NPS Form 10-900-b
0018
(June 1991)

COVER OMB No. 10024-

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is used for documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Register Bulletin 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items.

__X__ New Submission ____ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

HISTORIC RESIDENTIAL RESOURCES OF MEMPHIS, SHELBY COUNTY, TN

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographic area, and chronological period for each.)

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN MEMPHIS, 1865-1950

C. Form Prepared by

Name/Title: John Linn Hopkins
Organization: Hopkins & Associates
Street & Number: 974 Philadelphia Street
City: Memphis
Date: February 1998
Telephone: (901) 278-5186
State: TN Zip Code: 38104

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Herbert L. Harper
Signature of certifying official/Title

11/10/98
Date

DSHPO Tennessee Historical Commission
State or Federal agency and bureau

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Edson H. Beall

12/17/98

State or Federal agency and bureau

INTRODUCTION AND ORGANIZATION

The multiple property listing for Memphis, Shelby County, Tennessee is based upon the historic context, "Residential Development in Memphis, 1865 to 1950," which reflects the eighty-five year period in which Memphis grew from its modest size at the end of the Civil War to its development as a mature, major American city.

Unlike many other Southern cities, Memphis emerged relatively unscathed from the ravages of the Civil War, because the city fell to Union forces at an early point in the war without having sustained a prolonged siege or battle for its capture (Sigafoos 1979: 44-45). Its agricultural-based economy was restored in a reasonably short time, but the city did not resume business exactly as it had been before the war. The modern history of Memphis' residential character is essentially tied to the year 1865, when the development of the Memphis Street Railway began. This one service was to dramatically change the pattern of daily life in Memphis by permitting expanded mobility between the home and workplace, even for the working class. The Memphis Street Railway was a significant factor in shaping the residential development of Memphis until well after World War I, at which time the automobile began to replace mass transit in Memphis as the means of travel between the home and workplace. The rise of the automobile as a major form of transportation also had significant influence on the location and character of residential development in Memphis. The eighty-five year period covered by this historic context effectively ends with an annexation by the City in 1950, which essentially brought the city's limits to the "natural" boundaries established by the bottoms of the Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek.

This multiple property listing was begun as a building block for the evaluation of future nominations of all eligible residential resources within the city limits of 1950. It was prepared to recognize common patterns evident in these resources and to place them and previously nominated properties within a perspective of their historical contexts. The cover form will be followed by the nomination of residential historic districts which reflect these patterns. There will be many future projects developed under this Multiple Properties Documentation Form. Other, additional contexts and associated property types may also be forthcoming as further research and evaluation of historic resources progresses, and as the opportunities arise to pursue nominations of eligible resources.

Two property types were identified for inclusion in the multiple property listing of residential resources. They are: 1.) Residential Historic Districts and, 2.) Individual Historic Residences. There are many other historic contexts and property types to be found in Memphis which will stand for nomination in the future, but they are outside the scope this project.

Much of the historical information which follows was based upon the extensive work of Robert Johnson of the Memphis Landmarks Commission, who organized contextual histories as a planning basis for the *Memphis Historic Preservation Plan*, which the City adopted in 1997. We have freely

borrowed from this work, with our appreciation to the author and with the permission of the Memphis Landmarks Commission.

STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXT: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN MEMPHIS (1865 - 1950)

The location of Memphis as a settlement site on the Mississippi River was already well-established when the city was founded by John Overton, et al., in 1819, it having been an aboriginal ceremonial site for many centuries, followed by Spanish and French occupations. The city became a bustling center related to the inland cotton trade, given its ample wharfage on the Mississippi River. Its position as a trade center was firmly established in 1857 with the opening of the Memphis and Charleston Railroad, the first interstate rail line in the South to connect the Atlantic Ocean with the Mississippi River (Harkins 1982: 61). The strategic importance of the river-rail link at Memphis made it a key target for Union forces in the first year of the Civil War. Memphis fell to the Union in June 1862 after a short naval battle, and remained occupied for the duration of the conflict (Harkins 1982: 41-44).

Memphis rebounded quickly from the effects of the war, aided by the immediate reopening of unrestricted trade on the Mississippi River in 1865, the reopening of the Memphis & Charleston Railroad in 1866, and the reopening of the Mississippi & Tennessee and Memphis & Ohio railroads in 1867. These important connections reopened trade to the surrounding agricultural region, thus quickly fueling new profits to the cotton brokers and commission merchants of Cotton Row (NR 8/1/79). In some other cities of the South, such as Richmond and Atlanta, many additional years passed before their trade networks were re-established and their infrastructure rebuilt (Sigafoos 1979: 44-45).

A housing analysis prepared in 1865 would have shown that the greatest concentrations of free-standing residences were generally west of the Bayou Gayoso, to the north of Vance Avenue and to the south of Auction Avenue. The wealthy and elite of Memphis generally lived in detached residences along Adams, Monroe, Court and Poplar between Second and Fourth Streets, or to the south of Beale Street along Front Street. The middle class and the poor generally resided in boarding houses or in apartments over their shops; however, free-standing housing for the working and middle classes was also available in densely populated neighborhoods to the south of Beale Street, to the north along the Gayoso Bayou, and in the Pinch area at the north end of Main Street (Memphis Tax Book 1865; Dennison 1865).

Some upper-income suburbanization had occurred east of the Bayou Gayoso and west of the city limit at East Street, with some concentrations in the Vance-Ponotoc neighborhood and in the area of High Street and Adams Avenue that is in and adjacent to the Victorian Village Historic District (NR 12/11/72). Development of the Vance-Ponotoc area began in the early 1840s as the independent town of South Memphis; South Memphis was annexed by mutual agreement of its city fathers with those of Memphis in 1849 (Harkins 1982: 64). The annexation agreement of 1849 also encompassed the unincorporated area of development in the vicinity of High Street and Adams Avenue, making the city's boundaries effectively Calhoun Avenue on the south, East and Dunlap Streets on the east, and Auction Avenue on the north.

Outside the pre-1865 city limits lay other areas of significant housing development; one of these was Fort Pickering, also known as Chickasaw City, begun ca. 1845 by real estate speculator John C. McLemore and others. It became an important area of working and middle income housing by the 1850s, and increasingly so in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Unfortunately, this once vital community is completely lost today, a victim of the industrialization of the area surrounding the Frisco Railroad Bridge following its opening in 1892, and after, with urban renewal clearance of the area in the mid-1960s.

Another antebellum suburb with more lasting importance was Greenlaw, begun by the Greenlaw brothers, John and William, prominent local contractors and the owners of a brick manufacturing company. In 1856, they opened the Greenlaw Addition (NR 8/16/1984) for development and marketed lots within the development largely to the middle class. The Greenlaw Addition was bounded generally by Second Street on the west, Chelsea on the north, Seventh Street on the east, and Auction Avenue on the south. Many of the early residents of the Greenlaw Addition were working-class families who found their employment in the early sawmills and manufactories along the Bayou Gayoso near the mouth of the Mississippi River. The Greenlaw development was slow to become a magnet for the middle class artisans, shop owners, clerks and others, who found themselves able to afford a small house in Greenlaw but who had commute to their workplace by foot, hackney or carriage across the Second Street bridge, the only route leading to the city's core at this time.

The burgeoning post-Civil War business climate in Memphis led to the development and redevelopment of residential housing patterns in the city. The opening of the first line of the mule-drawn Memphis Street Railway during the late 1860s along Main Street made possible a greater separation between the home and workplace, a situation that was particularly attractive to the growing ranks of the middle class (Sigafoos 1979: 105-06). Its second line opened later in the same year and ran along Second Street, crossing the Second Street bridge over the Gayoso Bayou into the Greenlaw's subdivision. At that time Greenlaw truly began to become a successful housing

development, containing a wide variety of middle-income residential house types common to this period: the shotgun, the double crib cottage, the center hall cottage, the side hall townhouse and others among them. The renewed growth of the area caused the city to annex it in 1870, along with the Fort Pickering community to the city's south. This was the first expansion of the city's boundaries in more than twenty years.

By 1870, the Memphis economy was booming once again, not just because of the river trade with the cotton brokers and the commission merchants, but also because of the growth of industrial facilities such as the cotton oil mills established on the waterfront on the site of the former Memphis Navy Yard, and further development of sawmills and box mills along the Bayou Gayoso. Italianate and Second Empire residences built for printer John S. Toof (246 Adams Avenue, 1873-76, NR 3/25/1982), riverboat company owner James Lee (239 Adams Avenue, 1869-70, NR 10/2/1978), the Woodruff-Fontaine House (680 Adams Avenue, 1870-71, part Victorian Village, NR 12/11/1972), built for railroad promoter Amos Woodruff, and the house of clothing retailer John A. Austin (290 S. Front Street, ca. 1875, NR 7/12/1984), all stand today as legacies of the prosperity of the Memphis economy in this period and of some of the individuals who prospered within it.

The economic stability of the city was challenged in 1873, in part because of a national recession and in part due to the third outbreak of Memphis' periodic bouts with Yellow Fever (previous minor outbreaks occurred in 1855 and again in 1868). The previous epidemics had been serious enough, but had little overall effect on the local economy. This time, however, the plague occurred in conjunction with cholera and smallpox, leaving 2,000 dead by the time the first frost killed the plague-carrying mosquitoes. The city was financially strapped as a result of the impact of the disease and the recession, and was unable to execute measures to improve sanitation and drainage that might have prevented recurrences of the disease (Harkins 1982: 88-89).

The fourth of the Yellow Fever epidemics in 1878-79 crippled the city, and its effects lasted for more than a decade. By the end of this two-year spate of disease, more than 6,000 had died, more than half of the city's white population had fled, and most were never to return. Entire segments of the community had perished or fled the city; for example, virtually all of the city's significant pre-Fever population of German immigrants fled the city to take up new residence in St. Louis (Capers 1966: 198-205). The state legislature repealed the city's charter in January 1879 after the city's tax base had collapsed and Memphis was bankrupt. The city's status as a "Taxing District" - effectively, a ward of the state with no powers to levy new taxes or to issue bonds - would remain in place for twelve years (Sigafoos 1979: 58-60).

