established or familiar visual feature, or the related distinctiveness of a craftsman, master builder or architect, or a style or innovation, including but not limited to:
 - 1. Architectural style of the building or structure;
 - 2. Architectural period of the building or structure;
 - 3. Textures and colors of materials used in the building or structure;
 - 4. Shape of the building or structure;
 - 5. Roofline of the building or structure;
 - 6. Porch and entrance treatments of the building or structure;
 - 7. Height and mass of the building or structure; or
 - 8. Relative proportions of the building or structure (width to height, width to depth); and
- E. Archaeological value in the sense that the building, structure or site can be expected to yield, based on physical evidence, information affecting knowledge of history or prehistory."

CMEC historians believe that all properties identified as High priority in the 2016 survey would meet the landmark criteria. CMEC recommends contacting the owners of each High priority property to determine whether the owner is interested in landmark designation. The City Council could then nominate a group of properties at once to become the first designated local landmarks. The City of Galveston has recently completed a grouped landmarking process, for properties designed by Nicholas Clayton, which could serve as a model for this process.

In order to facilitate future designation of additional local landmarks, the City should establish a procedure and/or application process, including the potential for initiation of the designation process by citizens. The City should publish clear instructions regarding the materials required to process an application for a Landmark (statement of significance, photographs, maps, etc.) and provide support from the Historic Preservation Office. To incentivize Landmark designation,

the city should consider tax abatements, grants, and access to materials conservation resources.

In addition to listing High priority resources as local landmarks, CMEC recommends pursuing individual NRHP listing for High priority resources that are not already NRHP designated. For example, the Stonehaven Apartments (Survey IDs 126009, 123478, 123483, and 126083), which were designed to provide affordable and attractive housing to those displaced by Georgetown's urban renewal efforts in the 1960s, were upgraded from a Low to a High priority since the last survey. Resources like Stonehaven are now regularly recognized for their association with post-war historical trends. By listing Stonehaven and other High priority resources that do not currently have NRHP designation, the City can ensure that the documentation of Georgetown's history at the national level is robust and continues to evolve.

5.4 FUTURE SURVEY

Plan for survey updates every 10 years; add areas of the city/ETJ that have not been previously surveyed.

The City of Georgetown has demonstrated a commitment to historic preservation during the past several decades. The City should plan to continue to update the historic resources survey at least every ten years in order to ensure that the survey provides an accurate record of the city's resources and serves as a useful tool for City planners.

A large portion of the City and its ETJ have never been surveyed. There are mid-century neighborhoods west of I-35 along Williams Dive that have not been documented in full but have potential for significance. The 1984 survey evaluated a small number of agricultural properties in the ETJ. CMEC historians observed many more historic-age agricultural properties outside of the survey boundary that have never been evaluated. These agricultural areas are under threat of encroaching development and should be documented before they are lost.

5.5 FURTHER RESEARCH/ OPPORTUNITIES

Finally, CMEC recommends the creation of a repository for local architectural history. This could take the form of a web-based "wiki" application with a map, where participants can add stories, dates, and photographs to records linked to parcels in the city. Alternately, this information could be stored at the Williamson Museum, or at the public library.

REFERENCES

Francaviglia, Richard V.

- 1996 *Main Street Revisited: Time, Space, and Image Building in Small-Town America*. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City.

Georgetown Heritage Society and S. Elizabeth Valenzuela

- 2013 Olive Street Historic District National Register Nomination. Electronic document, <https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/NR/pdfs/13000615/13000615.pdf>, accessed February 8, 2017.

Georgetown Megaphone

- 1915 Swimming for Students. 7 May. Georgetown, Texas.
- 1933 Professor Added. 24 February. Georgetown, Texas.

Hardy Heck & Moore (HHM)

- 1984 *Historic Resource Survey of Georgetown, Texas*. Austin, Texas.
- 2010 *Final Report: Historic Resources Survey, City of Georgetown, Texas*. Austin, Texas.

Hoffman, Billie

- 2017 Interview by Theresa Wineinger, Williamson County Historical Commission, Electronic document, http://www.williamson-county-historical-commission.org/San_Gabriel_river_Blue_Hole_williamson_county.htm

Jakle, John A., Robert W. Bastian, and Douglas K. Meyer

- 1989 *Common Houses in America's Small Towns: The Atlantic Seaboard to the Mississippi Valley*. The University of Georgia Press, Athens.

