

---

**FINAL REPORT**

**Charlotte Comprehensive Architectural Survey, Phase II  
Charlotte, North Carolina**

**Prepared for:**

**John G. Howard  
Charlotte Historic District Commission  
Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Department  
600 East Fourth Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202**

**Prepared by:**

**Mattson, Alexander and Associates, Inc.  
2228 Winter Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28205**

**2 September 2015**

---

## I. Phase II Reconnaissance Survey Methodology

In 2014, the City of Charlotte was awarded a federal grant from the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (HPO) to conduct a second reconnaissance-level architectural survey of Charlotte. The survey was conducted between January and August 2015. The earlier Phase I survey of 2013-2014 focused on the area within the radius of Route 4, a partial ring road around Charlotte's central business district and surrounding neighborhoods. This Phase II survey concentrated on the areas within the current city limits that lie outside Route 4, much of which had been rural until the annexations and suburban development of recent decades. These outlying areas are currently documented in 361 HPO database records, seventeen of which are surveyed neighborhood or historic districts. The remaining records documented individual properties. In addition, this second study included an investigation of the Dilworth National Register Historic District, south of the center city, to determine the status of the individual resources within the district. Listed in the National Register in 1987 (locally designated 1983; 1992) the Dilworth Historic District has experienced intense development pressure in recent years.

It is anticipated that these reconnaissance-level surveys (completed August 2014 and August 2015) will be the basis for three future intensive-level architectural investigations. These five phases will support planning efforts as well as lead to local historic landmark and district designations, conservation district designations, and National Register nominations.

The City of Charlotte contracted with Mattson, Alexander, and Associates, Inc. (MAA), a historic preservation consulting firm based in Charlotte, to conduct the Phase II survey. Frances Alexander and Richard Mattson were the principal investigators, and Mr. John Howard, Director, Charlotte Historic District Commission (HDC), Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department, was the local project coordinator.

The scope of work for the 2015 survey is summarized below:

- 1) MAA conducted a reconnaissance-level survey of the Dilworth Historic District (approximately 1,040 primary resources) to compare each property to its 1987 National Register nomination inventory list entry. On a map, the contributing/noncontributing status of each property was updated. A report was prepared that documented the changes to the district and the effects of these alterations on the historic character of the neighborhood. The findings of the investigation are included in an appendix to this report.
- 2) MAA updated 361 existing HPO survey files, including seventeen (17) district/neighborhood/area files. For locally designated or National Register properties, the status of the individual property or district/neighborhood/area was assessed to determine if the designation continued to be warranted. The principal investigators also identified previously surveyed properties that now merited intensive-level survey and noted if any of these appear to merit National Register listing and/or landmark designation.
- 3) In consultation with the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) and the Charlotte Historic Districts Commission, MAA identified individual properties built prior to 1970 and neighborhoods developed prior to 1970 that had not previously been surveyed and now merited documentation. Sixty-nine (69) newly surveyed resources, including seven neighborhoods/subdivisions, were entered into the HPO survey database. These properties included those on the HLC Study List; Rustic Revival-style houses that had

been identified during a 2005 study by Stewart Gray of the HLC; historic resources identified during a 2013 windshield survey of the Oakhurst neighborhood (the East Charlotte Survey) sponsored by the HLC; neighborhoods identified in consultation with the HDC; resources identified by the principal investigators during field work.

The HPO's survey database was used to record individual properties and districts. Previously surveyed properties and neighborhoods were recorded with complete records in the database and digital photography. The existing survey files were updated with printed photo proofs, a survey form generated from the database, and any related research materials. Essays were prepared tracing the development of the previously surveyed neighborhoods. The surveys of all neighborhoods contained digital photographs and information on the number of resources, building types, and general condition. Individual properties identified for new survey were inventoried at the reconnaissance level with brief written summaries and a minimum of two digital photographs.

All work was completed to HPO standards as described in the survey manual, *North Carolina Historic Preservation Office Survey Manual: Practical Advice for Recording Historic Structures* (2008 edition), to the extent applicable to this project. Instructions for using the HPO's survey database and the HPO's digital photography policy, including guidelines for photo file labeling and printing of photographs, are all posted on the HPO's web site, [www.hpo.ncdcr.gov](http://www.hpo.ncdcr.gov).

MAA used the HPOWEB and Mecklenburg County Geographical Information System (GIS) as guides for locating historic resources within the prescribed study area and for assigning up-to-date street addresses, revisiting previously surveyed resources (individual properties, subdivisions, and historic districts), and surveying additional resources built prior to 1970. Properties were photographed primarily from the public right-of-way. The principal investigators classified the current status of each previously surveyed resource into one of five categories: unchanged, altered, deteriorated, demolished, or moved. The types of changes that have occurred to each property classified as such were described in the database narrative summary field. Altered properties are typically those that display significant loss of original character-defining features, replacement materials, and/or substantial additions. Deteriorated properties are those that have experienced noticeable decay of materials, often because of vacancy. The updated database survey forms, contact sheets of photographs, and any related research materials gathered during the project information were printed for inclusion in the existing HPO survey files.

The project followed the Time-Product-Payment schedule that was included as part of the contract dated March 12, 2015. At the completion of each of the benchmarks on the schedule, compact discs containing the database and all the photos taken during that portion of the project were submitted to HPO for review. The principal investigators provided the City of Charlotte and the HPO all survey products on CDs or DVDs and the final report in hard copy, and the updated paper survey files were returned to the HPO. John Howard scheduled a public meeting to be held on October 14, 2015, for the principal investigators to discuss the findings of the survey and to answer any questions.