In hindsight, the imposition of the Taxing District had its beneficial effects for the city. The measures taken to improve the city's public health conditions were executed by a legislature appointed by the

state governor, and thus were carried out without concern for political impact (Harkins 1982: 92-95). The measures were strict and costly, but the long-term value to the city was well worth the difficulties and the investment. The city began its recovery with the initiation of a strict sanitary code, which led to the design and construction of a revolutionary sanitary sewer system designed by engineer George E. Waring, Jr. (died 1898), its initial segment completed in 1881. The poor quality of the city's water supply, fed from the muddied Wolf River, led to the discovery in 1887 of a vast aquifer beneath the city, with a virtually inexhaustible supply of pure drinking water (Sigafoos 1979: 61-63). Both of these improvements in the city's circumstances had a major effect on economic and residential development in the decades to follow.

The effects of Yellow Fever on the patterns of housing development in the 1880s is unclear, due to lack of previous research into the question. While the vast number of deaths and relocations from the city must have caused something of a housing glut and a devaluation of real estate values, the actual effect was apparently short-lived as real estate values climbed steadily and surpassed their former pre-Fever levels by ca. 1890 (Sigafoos 1979: 60). A part of the rebound can be attributed to the agricultural recession of cotton prices throughout the 1880s and early 1890s, which fueled, in part, a significant wave of rural to urban migration among both African-American and Anglo-Americans (Sigafoos 1979: 70). Documentation of residential development patterns and forms from this period is extremely difficult due to the few structures remaining from the period today.

Though the lingering effects of the Yellow Fever epidemics still retarded Memphis' ability to attract outside capital for investment, the city's continued reliance on the cotton market did provide capital, which was largely re-invested into cotton-related warehousing and processing facilities. A new source of industrial and job growth appeared in the early 1880s, when the sawmills of Memphis began to supply the national demand for hardwood lumber, harvested from the vast upland oak forests that filled much of the Mississippi River valley (Harkins 1982: 97-98). The new industry spawned related enterprises: box mills, flooring manufacturers, barrel manufacturers, furniture manufacturers and sash, door and blind manufacturers among them. In spite of its reputation caused by the Fever epidemics, the city had a growing need for workers to replace the predominantly immigrant Irish and German populations which had left the city during the epidemics. While many of these lumber industry jobs were filled by the city's existing African-American population, the demand for workers was a magnet attracting additional populations of whites and African-Americans to the city, and away from the rural poverty in the surrounding region. The effect was that the 1880 Memphis population of 34,000 was to more than double by 1890, and then nearly double again to 102,000 by 1900. (Sigafoos 1979: 63).

By the early 1880s, six rail lines served the Memphis area; seven more were added in less than a decade, including the lines which were merged into the Illinois Central Railroad system. However, a

major problem remained in connecting the rail lines of the east with the markets of the growing west: there was no bridge over the Mississippi River below St. Louis. River-rail ports had been established before the Civil War, allowing the exchange of cargo over river ferries; these inefficient systems were replaced in the 1870s by rail ferries, which offered only slightly more efficiency. The Kansas City, Fort Scott and Memphis Railroad (later the Frisco Railroad) assumed the risk of building the $3,000,000 bridge project beginning in 1888, completing what was the third-longest bridge in the world in 1892 (Harkins 1982: 99). It was a time of great celebration, not just for the opening of the bridge, but also for the return of the city's charter the year before, and its taxing powers the year after.

Construction of the Frisco Bridge, as it is commonly called, became the landmark of an era of renewed confidence and economic growth, and of changing residential patterns. For example, redevelopment in Memphis' original downtown core began to displace older residential development in favor of new commercial buildings; the construction of the Frisco Bridge created the demand for rail-related facilities between the bridge and downtown, resulting in nearly complete transformation of this area from residential to warehouse uses (South Bluffs Historic District, NR 6/4/1987). The John A. Austin House at 290 South Front Street is one of the few residences left standing in this once elegant residential community.

Economic growth, population growth, and the loss of former residential areas to new commercial and industrial development created new dynamics for residential development between 1880 and 1900. Residential development began to move away from the old city core, a migration made possible by the suburban extension of street car lines. For the wealthy, the eastern reaches of the city provided sites along Vance, Linden, Ponotoc, Adams, Madison and Jefferson avenues for the construction of new homes. Examples of the residences built for the well-to-do from this period show the influence of some new architectural styles, and the survival of others; however, the same was not true of the general characteristics of house types and plans, which were slow to change even in the houses of the wealthy. By example, the J. J. Busby House on Vance Avenue in 1882 (part Vance-Ponotoc Historic District, NR 3/19/1980, removed NR 3/18/1987) is a large Italianate house similar in style and character to others built in Memphis a generation before. The stylistic elements of the Romanesque Revival style can be seen in the 1890 Elias Lowenstein House (NR 3/23/1979) on Jefferson Avenue, though its tower and center hall-based floor plan were also surviving traits from Italianate and Second Empire houses. The 1886 Molly Fontaine House on Adams (part Victorian Village Historic District, NR 12/11/1972), while an exuberant example of the Queen Anne style, still holds to a simple variation of the side hall townhouse in its floor plan. Even so, new forms arrived in the community, such as the very unusual T-plan townhouse design of the 1885 Reverend George White House on Vance (part Vance-Ponotoc Historic District, NR 3/19/1980, removed NR 3/18/1987), a truly rare example of the Jacobean Revival style. The Dr. William Voorheis House on Vance and the Newton

Richards House on Peabody Avenue (NR 7/12/1984) were built in 1893 and 1889, respectively, with much more ambitious, asymmetrical floor plans, as the trends in residential design in Memphis began to follow newer, more national precedents.

The greatest housing demand in the period immediately before the turn of the century was for the working and middle classes. Vast areas of housing sprang up in North and South Memphis to respond to the demand, including the redevelopment of portions of existing neighborhoods such as Greenlaw. Real estate developers such as Robert Church, Sr., and others were among those to profit from the demand, building substantial numbers of shotgun houses, double-shotgun houses, double-crib houses and other forms of small cottages which the working-class families of Memphis could afford. Church concentrated most of his development activities in areas of the city south of Beale Street, often building worker housing near some of the more affluent houses of Vance and Ponotoc avenues, like the double-shotguns built by Church on Hernando Street south of Vance, built ca. 1890. Elsewhere within the city, other developers responded to the same demand with the construction of shotgun districts such as the Delmar-Lema Shotgun Historic District (NR 3/12/98), begun ca. 1895 near the city's eastern edge on Delmar Street just north of Poplar Avenue. The building of large areas of shotgun houses and other worker housing continued well into the 1920s, though many of these enclaves have disappeared since ca. 1935 due to slum-clearance and urban renewal initiatives.

The shotgun is generally accepted as a characteristically Southern housing form; and shotgun neighborhoods, or districts, as they are commonly called, are generally accepted as a housing developed exclusively for occupation by African-Americans. The diminutive cottage has been cast into this role by the combination of effects of Jim Crow segregation and the stereotyping that went along with it, but the truth of the matter is far more subtle and elusive. The shotgun houses of Memphis do not hold an answer to the origins of the shotgun, but rather point out a larger sense of its use since the Civil War.

In Memphis, the shotgun cannot be conclusively dated before ca. 1870 at this time. The earliest known forms were built as the owner-occupied dwellings of Germans and Irish on the edges of the Greenlaw area along North Second Street (Hopkins 1996). Beginning in about ca. 1880 with the in-migration of rural families, the shotgun began to be developed in large numbers as rental housing. Shotgun districts might include as few as ten structures or as many as fifty or more, though the number of developments of this size were rare in Memphis, according to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps of the period (Sanborn 1887, 1897), unlike other Southern cities such as New Orleans and Louisville. Also contrary to the perception, the shotgun districts were open rental housing in Memphis, not developments linked to a particular industrial concern, like the shotguns of the

Piedmont areas North and South Carolina developed as "company towns," usually in conjunction with textile mills.

Another misconception is that shotgun districts were developed as segregated housing for African-Americans in the late nineteenth and early-twentieth century. Again, this was certainly not always the case, if ever exclusively so before World War I. For example, the shotguns of the Delmar-Lema shotgun district were occupied by a mixture of races late in the nineteenth and early in the twentieth century; as late as 1924, the newly-developed shotguns of the Wells-Arrington Historic District (NR pending) were occupied solely by Anglo-Americans in a larger neighborhood made up of both races. The effects of segregation came late to the housing of the working class, though there is little doubt that the opportunities afforded Anglo-Americans in the selection of housing were greater than those opportunities afforded African-Americans. There is no question that the segregation of housing opportunities was occurring, but it appears that its institutionalized regulators did not apply to those of modest means. Ironically, it seems that the public housing projects built by the Public Works Administration in the mid-1930s may have been the first places in Memphis where race was a consideration when finding housing for the truly poor (see Public Housing Projects in Memphis MPS, 7/25/1996).

The improving economic picture at the end of the century led to other factors that shaped residential development which was characterized by the increasing influence of suburban development outside of the city's limits. Prior to ca. 1885, suburban development had occurred only sporadically, limited generally by proximity to railroad lines with inter-urban service, such as the Southern (formerly Memphis & Charleston) Railroad's "Accommodation Line," which ran twice-daily service from Memphis to Collierville. Even with this service, residential development was limited to individual farms or estates, like Maxwelton (NR 3/10/1980), built ca. 1874 on Southern Avenue, and the Cheatham farm, built ca. 1884 on Blythe Street (part Cooper-Young Historic District, NR 6/22/1989), or to small whistle-stop communities like Buntyn (Southern Avenue at Semmes) and Whitehaven (Elvis Presley Boulevard at Shelby Drive).