Josey, Donna Scarbrough

- 2014 *Georgetown: Then and Now*. Arcadia Publishing, Charleston, South Carolina.

McAlester, Virginia Savage

- 2015 *A Field Guide to American Houses*. 2nd ed. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

McKnight, Kim

- 2002 Texas Main Street Program: 20 Years of Achievement. Electronic document, <http://www.mainstreet.org/main-street/main-street-news/2002/01/texas-main-street-program.html?referrer=https://www.google.com/>, accessed February 7, 2017.

Moore, David, Martha Freedman, and Tara Dudley

- 2016 *The Meridian Highway in Texas*. Prepared for the Texas Historical Commission. Austin, Texas.

Moore, David and Daniel Hardy

- 1984 The Historic Resources of Georgetown, Texas (Partial Inventory of Architectural and Historic Properties) National Register nomination.
<https://npgallery.nps.gov/pdfhost/docs/NRHP/Text/64000843.pdf>

Odintz, Mark

- 2016 Williamson County. Handbook of Texas Online. Electronic document,
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hcw11>, accessed February 7, 2017.

Sanborn Map & Publishing Co.

- 1885 Sanborn Map: Georgetown, TX. New York.
1889 Sanborn Map: Georgetown, TX. New York
1905 Sanborn Map: Georgetown, TX. New York
1910 Sanborn Map: Georgetown, TX. New York
1916 Sanborn Map: Georgetown, TX. New York.
1925 Sanborn Map: Georgetown, TX. New York.
1925 Sanborn Map, Corrected 1940: Georgetown, TX. New York

Sanborn-Perris Map Co.

- 1894 Sanborn Map: Georgetown, TX. New York.
1900 Sanborn Map: Georgetown, TX. New York

Scarborough, Clara Stearns

- 1973 *Land of Good Water: A Williamson County, Texas, History*. Williamson County Sun Publication, Georgetown, Texas.
2010 Handbook of Texas Online, "Georgetown, TX (Williamson County)." Electronic document, <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hfg03>, accessed January 31, 2017.

Scarborough, Linda

- 2008 *Road, River, and Ol' Boy Politics: A Texas County's Path from Farm to Supersuburb*. Texas State Historical Association, Austin, Texas.

Texas Almanac

- c. 2000 Texas Almanac: City Population History from 1850–2000. Electronic document, <https://texasalmanac.com/sites/default/files/images/CityPopHist%20web.pdf>, accessed February 7, 2017.

Texas Historical Commission

- c. 2000 Untitled report describing the history of Georgetown. Electronic document, http://www.georgetown-texas.org/THC_Georgetown_Texas.pdf, accessed February 7, 2017.
- c. 2006 Williamson County Courthouse – Georgetown. Electronic document, <http://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/texas-historic-courthouse-preservation/restored-courthouses/williamson>, accessed February 7, 2017.

United States Census Bureau

- 2016 “Five of the Nation’s Eleven Fastest-Growing Cities are in Texas.” Press Release. Electronic document, <http://census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2016/cb16-81.html>, accessed February 7, 2017.

Veselka, Robert E.

- 2000 *The Courthouse Square in Texas*. The University of Texas Press, Austin, Texas.

Williams, J. R., and Marie D. Landon

- 1976 Williamson County Courthouse Historic District National Register Nomination. Electronic document, <https://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/NR/pdfs/77001480/77001480.pdf>, accessed February 8, 2017.

The Williamson County Sun [Georgetown, Texas]

- 1896 “Short announcement about baptisms.” 10 December. Georgetown, Texas.
- 1898 “Announcements.” 17 February. Georgetown, Texas.
- 1906 “Short announcement about baptism.” 16 August. Georgetown, Texas.
- 1967a “Urban Renewal – Its Prospects & Possibilities in Georgetown.’ 12 January. Georgetown, Texas.
- 1967b “\$2.19 Million Grant for Renewal Project OKed.’ 2 February. Georgetown, Texas.
- 1970 “\$516,913.00 Loan to Build 30 More Stonehaven Units.”
- 1975 “Supporters tour proposed park.” July 20. Georgetown, Texas.
- 1977 “1977 Review.” December 29. Georgetown, Texas.

APPENDIX A: MAPS

APPENDIX B: INVENTORY TABLE

APPENDIX C: INVENTORY FORMS

APPENDIX D: MATERIALS FROM MOBILE WORKSHOP