The change in suburban development began in 1884 with the construction of the Citizen's East End Railway Company, followed soon after by the formation of the Suburban Street Car Line in 1891. The East End Railway ran on Madison from the center of the city to its own amusement park near the corner of Cooper and Madison, then down Cooper to Montgomery Park, a pleasure ground and horse racing track owned by the New Memphis Jockey Club. The Suburban Line ran out to McLemore Avenue to Mississippi Boulevard, and a Latham Avenue division, which ran over Trigg Avenue and South Lauderdale Street. A third major line added at this time was the Raleigh Springs Railroad, an inter-urban trolley that ran to Raleigh Springs and its resort hotel on the Wolf River (Sigafoos 1979: 105-06).

Both the Citizens and the Suburban trolley were developed to serve a market demand on a daily basis, not just weekend or special events traffic to East End or Montgomery Parks. The enormous growth in Memphis' population between 1880 and 1900 had created a huge demand for housing, much of which was being built outside of the city limits. The streetcar lines made suburban development possible, especially for the middle classes; the street car lines were built because the promoters of the lines were made up of real estate interests and/or worked closely with their interests at heart (Sigafoos 1979: 105-06).

For example, speculative development occurred ca. 1890 along the East End line in areas that began to be known as Idlewild, Lenox (part Idlewild-Lenox Station Historic District, NR pending), Mount Arlington (part Cooper-Young Historic District, NR 6/22/1989) and Madison Heights (near Madison Avenue and Claybrook), among others. The Suburban line also served suburban populations, including Estival Park (Peabody Avenue east of East Street), and a growing commercial and residential population further south surrounding the intersection of Mississippi Boulevard and Walker Avenues (Memphis Heritage, Inc. 1989: Cover form for Census District 59), including the Pond Subdivision of 1890 at McLemore and Lucy Street.

Contrary to what one might imagine, the great majority of the demand for housing in the newly created pre-1900 suburbs was among low- to low-middle income families, not upper middle-income or the wealthy. The subdivision developers responded by tailoring their properties and the houses developed on them to that market. The subdivision and residential development patterns within the new suburban communities varied widely, due to the lack of land use controls and building standards. Many of the subdivisions were created as so-called "shotgun subdivisions" that featured minimum lot widths of as little as 12 1/2 feet, dubbed "pony lots" by some. The Mount Arlington Subdivision, developed by Frank Trimble with the cooperation of the Citizen's East End Railroad, was an example of this type, where lots were laid out with 25' frontages and lots depths of 80' without the benefit of rear alleys for accessibility or fire protection. Prospective buyers, most of them speculators, were allowed to buy and develop as many or as few lots as they desired. As a result, streets in Mount Arlington such as Philadelphia and Blythe were developed with houses placed on single, double or triple lots; in that (and other) areas, a single shotgun house can be found standing between two-story houses.

The small house or cottage was the predominant form of residential development in the pre-1900 suburbs. Shotgun houses and their variations, L-plan cottages, cubical cottages, and composite cottages and their variations were all among the pattern language of house designs in these new communities. Architectural styling applied to these modest homes most often consisted of Queen Anne and Colonial Revival elements of stock millwork components from local sources.

A notable exception to this pattern was the development of Orange Mound by E. E. Meacham in 1890. Meacham was responsible for the development of many subdivisions in Memphis during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, but none was more intriguing than Orange Mound. Meacham's stock in trade in his developments was the "shotgun suburb," which he developed intentionally to serve a predominantly African-American market, largely for rental housing. In effect, Meacham was exploiting the slowly tightening effects of segregation on the housing market following the U. S. Supreme Court decision of 1896 in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. Orange Mound was developed in an area quite remote from the rest of the suburban development on the city's eastern edges, and it was also remote from the various streetcar lines and other transportation networks existing in the city and its suburbs. Perhaps for this reason, Orange Mound developed into a vital African-American community with distinct characteristics. Its housing stock, composed of composite cottages, variations on shotgun houses, bungalows, L-front double-pile cottages and other cottage forms, developed slowly in the nineteenth century but increased pace in the early-twentieth century.

The consolidation and electrification of all of the competing street car lines into the Memphis Street Railway Company in 1891 by Chicago capitalists C. B. Holmes and A. M. Billings brought faster trolleys and expanded service, and spurred the pace of suburban development (Sigafoos 1979: 105-106). Though not known from contemporary accounts, the pace of development on the suburban fringe must have concerned local politicians, not only due to the potential tax revenues being lost out the street car lines, but also due to the potential for future suburban incorporation, "land locking" Memphis from growth by annexation in much the same way as that occurring in St. Louis at the same time. The issue was made more urgent by the large numbers of suburban residents around the eastern and southern edges of the city, numbering some 58,000 people by 1900 (Sigafoos 1979: 98).

The suburban question came to the forefront of public attention in the mid-1890s. A group of the city's civic, real estate and industrial leaders banded together as "The Committee of One Hundred" and produced a consensus vision for the city in 1895, promoted as the "Greater Memphis Movement" (Sigafoos 1979: 99-101). The progressive agenda advocated by the Greater Memphis Movement included the annexation of suburban areas and the extension of water and sewer lines into these areas, the construction of new schools throughout new and old areas of the city, the development of a park system, and the creation of a municipal water and gas company to better serve the public's interest. The issue came to a head in the election of 1897, and while both candidates publicly endorsed the reform movement, the Committee of One Hundred supported John J. Williams, who won the election.

Williams took the agenda of the Greater Memphis Movement and enacted it with surprising speed. Annexation of a vast amount of land bound by Trigg Avenue on the south, Cooper Street on the east and Vollentine Avenue on the north was begun in 1897 but not completed until after resolution of a court challenge and the revision of state enabling legislation in 1899. In the interim, the towns of Idlewild and Lenox had both voted for incorporation; in the face of a lengthy court challenge, Idlewild surrendered its charter and was brought into the city. Lenox did not surrender its charter for another decade.

State legislation in 1897 was also required to establish the Memphis Park Commission; a court challenge also had to be resolved before the Park Commission could formally meet for the first time in 1900. Once established, the Park Commission enacted its ambitious programs to acquire and develop small and large parks throughout the city, including the newly annexed area, and to connect them with a series of major and minor parkways that could spur residential development (see Memphis Parkway System, NR 7/3/1989, and Overton Park Historic District, NR 10/25/1979). The development of Overton Park was the Commissions' first priority in 1901, followed by Riverside Park in 1903, all funded by the sale of bonds issued by the Commission. The other key element of the plan, the system of parkways at the city's perimeter, followed in 1904 and was completed in 1905. The concept of using park development and utility improvements to spur residential development quickly achieved its objective.

The construction of main line sewers and water lines into the newly annexed area began almost immediately after the sale of bonds and was largely completed by ca. 1905. With these improvements came an explosion of activity in areas of existing development and in the creation of new subdivisions. Annesdale Park and Annesdale-Snowden were among the first of these, developed in 1903 and 1906, respectively (NR 12/22/1978 and 10/25/1979). Annesdale-Snowden was developed on a portion of the property surrounding Annesdale (NR 11/25/1980), the mid-nineteenth century rural estate owned by Robert Snowden. As development moved eastward and southward, other properties formerly held as estates or plantation centers were subdivided for new housing, leaving some of the original rural dwellings as evidence of nineteenth century development patterns. A few of these properties include the Buntyn-Ramsey House (part Goodwyn Street Historic District, NR 3/9/1990), the Eli Rayner House (NR 5/9/1977), and the Rozelle House (part Central Gardens Historic District, NR 9/9/1982).

The rush to develop the newly annexed area initiated concern within city government for instituting control of the development process, leading to the adoption of rudimentary city planning controls. One enlightened step toward this end was taken in 1901, when the city sued a major real estate developer for his proposed development of a vast shotgun subdivision (Sigafoos 1979: 101-02). The city's position was upheld by the United States Circuit Court. Apart from other basic forms of

subdivision regulation, regarding technical issues such as the minimum widths of streets and the like, another twenty years passed before the city adopted formal comprehensive planning and land use controls.

Instead, the city took an approach that was successful in other cities. Following the model he first developed in 1890 in Kansas City, George Kessler, the Park Commission's landscape architect, began campaigning for the creation of a secondary parkway system that would lead from the major streets and the new parkways, penetrating residential areas as they developed. The Park Commission was given the right to review subdivision plans by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen in 1906. The effects of their first efforts can be seen in the curvilinear, tree-lined median of Belvedere Boulevard, an improvement funded entirely by the subdivision developer but maintained by the Park Commission. The efforts to develop a secondary parkway system were not entirely successful due to changes in the Mayor's office in 1908. However, the intent of Kessler's vision can be seen in the form of medians that were imposed over existing streets such as Central Avenue and developed in many other new subdivisions before the effort was stalled. The medians of Tutwiler Avenue in the Speedway Terrace Historic District (NR pending) and the unique "court" subdivision plan of the Fountain Court Historic District (NR pending) were both products of this vision fostered by Kessler, among others, in the city.

Housing development before World War I in the newly annexed areas of the city was surprisingly different from that which had occurred previously. The major difference was that this wave of development appealed to the middle and upper income families of the city, not just the working-class families. Developers responded accordingly, with developments that could be inclusive or exclusive. To a degree, the marketplace was a determining factor, not the developer. For example, Annesdale-Snowden was envisioned by Robert Brinkley Snowden as a middle-income subdivision, but once offered to the open market its desirability drove up prices to a more exclusive level (Johnson 1990: 212-13). As a result, the area of Annesdale-Snowden that developed early (ca. 1906-1910) to the west of Bellevue is composed mostly of small frame or stucco composite cottages and bungalows, but the areas developed later, to the east of Bellevue Boulevard, are mostly stone veneer four-squares and large Craftsman houses.

The houses in Brinkley's Annesdale Snowden and Annesdale Park, along with contemporary subdivisions like Belvedere (Central Gardens, NR 9/9/1982), and Stonewall Place (NR 3/25/1982) were developed for the most part with larger scale residences for upper-middle class families and the wealthy. The four-square and its variations appear to be the most common house type within both neighborhoods, though there are significant numbers of architect-designed houses in these areas with floor plans that defy categorization. Larger scale bungalows, Craftsman houses and other types

can also be found in significant numbers, detailed with Colonial Revival, Craftsman, Tudor Revival Mediterranean Revival, Classical Revival and other stylistic influences.

The new suburbs were as attractive to the working and middle class after annexation as they were before, perhaps more so because public utilities were available after 1899. For example, from the core subdivision of Mount Arlington emerged the greater neighborhood of Cooper-Young, as wave after wave of subdivisions were taken by home builders to build residences for the working and middle classes. Much the same experience was shared by the older residential areas of Idlewild, Lenox, Madison Heights, and others. By ca. 1905, the Craftsman bungalow had begun to compete with the composite cottage as a mainstay of the home builder and a favorite of the home buyer. Apart from the Craftsman style, the Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival and lingering applications of the Queen Anne Revival style were the most popular architectural styles applied to the cottages and bungalows built in these neighborhoods.

As major portions of the population began to move to the new areas of the city, the first signs of change in the older areas of the city began to occur. Perhaps no where was this effect more recognizable today than in Greenlaw, where new development practically ceased after the Mississippi River Flood of 1912. Due to the lack of a levee and a flood control system for the Bayou Gayoso, the floodwaters of the Mississippi backed up into the bayou, flooding most of Greenlaw for a month. The housing stock of Greenlaw remained occupied and useful afterward, but its values began a slow decline, and with those declining values came the exchange of owner-occupancy for predominantly rental occupancy by the 1950s. Another example of the effect of eastward suburbanization is the St. Paul Street Historic District, an informally-developed area on the eastern fringe of the city before 1899, which changed to an area composed of mostly double-shotgun rental housing by 1925. (NR pending). The same experience was shared by other older areas of the city, even including the former "silk stocking" district of Vance-Ponotoc.

The impact of the automobile caused few physical changes in the design patterns of subdivisions in pre-World War I Memphis, though it did begin to effect the location of developments at about this time. Morningside Park, with development beginning in 1916 as an exclusive subdivision, was the first housing area in the city with virtually no connection with the street car lines of the city. It was followed by Strathmore Place in 1917 (NR pending), and Hein Park in 1923 (NR 11/16/1988). Each of these subdivisions, along with many others that followed in the years ahead, was consciously planned to be in-ward facing and self contained, to isolate them from the surrounding traffic pattern (a trend really begun with Fountain Court in 1907). In the absence of comprehensive transportation planning and land use controls, this approach to site planning was not always an attempt to provide exclusivity for the wealthy, but instead was a device to protect the integrity of a development from the noise and intrusions of contemporary life, as well as from incursions of inappropriate land use

development. The example of Strathmore Place underscores this point, because houses developed there included some that were affordable to middle-income families as well as some for upper-middle families.

The economic boom in Memphis created a situation ca. 1915-20 which dramatically changed the speed of development in the annexed area. The city's population of 131,105 in 1910 had grown to 162,351 in 1920; it would exceed 253,143 in the Census of 1930 (Sigafoos 1979: 140). Unemployment was low, wages were high, and land costs in the subdivisions were being forced down by the large amount of land for sale. Lumber costs were the lowest in history, due to the clear-cutting of the vast pine forests of Southern Mississippi; the costs of other building materials such as brick had dropped as a result of improved manufacturing techniques. The combination of these factors created the real opportunity for home ownership among the middle class, the likes of which had not been seen before. Block after block of Colonial Revival cottages and Craftsman bungalows were built to fill in older neighborhoods such as Cooper-Young, and Speedway Terrace. The same trends created new subdivisions like Vollentine Evergreen (NR 4/12/1996), Glenview (NR pending), and Shadowlawn (NR 8/14/1995), among many others; this trend continued unabated up to the threshold of the Great Depression. In the 1920s, the housing boom of the era produced more than 10,000 single-family housing units out of the total of 18,000 units of all housing types built in the period (Sigafoos 1979: 153).

During this period the automobile began to affect the physical design of suburban development, though its full impact would not be felt for many years. The automobile became increasingly common in the middle-income suburb of the 1920s, but in most cases, the subdivision plan had been set in motion years before the automobile was considered in its planning. The Strathmore Place subdivision of 1917 may be the earliest that includes evidence of site planning for the automobile, since its design set aside specific locations for "garages" in two of its most confined lots (Plat Book 7: 74). Subdivisions with larger lots were easily adapted for a driveway and garage if one was deemed necessary, while other subdivision plans, like that of Annesdale-Snowden, had rear alleys that allowed placement of garages accessible from the alleys with no need for front-yard drives. Older subdivisions, like those of Idlewild, still have streets with few developed drives and fewer still with surviving garages, since the lot constraints and lack of rear alleys made the development of a drive and a garage quite difficult, if not impossible.

By 1925, though, the accommodation of the automobile within a subdivision development had become the rule, not an afterthought. Neighborhoods like Shadowlawn, developed by William C. Chandler in 1925, not only included enough frontage for a well-appointed, middle-income bungalow, but also included the driveway as one of the standard improvements. The porte-cochère, once a

feature of only the homes of upper-middle and upper-income houses prior to World War I, became nearly a standard feature of the middle-class Craftsman bungalow by ca. 1925.

Development in Memphis during the 1910s and 1920s was not confined to the 1899 annexation area alone. New South Memphis, a planned industrial community on South Third Street at Nonconnah Creek, was developed by a consortium of industrialists to include residential areas for its workers. The Douglass community, located near the intersection of Chelsea and Warford, was a predominately African-American neighborhood begun ca. 1905. Binghampton and the accompanying commercial strip along Broad Avenue were developed in 1900 to house the workers of the American Car Company plant; and Highland Heights, a large community was developed in the 1910s and 1920s along Summer Avenue and north towards Jackson, east of Highland. Industrial development between Jackson and Chelsea provided employment for those living in this community of composite cottages and bungalows.

However, the availability of automobile to large segments of the population in the 1920s allowed Memphis to grow eastward, which was (and still is) especially enticing to upper-income families who sought the peace and serenity of a "rural" estate. Residential development steadily spread to the east, and the city's annexations followed that development path.

The automobile allowed the establishment of the Memphis Country Club at Goodwyn Street and Southern Avenue in 1905, leading to the development of substantial residences on estate-sized lots along Goodwyn Street itself (NR 3/9/1990) as an enclave for the very wealthy before World War I. The development of the Memphis Country Club and Goodwyn Street also spurred the development of a significant line of estate-sized properties along Central Avenue between Buntyn and Lafayette Street in the 1910s and 1920s. Premier among these was the Clarence Saunders' massive estate of *Cla-Le-Clare* (also known as the Pink Palace, NR 7/9/80), developed beginning in 1922, but never completed. Portions of the 160 acre estate, where Saunders had built a golf course, were sold in 1927 as the nucleus of Chickasaw Gardens subdivision, left incomplete due to the Great Depression.

The Model T and the Model A Ford automobiles also allowed the middle class to follow the same trends, resulting in neighborhoods such as the East Buntyn Historic District (NR 11/22/1995) developed to the east of the Memphis Country Club in the 1920s and 1930s; and, a similar area of middle class development occurred beginning in the late 1920s in the Buntyn-Messick area. The housing stock built in these neighborhoods includes late examples of the bungalow, variations of the Cape Cod houses, or simply "Capes," small Colonial Revival cottages built in imitation of center hall plan houses, and variations on the English cottage with its front-wall chimney and stripped-down Craftsman or Tudor Revival influence.

Affluent areas "Out East," as the area was called, included development of Red Acres, a development begun ca. 1923 by H. W. Brennan. The development plan included the gift of 120 acres to the City for the construction of a golf course, now part of Galloway Park. The area became an exclusive enclave, with minimum construction costs for houses on the lots in the development mandated, with the highest costs restrictions placed on those lots facing the course itself (Sigafoos 1979: 153). Here were built very large residences designed by some of the city's best architects, executed in forms of the Tudor Revival, Colonial Revival and Classical Revival, such as the Walk C. Jones, Sr. House on South Galloway Drive, a large Tudor Revival house designed by the architect as his own home. Vacant lots in the subdivision were still left for sale after World War II, leaving room for the construction of newer homes from the 1940s up to the 1980s.

The spread eastward continued through the 1930s, though the pace slowed due to the effects of the Depression. Large-lot estates were developed sporadically through the 1930s, between Poplar Avenue and Walnut Grove Road, reaching as far east as Waring Road. One notable area among these was The Village subdivision along Williamsburg Lane east of Goodlett Street, which was developed by William C. Chandler beginning in 1938, to the designs of architect J. Frazier Smith (Johnson 1990: 334-35). This development used adaptations of the Georgian style throughout, a style brought into vogue by the restorations at Colonial Williamsburg; the so-called "Williamsburg Revival" phase of the Colonial Revival remained popular for new developments well into the 1960s. Even though this subdivision was considered upper middle income, the scale of its houses is small in comparison with upper-middle income housing built a decade or two before, perhaps a reflection of the times and economic conditions brought on by the Depression.

In the last half of the 1930s, the architect J. Frazier Smith rose in prominence as a significant figure in residential development in Memphis, and his influence in shaping the style and quality of residential architecture for the low-income and middle-income families of Memphis lasted for many years. Smith's first contact with the design of affordable housing came in 1936, when he was selected to design the Lauderdale Courts Public Housing Complex for the newly-created Memphis Public Housing Authority (NR 7/25/1996). Soon after, Smith was approached by the Federal Housing Authority and asked to assist with designing affordable housing that would be built under loans guaranteed by the FHA. In 1937, Smith established the Memphis Small House Construction Bureau in conjunction with a local group of architects, developers and contractors, who produced more than one hundred stock plans for houses within a price range of $2,000 to $6,000. The project was considered a great success, when the FHA reported that 95% of the house plans submitted for loan guarantees in 1938 were architect-designed. (Johnson 1990: 217-218).

The impact of Smith's work can be seen in two other contemporary developments to that of The Village: the first, is the Rosemary Lane/ Park Lane Subdivision of 1937, in which Smith tested many

of his ideas for the design of small, affordable houses, each given individual treatments of Williamsburg Revival and Colonial Revival details; the second development was Prescott Circle, which Smith designed for William C. Chandler, whose experience with the development of affordable middle class housing had been tried and found successful with developments in Shadowlawn and Speedway Terrace, among others. Prescott Circle was begun in 1941 though it was not entirely built-out until after World War II. Houses designed by Smith built here include interesting variations on the Cape house form, detailed in a stripped down Colonial Revival form often referred to as Minimal Traditional, a style that was largely maintained in Prescott Circle after the war.

World War II brought a nearly complete halt to residential construction between 1942 and 1945, though there probably are exceptions that can be found. Nonetheless, the building boom that had so dramatically transformed the appearance of Memphis in the forty years before the war resumed with renewed vigor immediately after its end. The G. I. Bill of Rights enacted during the Roosevelt Administration to reward all veterans for their service was the impetus for the development of many new neighborhoods and completion of the development of older ones.

The close of World War II brought 30,000 veterans back to Memphis, and with them, a renewed housing shortage. City leaders implored home builders to create new supplies of single-family housing to meet the demand. The builders responded by creating 8,500 new homes in 1946 and 1947 (Sigafoos 1979: 214). By 1952, the shortage of single-family homes available to Anglo-American families was largely over, there having been 25,500 single-family units built between 1945 and 1952.

According to a phamplet published by the Memphis Housing Authority in 1947, not only had veterans returned to the city, but more students were attending school and new industrial firms were moving into Memphis. As a result, home builders, real estate developers and lending instutions worked to add nearly 4,000 housing units in two years. The Federal Housing Administration, Veterans Administration, and numerous city agencies worked together to accomodate the need for housing. Nearly forty new subdivisions were approved with a total of nearly 10,000 building lots. There were also 400 temporary units for veterans and new public housing constructed. Between January of 1946 and the issue of the phamplet, 6,700 housing units were completed (Memphis Housing Authority 1947: 5).

The many new middle-class housing areas developed in this period included Bethel Grove, near the intersection of Airways and Lamar Avenue; Highland Terrace, east of Highland and north of Walnut Grove; and the National-Macon area, which developed to provide additional housing for industrial workers in the Chelsea and Jackson Avenue areas.

The housing forms developed in these areas were typical of the period: versions of the Cape, detailed with greater of lesser influence of the Colonial Revival style; versions of the double-pile house, especially with a front-facing ell, most often detailed with Minimal Traditional influence; and, surviving variations of the English cottage, with minimal Tudor Revival, Mediterranean Revival or Minimal Traditional influence. Of these, the double-pile cottage is the one most frequently associated with construction under the G. I. Bill.

The City's annexation of 1950 was the last sweeping expansion of the city before the U. S. Supreme Court's 1954 decision in the case of *Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka,* and the 1955 *Plan for the City of Memphis*, prepared by Harland Bartholomew & Associates, which included the city's first proposal for highways as part of the newly-devised federal Interstate system. The combination of these watershed acts was to change the course of nearly all aspects of life in Memphis in the time since, including its residential development patterns. Minor annexations during the next ten years extended the city's limit to the I-40 and I-240 boundary, a situation largely due to modifications made to the alignment selected for the interstate right of way through the early 1960s. The annexation limit of 1950 is the most appropriate boundary to demonstrate the historic development patterns of the city's residential development prior to the changes wrought by desegregation and interstate highway construction.

ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

The preparation of this multiple property nomination was based upon the general trends and findings of several landmark projects, including the *Cultural Resources Survey of Memphis, Tennessee*, completed in 1994, and the *Memphis Historic Preservation Plan*, completed in 1997. Taken together, these projects have established a comprehensive basis for the identification of the range of historic properties, their types and styles, and for their evaluation in light of the distinct historical development patterns of this city.

The multiple property nomination for Residential Development in Memphis, 1865 to 1950, has been prepared to respond to the highest priority for nomination. Two property types associated with this historical context have been identified: 1.) Residential Historic Districts; and, 2.) Individual Historic Residences. These property types are defined as follows:

1. RESIDENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

DESCRIPTION OF RESIDENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

When this document was prepared, there were sixteen residential historic districts previously listed upon the National Register of Historic Places; they contain a total of more than 9,000 residences. Another sixteen residential historic districts have been previously determined eligible for National Register listing by the staff of the Tennessee Historical Commission, based upon previous action under Section 106 review and as a result of a 1991 "Windshield Survey" of potential districts carried out in conjunction with the City of Memphis' Cultural Resources Survey.

Memphis has often been described as a city composed of large and very distinctive neighborhoods, and it is apparent that its historic neighborhoods are a significant part of that impression. The historic neighborhoods of Memphis are widely diverse, ranging from low-income areas to upper income ones; areas of modest shotgun houses to areas with houses of 5,000 square feet or more; areas containing houses of twenty different styles and types to areas containing but one. The historic districts previously listed in the National Register contain resources which reflect the general patterns of Memphis' historical development between 1865 and 1950; the same is true of the districts which have been determined eligible for listing.

An extensive range of potential building types, architectural styles, construction materials, the elements of their settings and common associations is found within this property type. The following discussion provides a general overview of these characteristics as they appear in the City of Memphis:

SCALE

The resources within residential historic districts range from one to two and one-half stories in height, a few with towers or projections that can exceed the equivalent of three stories.

CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS AND METHODS.

Frame construction. Heavy timber framing, whether sawn or hand-adzed, was still employed in the construction of residences during the third quarter of the nineteenth century in Memphis. Balloon framing was introduced just before the Civil War and eventually became the standard for the framing of houses through the end of the historic period. Frame house cladding was generally weatherboard or forms of wider plank siding in the nineteenth century, though resources originally clad in vertical board and batten siding are known. Wood shingles became a popular form of exterior cladding beginning in the 1880s; patterns of plain or shaped shingles were often used in combination with other materials, especially to accent gable ends or other architectural elements.

The diversity of exterior materials expanded dramatically in the early years of the twentieth century. Beveled weatherboard remained a standard in wood siding, but sawmills also began to produce varietal wood siding such as shiplap, novelty, radius-edged, and other milled wood sidings. Wood shingles as an accent or as an overall exterior cladding continued to be an important material through the end of the 1930s. Exterior cladding with materials other than wood was common after the turn of the century. Stucco veneer, brick veneer, stone veneer, cast stone veneer, asbestos shingle, sheet metal, porcelain panels, asphalt roll siding, and compositional shingle siding, among others, all came into common use. The combination of two, three or more of these materials on a single house was not uncommon in the early twentieth century.

Other than the various forms of wood siding, brick and stone were the two materials of greatest significance in the twentieth century. Brick veneer became a common treatment beginning ca. 1910 with the development of gas-fired kilns which allowed the continuous production of inexpensive, hard-fired bricks. Brick veneer remained a major form of exterior cladding throughout the historic period. The use of stone also increased in popularity at the turn of the century, especially as a form of veneer. Limestone was by far the preferred material, and its use became increasingly common between ca. 1900 and ca. 1930. Granite was rarely used as an overall form of cladding and was more commonly reserved for use in architectural details, such as porch piers, lintels and sills for doors and windows, etc. Yellow-brown quartzite (a variety of which is commonly called Crab Orchard stone) replaced limestone as a veneer in the 1920s and 1930s. After World War II, the use of stone veneer in Memphis practically ceased.

Load-bearing Masonry Construction. Construction of houses with load-bearing brick or stone masonry was more common in the nineteenth than in the twentieth century. The choice of less

expensive "salmon" brick often required that a brick residence be covered with a layer of stucco. More expensive brick houses were often finished with stone or cast stone elements, which were used on sills, column bases, lintels, cornices and etc. Most stone used in residential construction was limestone shipped to Memphis from Indiana or Illinois quarries. After the turn of the twentieth century, other forms of load-bearing masonry construction superseded brick and stone, including the use of cast stone (generally in the period of ca. 1905-1925), fire-proof terra cotta block (generally ca. 1920-1935), and concrete or cinder block (after 1925). Block construction was most often faced with another material, such as stucco, brick, stone, to improve its appearance.

ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

Nineteenth Century Styles. Architectural styles used on residential resources during the nineteenth century in Memphis generally followed national trends and tastes. This does not mean that a style was abandoned completely as soon as a new one gained popularity; instead, "periods" of architectural styles overlapped here, much as they did elsewhere in the nation. However, there are relatively few nineteenth century residential structures extant in the city; an exact number is not known, but an estimate of less than two hundred would not be implausible. The discussion that follows is based upon the trends in evidence among the surviving examples, combined with observations drawn from historic photographs of Memphis' nineteenth century neighborhoods.

In 1865, the predominant architectural styles of residential structures were the Greek Revival and the Italiante, which remained popular from the pre-Civil War period. A regional Italianate variant of the Greek Revival also remained popular, featuring columns of thinner proportions and Italianate-styled brackets on the entablature. Construction of residences in the pure Greek Revival style and its Italianate variant waned by the early 1870s, but the Italianate itself remained important as a local architectural style well into the 1890s, particularly in houses for low-to-moderate income occupants.

The Second Empire, the Stick style, and the Queen Anne were the residential architectural styles of major consequence during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Examples of houses in the Second Empire style are not known to have been constructed prior to ca. 1870. Even so, the Second Empire became a style of choice for some upper-income houses built between ca. 1870 and ca. 1885. The Stick style had greater impact than the Second Empire, though the detailing of Stick style houses was far more restrained than examples built in other parts of the nation. The Stick style became prominent in the early 1870s and remained popular through the 1880s before its elements and treatments were more or less melded into the Queen Anne. There are very few Stick style houses remaining in Memphis today. The Queen Anne style, on the other hand, became immensely popular for the construction of houses at all income levels. The earliest known examples of the style were built in the mid-1880s, and it remained popular well into the first decade of the twentieth

century. Of all nineteenth century buildings still standing in Memphis, those built in the Queen Anne style represent the greatest population.

Less common nineteenth century architectural styles in Memphis included the Romanesque Revival, the Shingle style, the Gothic Revival, the Jacobean Revival, and the Colonial Revival. All of these styles were applied to buildings constructed in the last two decades of the nineteenth century.

Twentieth Century Styles. The population explosion in Memphis that began just before the opening of the twentieth century fueled a building boom that lasted well into the 1920s. As a result, the Queen Anne style remained an extremely important architectural style for houses constructed between 1900 and ca. 1910. By ca. 1905, however, the Colonial Revival and the Craftsman styles had begun to capture the attention of speculative house builders and architects alike. The Colonial Revival and the Craftsman styles became the two most important architectural rivals for the tastes of all income levels of Memphians before the Craftsman style waned in popularity ca. 1930. The Colonial Revival remained a significant form of architectural detailing through and even beyond 1950.

Next to the Craftsman and Colonial Revival, the Tudor Revival style was the most influential in shaping the twentieth century neighborhoods of Memphis, and its popularity was shared in both working class and upper income neighborhoods. The Tudor Revival appeared in Memphis ca. 1905, and gained popularity until reaching its zenith in the late 1920s and lasting until 1950. Jacobean Revival variants of the Tudor style are quite rare, but are not unknown.

Another important phase of architectural styling was the Minimal Traditional, a highly diluted form of the Colonial Revival which emerged ca. 1930 to become a major architectural style for the design of low to middle class housing, particularly for housing built immediately after World War II under the so-called "G. I. Bill."

Other significant but numerically less popular architectural styles employed on Memphis residences in the twentieth century included the Neo-Classical Revival, the Mediterranean Revival and the Beaux Arts, which generally were built for upper income families. All three of these styles found popularity for residential construction between ca. 1900 and ca. 1925. The Spanish Revival and Mission styles were also popular, beginning ca. 1910 and continuing through the 1920s. Both styles were adapted for upper-income and middle class neighborhoods; however, there is at least one Spanish Revival shotgun house existing in the city today. The French Eclectic style is also represented in the city, though there are comparatively few examples of the style to be found, most of which are located in upper-income neighborhoods.

There are only rare examples of residences in Memphis which can be said to be Prairie-influenced, and fewer still houses recognizable as Art Moderne-styled houses. The houses with Prairie style features were built between ca. 1905 and ca. 1915; houses designed in the Art Moderne appeared

in Memphis between ca. 1930 and ca. 1940. There may be early examples of early International-styled houses in the city, but if so, they are located in neighborhoods not yet covered by architectural surveys.

HOUSE/PLAN TYPES AND FORMS

The architecture of residential buildings is not defined by architectural styles alone, but also by the particular floor plan or type of house that the style is applied to. In some cases, the architectural styling of a residence is almost non-existent, leaving the house form to be its only notable element. There are, quite expectedly, far too many variations of floor plans and types than can possibly be described in this format, especially when one considers the number of architect-designed houses in a city of the size of Memphis. Architectural surveys have not included access to all house interiors, and thus, the identification of types and forms is often reliant on the experience of the surveyor in recognizing patterns of massing, roof configuration, porch locations and other features, in comparison with known examples where interiors have been accessible. However, there are particular notable trends that can be identified, and these trends in house plans and house types can often be significant elements of historic districts, especially in areas of worker-class and middle class housing.

Nineteenth Century House Plans/Types. In Memphis after the Civil War saw the continuation of many house plans and types that had great acceptance by homeowners and builders before the Civil War, much the same as was experienced with the survival of architectural styles from the pre-War period. In 1865, there were many variations on plans or house types in use in Memphis that are known. All of these types and forms of house plans are known outside of Memphis at least on a regional basis.

Unlike many cities, residences built in Memphis after the Civil War were constructed as free-standing structures; the party-wall townhouse was never common, if built at all. Instead, upper income houses were being built as free-standing structures using the four-room center hall plan; the basic three-bay, side hall townhouse plan; the two-story upright and wing plan; and the I-house plan. Middle and lower-income housing was constructed in a range of housing types as common to rural areas as to urban ones, including the double-crib or double-pen, center hall, the hall and parlor, the one-story upright and wing (sometimes called the "side L"), and the "piano box" (a U-or H-shaped plan with two front-facing gable ends, with a porch stretching between). All of these were being built in the period from 1865 to 1875; a few of these remained important to the end of the century. Of interest as well was the development in Memphis of the shotgun house and some of its variations, which found its earliest development in Memphis in the period of ca. 1870. Almost all of these plan types remained in use for middle-income and worker class housing through the turn of the century.

After ca. 1875, the traditional I-house plan type faded from use as balloon framing allowed the architect and the builder to explore more flexible and innovative floor plans, many of which were inspired by the published plan books of other architects and builders. One of the more standard forms that came into use for upper income families was an asymmetrical variation on the center hall plan, in which rooms of different sizes and configurations were grouped flanking the center stair hall. Similar variations of the townhouse plan occurred during this era, resulting in the stair hall being moved from the front to the center of the house, replaced at the front by a foyer.

Circa 1890, a new house type began to appear in Memphis: the asymmetrical, two-story "Queen Anne" house and its one-story variation, the composite cottage. This house type was made possible by balloon framing and inexpensive lumber prices, resulting in a complex floor plan laid out under an equally complex roof of multiple hips and gable ends. Apart from its complex roofs, this plan is recognizable for its front-projecting wing often featuring a gable end, and primary and secondary entrances located near either end of its L-shaped porch. The Queen Anne house and, to a much greater degree, the composite cottage, became an extremely important element in the building of Memphis late-nineteenth and early twentieth century subdivisions, especially in middle class neighborhoods.

Twentieth Century House Plans/Types. The turn of the twentieth century ushered in a wave of new housing types, many of which came into use somewhat suddenly as subdivision developers and architects rushed to keep pace with the demand for housing. The growth of the middle class in this period fueled demand for greater variety, which was met by speculative developers and builders who turned to the expanding sources of house plans available through plan services and plan books, such as those published by William Radford of the Radford Architectural Company. The parallel growth in the number of higher income families also fueled a greater demand for the services of architects, who often prepared new and individualistic house plans for their customers. The resulting variety often defies classification as part of any particular plan type.

The bungalow made the greatest impression on working class and middle class housing during the period of ca. 1905 to 1930; but before World War I, neighborhoods were also being developed with many other non-bungalow house types. The composite cottage, the upright and wing, and the shotgun (with their many variations) all remained popular forms of housing; they were joined by "new" house types not seen before, such as the cubical cottage, a squarish, hip-roofed cottage that can be considered to be the one-story cousin of the four-square house. It was not uncommon to find that these traditional plan types would be modified by their builder with variations in roof configurations, porch configurations, and the addition of new elements (such as bay windows) to offer a distinctly new look to a time-honored house plan.

Middle and upper-income residences were also built in new house forms during this period. The four-square house, whether in its three-bay or five bay form, made a major impression in neighborhoods developed before ca. 1920. Notable variations on this basic form included an additional one or two-bay wide side wing, and a local form popularized by architect Neander Wood, which featured a wing and/or porte cochère which diagonally abutted the main block of the house. Another important form was brought about by the continuing rage for the Colonial Revival in the 1910s and 1920s, which caused the design of some houses to closely resemble the appearance of traditional symmetrical center entrance plans of late-eighteenth and early nineteenth century Georgian and Federal houses. The interior arrangement of these new houses most often did not adhere to the rigid symmetry of the originals, opting instead for the larger rooms and more open-space planning familiar to the twentieth century. Most of these were built in middle and upper-income neighborhoods, often with front or side porches rarely if ever built on the original Georgian or Federal houses.

Pre-fabricated housing also appeared in middle class Memphis neighborhoods before World War I. Houses manufactured by Sears, Roebuck & Company have been identified; houses manufactured by the Aladdin and Monarch companies may be found, since both companies had representatives in the Memphis area. Houses by other manufacturers may also be found as research into this area continues.

During the 1920s, the bungalow remained the most common house type built in middle income neighborhoods. Towards the end of this decade, though, the modest English Cottage Revival the Tudor Revival house, began to enjoy greater popularity. This form, with its complex gable roofs, front-placed exterior chimney and doorway set in a vestibule beside the chimney, became more common in its smaller, middle class form than in the larger house form in neighborhoods across Memphis. This house form should not be confused with houses detailed with Tudor Revival influence, since not all Tudor Revival houses have the distinctive front-wall chimney and entrance vestibule; similarly, there are examples English cottage forms entirely detailed with Craftsman elements instead of the Tudor Revival.

As the bungalow waned in popularity in the late 1920s, another distinctive form emerged. The Cape, also called the Cape Cod cottage, was developed to serve the growing appreciation for the Colonial Revival style. Capes were built in both large and small forms to suit the income level of their owner, though their scale almost always appears modest; the same was true of their architectural detailing. Variations on this symmetrical, side gable house include the construction of symmetrical or asymmetrical "telescoping" wings, often diminished in roof height somewhat from the central block to afford the impression of their construction as additions. The popularity of the Cape remained strong for many years after World War II.

The final major house type that made its impression on Memphis prior to 1950 was the double-pile cottage and its variations. The double-pile cottage has a plan that is generally two-rooms wide, and two-rooms deep under a side gable roof; a significant variation on this basic plan is the gable-L, which features an additional room or an extended room located in a front-facing, projecting gable-front wing. The double-pile cottage is first known to have appeared in Memphis in the 1910s, but it was not common until the 1930s. The versions of the double-pile cottage that made their impression in the 1930s were treated with far more minimalist detailing than earlier examples, often being built with flush eaves and window and door openings with little, if any trim and little, if any depth to their reveals. This house type is most often associated with post-World War II housing constructed under the "G. I. Bill," and there are extensive neighborhoods in Memphis filled with double-pile cottages built between 1945 and 1950 under this legislation.

SETTING

The settings of residential historic districts are as varied as the house types they contain. The diversity of subdivision plan, lot sizes, set back configurations, and landscaping characteristics includes a very broad range of possibilities, though there are some predictable expectations based upon the income level of the individual area. The settings of practically all residential historic districts have evolved over time, as generations of home owners add their own marks (or subtracted from earlier ones.) For example, the original streetscapes of some nineteenth century districts are known through early photographs to have had some wooden fences that have long-since disappeared. Similarly, some districts were developed without street trees, but through the efforts of property owners over time, the streets are deeply shaded today.

The city's first subdivision was the Greenlaw Addition, created in 1856 as an extension of the original city's gridded block pattern, each 325' square block quartered by alleys containing lots of 150' in depth and lot widths averaging from 30' to 50'. The creation of the Greenlaw Addition was probably the last time in Memphis's history that a subdivision of such regularity was ever accomplished.

Outside of the city limits as of 1866, the regular pattern of the grid established in the city's original town plan of 1819 was not maintained. Subdivision plans established after the Greenlaw Addition tended to introduce a looser grid of rectangular blocks where possible, though no standard applied to block width or its depth. The paths of development flowed outward from the original city core, following the paths of older roadways like Poplar Avenue and Jackson Avenue, which were in use as roadways prior to the establishment of the city. As a result, later subdivision developments often incorporated the older road running through the new grid at an angle, or more frequently, caused subdivisions to be laid out parallel with the older road. Both of these conditions resulted in so-called "breaks in the grid," creating some non-rectilinear blocks. In general, block depths developed in the city prior to 1950 range from as little as 50' to more than 1,000', depending to a great degree on the

income-level that the subdivision was established to serve. Block widths can range from as little as 300' to more than 1,250'. Within these wide ranging parameters, lot sizes for residential structures can be as little as 12 1/2' in frontage and 30' in depth in so-called "shotgun subdivisions," ranging upward to lots with more than 600 feet in frontage and perhaps an equivalent amount of depth for estate-sized properties.

The resulting road pattern for the city provided streets of varying character and widths. Typical residential streets have a width of 50' to 60'. Collector streets and avenues that bisect residential historic districts can range from 60' to 100' or more; generally, these larger streets were originally developed with additional lanes for streetcar tracks. There are streets developed during the city's move to establish a residential parkway system between ca. 1905 and ca. 1920 that have grassy and tree-lined medians, which can increase the street width to 150'. Major streets that range in width from 80' to 150' can bisect neighborhoods or define their edges. Finally, the elements of the Memphis Parkway System, developed between 1904-06, can have rights of way ranging from 80' to 180'-200' in width. Portions of the parkways were developed without medians, but the majority of their lengths feature grassy and tree-lined medians ranging from 20' to 60' or more.

Not all streets are linear, but the development of curvilinear streets as an intentional design of a subdivision development site plan was not common before ca. 1920; however, a few do exist. The earliest of these non-linear streets (Belvedere Boulevard) was developed in 1906 from concepts promoted in the City Beautiful Movement; during the 1910s and 1920s, there were entire subdivisions planned with circular drives, meandering streets, curvilinear drives ending in *culs-de-sac*, and other non-linear street plans. The trend continued to become more and more important through the 1930s and continued after World War II. However, the use of curvilinear streets in subdivisions was never common enough to be considered the rule. This development of residential areas with non-linear streets resulted in irregular-shaped lots, in contrast to the more regular rectangular lots produced by the other street grids.

Within the matrix of streets, blocks and lots, the setbacks of structures within residential historic districts also ranges widely. Residences developed soon after the Civil War in the original city core of 1819 can have front yard setbacks of 0' to 25', with side yard setbacks of 3' to 30'. Lower-income neighborhoods, such as "shotgun subdivisions" or in historic districts with shotgun houses as elements, the common front yard setback ranges from 5' to 25', with side yard setbacks ranging from 5' to 25'. Neighborhoods developed for more middle class families may have front yard setbacks of 25' to 40', and side yard setbacks of 5' to 30'. Upper-income neighborhoods can have front yard setbacks of 30' to as much as 250', with side yard setbacks ranging from 30' to more than 250'.

The landscape characteristics of residential historic districts range from the very simple to the complex, in part a function of the time during which the structures and districts were developed, and

in part a function of economic level. Residences built after 1865 in the city's original core area were generally placed at street level, and the restriction on available space often only resulted in a single street tree in the front yard, if any front yard was available. Outside of the original core, in the Greenlaw Addition, for example, the character of setting began to take on a more suburban quality due to the availability of greater space for development. Street trees and other front yard plantings became common; backyards used a portion of their spaces for carriage barns and other service uses. Higher income residences located on larger lots were afforded the luxury of ornamental garden spaces in the front and side yards, and on occasion, in the rear yard as well.

When streets were cut through the gently rolling topography of Memphis, the leveling of the street often permitted the development of yard terraces on which houses were placed. The height of the terrace and the size of the lot determined whether the lot frontage would be held up by a retaining wall of stone, brick or concrete. If no retaining wall was needed, the terrace of the lawn was gently sloped to the sidewalk. Fences were sometimes placed atop retaining walls, but these features are only known in nineteenth century neighborhoods. Perimeter or back yard fencing was common in nineteenth century neighborhoods, but with the advent of public health ordinances which prohibited maintaining chickens, pigs and other farm animals within city limits, the need for fencing soon disappeared. By ca. 1905, the need for fencing had diminished to the point that its expense was considered unnecessary, and fences disappeared from the neighborhood landscape in all but the rarest of cases. The open-yard characteristic of the streetscape created by the lack of fencing is a defining element of the twentieth century suburb in Memphis, and it was a characteristic that was to continue well after 1950.

Most nineteenth century neighborhoods and some twentieth century ones were developed with mid-block alleys to provide services and access to rear yards. There were cases where lots were developed with no front drive connection with the street, but these are the exception rather than the rule. The use of concrete for driveways was a twentieth century phenomena; in years prior, gravel drives or ones paved with brick or stone pavers were common. During the first quarter of the twentieth century, the double-track driveway became a common feature, replaced by the slab driveway there after. *Portes cochère* became common treatments during the early decades of the twentieth century, as the automobile made its definitive impacts on Memphis' suburban development. With the automobile, the garage replaced the carriage house, the wood shed and the privy in the rear yards of twentieth century houses.

The streetscape has both public and private pedestrian elements. Sidewalks provided for neighborhoods developed in the nineteenth century generally range in width from 5' to 11' in width, and were set at the curb (the curb usually was of granite). After the turn of the twentieth century, sidewalks were sometimes set back from the curb behind a grassy strip, sometimes planted with street trees. Names of sidewalk contractors were often stamped into the wet concrete of many pre-

1950 sidewalks; some of these are also dated. There are also sidewalks installed before ca. 1930 that feature cast iron plaques placed by the Memphis Novelty Works or the Charles Miller Construction Company ("Miller Maker Memphis") set into the concrete.

Walkways connecting the sidewalk with individual homes also showed some variation. The most common treatment was to connect the sidewalk with the front door by a straight line, stair-stepping up lawn terraces or through retaining walls where present. Nineteenth century walks were often paved with gravel, crushed brick or cinders; the rare treatments employed flagstone paving and granite or limestone steps. In almost every case, all of these early walks have been replaced with concrete walks. Twentieth century walkways still connected the street with the house by a straight line, but the flexibility of concrete was exploited to dramatically flair the walkway to a wider connection at the street, and/or to symmetrically curve the retaining wing walls for walkways and steps at their connection with the sidewalk. In many neighborhoods, tile street numbers were set into the walk or the stairs to identify house locations. On other occasions after ca. 1910, the walkway was built to connect the entrance only with the driveway and not the street, a true statement of the automobile age. Later still, ca. 1945, the "Lazy S" walkway became an alternative, connecting the street with the entrance by a shallow, stairless curve, intended to remove the strict axial treatment and replace it with a pattern more fitting to people's perambulation.

Other aspects of the urban/suburban streetscape are of significant note, including historic street lights and their placement, and the delivery of overhead wiring services in an area. While these are important, of greater importance are elements which represent development patterns, such as subdivision gates and street signs. Residential historic districts can often represent a single subdivision or multiple ones, which were sometimes marked by gateways or street signage as an individualized statement and investment on the part of the developer. Subdivision gates were both modest and monumental, whether executed in brick, stone, masonry and stucco veneer, or in combinations of two or more of these materials. Street signs were executed as simple concrete pylons, or in more expensive forms of post-mounted cast or wrought iron plaques. Historic street signs and pylons have become increasingly rare in recent years due to loss by theft, vandalism or accidents, and due to replacement programs being carried out by the City of Memphis.

Although rare, in a few places the street names were cast into the sidewalks at intersections of streets, a treatment more beneficial to pedestrians than to automobile occupants.

The development of residential areas occurred as the result of market conditions, in large part driven by the availability of conveniences, such as the proximity to early roads, streetcar lines, bus lines and collector streets or major roads. Other related elements of daily life developed along with the neighborhoods. Some neighborhoods contain structures much older than the surrounding development, remaining from an earlier development pattern. Far more common, however, is the

blend of land uses which occur in neighborhoods, particularly before the development of established land use and zoning restriction ca. 1923. Commercial buildings, churches, schools, public utility facilities, and even industrial buildings developed in proximity with neighborhoods, some providing service to the residential population, some providing employment, some exploiting a local market. These are natural elements of most neighborhoods and are not intrusive.

SIGNIFICANCE OF RESIDENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

The significance of residential historic districts should be evaluated in relation to the context of the historical development of Memphis within the period of 1865 to 1950. The significance of these structures will most likely be found for evaluation under National Register criterion C in the area of architecture, though some resources may also possess significance under criterion A in the area of community planning and development or criterion A in the area of social history. Neighborhoods that have a large number of residences associated with many important individuals may be eligible for listing under criterion A, posssibly for commerce or government. The Hein Park Historic District (NR 11/16/98) is an example of a district that was listed, in part, under this category. There could be many other areas of significance for the evaluation of residential historic districts in the city, including ethnic history.

The wide range of architectural styles, house plan types, materials, subdivision patterns and other characteristics exhibited by residential historic districts reflect broad patterns of historical experiences on the national, state-wide and local levels that all have contributed to the development of Memphis during this period; the majority of districts will be found to possess only local significance. These experiences demonstrate levels of cultural and technological sophistication, the ebb and flow of the city and regional economies, periods of development and redevelopment, and of changing perceptions of the role of government in shaping the physical appearance and growth of the city, among many other historical patterns and trends. Residential historic districts remain as documents of a significant portion of the history of Memphis within the period of 1865 and 1950.

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

The resources comprising this property type must be associated with the residential development of the City of Memphis in the period of 1865 to 1950. A residential historic district proposed for nomination should reflect a portion of the broad patterns of house types and architectural influences recognized as important aspects of this property type.

The identification and definition of a residential historic district should take into account its history of development, its common architectural and historical traits, its context and/or its historical sense of identity. Residential historic districts need not be limited in size to the boundaries of one subdivision,

since larger areas that share a common sense of place can often be composed of many subdivisions and re-subdivisions. Care should be taken in defining boundaries of districts on the basis of major roadways and topographic features alone, which do not always divide communities. In many cases, a major roadway or a railroad separates a single district into two parts, but research may show that the road served as a historical element which enabled the parts to develop as one community.

Apart from their common associations, residential historic districts should contain integrity of outward character that relate the buildings to their physical setting. These characteristics include integrity of physical context, setting, massing and setback. The physical characteristics of the individual residences themselves must reflect the basic characteristics of plan, massing, and form that define its house type. The same is true of its elements and materials that define its architectural styling.

Resources in districts which retain integrity of these qualities should be rated as contributing to the significance of the district; those which do not retain these qualities should be considered non-contributing to the significance of the district, as defined by and consistent with National Register criteria.

As was previously noted, districts can contain buildings which represent other property types, such as schools, churches, commercial properties and etc. In most cases, these properties are inherently linked to the developmental history of the district, and should not be considered non-contributing solely on the basis of their non-residential character. These properties will contribute to a district's significance if their use and period of significance are symbiotically related to the district itself, and if their architectural qualities still retain a similar level of integrity as those of residences. They will not contribute to the character of the district if they have been built after the period of significance for the district, if they have had no direct association with the district, or if they have been so altered as to have lost integrity.

Finally, the end date of the period of significance for this nomination has been set at 1950, to reflect the date and boundary of the City of Memphis's last major annexation prior to the era of de-segregation and the construction of the interstate highway system. In light of the development history for residential structures in Memphis, it makes greater sense to employ this year to close the historic period, as opposed to an arbitrary date established by the fifty-year criteria in National Register standards. Given the two-year difference between the two dates (1948 v. 1950), nomination pursued under this Multiple Properties Listing in the years 1998, 1999 or 2000 should treat properties built in 1949 or 1950 as non-contributing elements, with the caveat stated that their status can be re-evaluated once the building reaches the fifty-year mark.

2. Individual Historic Residences

Individual historic resources share all of the same qualities of scale, materials, architectural style, plan type, and setting as those found in residential historic districts. The essential difference between the two is that individual historic residences have qualities that distinguish them from surrounding properties, either due to the outstanding architectural qualities of both the exterior and interior, their association with a significant event or important personality, and/or due to their critical association with larger patterns in our history.

Significance of Individual Historic Residences

Individual historic residences should be evaluated in relation to the context of the historical development of Memphis within the period of 1865 to 1950. The significance of these structures will probably be found for evaluation under criterion C in the area of architecture. However, this does not mean that individual historic residences must be outstanding examples of an academic architectural style or the work of a major architect. They can be outstanding examples of designs of regional or local architects or builders or outstanding examples of a particular type or form of building. The significance of individual resources may also be derived from their association with a significant historic person, and thus eligible for evaluation under criterion B; or, the individual resource may have importance for its role as a representative of a trend or broad pattern of cultural history, and thus be eligible under criterion A. These resources, too, demonstrate levels of cultural history, technological sophistication, patterns of economic development and other factors which have contributed in unique ways development of Memphis.

Registration Requirements for Individual Historic Residences

The resources comprising this property types must be associated with residential development within corporate limits of Memphis in the period of 1865 to 1950. Residential buildings proposed for individual listing must be outstanding local examples of specific house types and/or architectural influences common to the Memphis experience. They must retain a high degree of their original or other significant architectural character on both the exterior and interior of the property, including the integrity of their interior arrangement and its detailing.

Individual historic residences to be nominated for their association with significant individuals, events or broader patterns must also retain a substantial degree of their original architectural character, especially from the period when the significant association took place.

Integrity of setting is also a necessary element for properties to be nominated as individual historic resources. These resources may have become separated from their original surrounding context by subsequent development, or be integral to districts. If separated from districts, the individual

resource must retain a good sense of its internal character of setting that can maintain its sense of association. If integral to districts, the pursuit of an individual nomination should probably only be considered when the individual resource's sense of historical association is not shared with the buildings which surround it.

Again, because the last two years of the period of significance for this Multiple Properties Listing do not meet the fifty-year criteria established by the National Register as a benchmark for nominations, listing of individual residences built in 1949 or 1950 should not be pursued until the property reaches the fifty-year mark. However, if the property has exceptional significance under National Register standards, its nomination should not be discouraged.

GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

This Multiple Property Listing is limited in scope to the incorporated limits of Memphis, Shelby County, Tennessee, up to and including 1950.

SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS

The Residential Development in Memphis, Shelby County, Tennessee Multiple Properties nomination was based upon contextual histories developed in the *Memphis Historic Preservation Plan*, prepared by the Memphis Landmarks Commission, Division of Planning and Development for the City of Memphis. The plan and its many elements were derived, in part, from research and field data collected in the "Cultural Resources Survey of Memphis, Tennessee," a project executed by Memphis Heritage, Inc., under contract with the City of Memphis from 1987 to 1994. The survey targeted areas in the city that had a high potential to be impacted by development. Neighborhoods that might be affected by "Section 106" review for federally funded or licensed projects were also targeted. The staff of the Tennessee Historical Commission worked with the City of Memphis and Memphis Heritage to establish potentially eligible resources for the preservation plan.

The survey recorded data on more than 13,000 principal properties not previously evaluated under National Register criteria; only cursory information was collected on outbuildings. Unfortunately, the survey data collected was not entered into a data base management program of sufficient flexibility to allow comprehensive analyses of the data which could be used to derive a sense of the occurrence of particular styles, types, materials and other comparative conclusions. Efforts are currently under way to transfer the original survey data to another data base management program to enable such comparisons in the future. However, given that the survey itself was not comprehensive, the value of such comparative analyses would be limited, at best.

In the absence of comparative data, the information presented herein and its analysis has been derived from a substantial amount of other source materials, including neighborhood-scale historical analyses of the Cultural Resources Survey data ("Coverforms") prepared after the conclusion of survey work in each Census tract covered, existing National Register data, information and data revealed during the preparation of the City of Memphis Preservation Plan, and from information gleaned from local histories, maps, and other sources.

Under the criteria set forward for the survey, the majority of cultural resources recorded were associated with the period from 1865 to 1945. The passage of time since the completion of the Survey has revealed other eligible resources that represent the significant impact of the post-World War II housing boom had on shaping other areas of the city in important ways, as well as its effect completing the development of areas begun before World War II. This building boom, started by the passage of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the "G. I. Bill of Rights"; the resulting impact of this legislation on housing development is clearly reflected by the City's annexation of 1950, which encompasses most, if not all, of the areas developed with G. I. Bill financing.

The combination of the survey and the plan has set a formidable basis for the evaluation of historic properties in Memphis and for the prioritization of their nomination. The multiple properties nomination of residential resources was identified in the plan as the first priority for action, to be followed by nomination of several districts identified by the survey as eligible for listing. The analysis of the survey material and the corollary development of historical contexts within the plan revealed two property types for inclusion in the cover nomination: Residential Historic Districts and Individual Historic Residences.

Registration requirements were based upon National Register standards for assessing integrity of resources, as shaped by the historic resources identified.

MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES

Bledsoe Census
1865 *Special Census of Memphis, Tenessee*, compiled by Job Bledsoe under resolution of the City Council, April 25, 1865. MS on file at the Memphis Public Library and Information Center, Memphis, TN.

Capers, Gerald M., Jr.
1966 *The Biography of a River Town*. Tulane University Press. New Orleans, LA.

City of Memphis, Tennessee
1865 Tax Book of 1865. MS on file at the Memphis and Shelby County Archives, Memphis, TN.

Dennison, A.C.
1865 *Memphis Directory for 1865*. A.C. Dennison & Co., Memphis.

Harkins, John
1982 *Metropolis of the American Nile*. Windsor Publications, Woodland Hills, CA.

Johnson, Eugene J. and Robert D. Russell, Jr.
1990 *Memphis: An Architectural Guide*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, TN.

McAlester, Virginia and Lee McAlester
1984 *A Field Guide to American Houses*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, NY.

Memphis Heritage, Inc.
"Cover forms for Census Districts and Thematic Property Groups." MS on file with Memphis Heritage, Inc., Memphis, TN.

Memphis Housing Authority
1947 *Out of Balance: 1946-1947 Annual Report of the Memphis Housing Authority*. Memphis Housing Authority, Memphis, TN

Memphis Landmarks Commission
1997 *Memphis Historic Preservation Plan*, Vol. I and II. City of Memphis, Office of Planning and Development, Memphis, TN.

Memphis Landmarks Commission
1983 *Survey and Preservation Plan*. City of Memphis, Department of Housing and Community Development, Memphis, TN.

Sanborn-Ferris Map Co.
Fire Insurance Maps of Memphis, Shelby County, Tennessee. 1887, 1897, 1907 and 1927 series.

Shelby County, Tennessee
Shelby County Plat Book 7. Office of the County Register, Shelby County, TN.

Sigafoos, Robert A.
1979 *From Cotton Row to Beale Street: A Business History of Memphis.* University of Tennessee Press. Knoxville, TN.