## **II. Previous Surveys (1970-2015) Conducted in the Phase II Study Area**

Since 1970, beginning with the National Register listing of the Hezekiah Alexander House (1774), numerous individual properties and several historic districts within the Phase II study area have been recorded as part of National Register nominations, local landmark designation reports, or architectural surveys. Notably, the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office sponsored a

comprehensive architectural inventory of rural Mecklenburg County in 1987-1988 (Gatza 1987-1988). The majority of the HPO survey files that have been updated for the present Phase II study were first completed during this 1987-1988 survey project. They include many of the county's historic farmhouses, farmsteads, crossroads stores, and rural churches and cemeteries. In 2001-2002, a survey was conducted of African American historic resources in the county that included a number of rural properties within the Phase II study area (Gray and Stathakis 2001-2002). The HLC has also sponsored small-scale, windshield architectural inventories, including surveys of Rustic Revival-style architecture across the county and the Oakhurst neighborhood in East Charlotte (Gray 2005; Norman 2013).

Other individual properties and historic districts within the Phase II study area have been documented during environmental compliance projects for the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) highway and railroad divisions, and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). For example, the expansion of Charlotte-Douglas International Airport on the west side of Charlotte triggered a 1997 architectural survey and evaluations of eligibility in the vicinity of the airport. Numerous properties have been documented as part of such transportation improvement projects as the construction of I-485 around the broad periphery of the city and two Charlotte Area Transit System projects—the 2006 Center City Streetcar Project (ER 05-2463) and the 2008 Blue Line Extension Project (ER 6-1957), that extends from the center city to the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. These reports have generated survey files and determinations of eligibility (DOEs) for a wide range of resources that were at least fifty years of age at the time of the studies.

### **III. Summary of Survey Findings**

#### Introduction

The sprawling metropolis of Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, exemplifies the post-World War II urban form in the United States. Dominated by suburban development, Charlotte is less densely settled than metropolitan Atlanta, the world's least dense urban area with more than 4,000,000 residents. Charlotte, in fact, has just one-quarter the density of Los Angeles—long regarded as the epitome of America's suburban culture. Since World War II, Charlotte has been among the fastest growing metropolises in the country. In 1940, the city had some 101,000 residents and covered a land area of nineteen square miles. By 2010, Charlotte's population had risen by seven times to exceed 700,000 while its land area had expanded by fourteen times, nearly stretching to the county limits. Taking advantage of North Carolina's liberal annexation policies, Charlotte has aggressively acquired the majority of Mecklenburg County in support of suburban residential and commercial expansion (Cox 2014).

Charlotte's tremendous suburban growth has been generated by many factors. In the latter twentieth century, the city was transformed from a textile manufacturing and distribution hub into the second largest banking center in the United States, behind only New York City. At the same time, new and improved roadways near great tracts of affordable farmland pulled development away from the traditional center city. The construction and widening of highways, including Interstates 77, 85, and 485, have all encouraged suburban commuters while creating the demand for ever more highway construction. The expansion of both Charlotte-Douglas International Airport, west of downtown, and the University of North Carolina, Charlotte to the north have been magnets for suburban growth. By the early twenty-first century, the city had attracted the headquarters of seven Fortune 500 companies as well as numerous smaller, supporting businesses. Expansive corporate campuses and

nearby residential subdivisions and retail shopping malls arose nearby on former farmland. Since 2000, approximately 30,000 new residents have arrived in Charlotte annually, most of them finding homes in the suburbs and driving to work (Francis 2012).

The Phase II survey area was largely agricultural into the mid twentieth century but has since been transformed by suburban development. This broad survey area encompasses the suburban periphery of the city, beyond the more densely developed center city and adjacent Route 4 radius which defined the Phase I geographical boundaries. The Phase II survey area contains the great majority of the county's surviving historic rural properties, including plantation seats, farmhouses, farmsteads, crossroads stores and churches, cemeteries, and historical farming communities. They include both white and African American resources. While agrarian-related resources predominate, this area also holds some of Charlotte's major suburban subdivisions of the postwar period, featuring some of the city's fullest expressions of Modernist residential architecture.

### Phase II Reconnaissance Survey Update Results

Within the Phase II survey area, the principal investigators updated the existing survey database for 361 previously surveyed resources, including individual buildings, historic districts, and neighborhoods/subdivisions. The principal investigators also completed reconnaissance-level documentation for sixty-eight resources newly identified for survey.

The most significant results from the reconnaissance survey of individual properties are as follows:

1. Previously surveyed properties that have been demolished: 172
2. Previously surveyed properties that have deteriorated or have been altered significantly: 9
3. Previously surveyed properties that have remained unchanged or were improved: 203

The data show 172 of the 361 (47.6 percent) of the previously surveyed resources in the Phase II survey area have been demolished. This number compares with only 101 of 432 properties (23.4 percent) demolished within the Phase I survey area. The reasons appear to be clear. Firstly, the resources within the Phase I survey area—primarily those located around the center city and streetcar suburbs—include National Register properties and locally designated historic landmarks. National Register resources have typically benefited from owner and public support as well as from preservation tax credits for renovations. Local historic landmarks have also benefited from private and public support as well as from the formal design review process that regulates property alterations. Secondly, many of the other previously surveyed, individual properties within the Phase I study area were inventoried in recent years, and thus there has been relatively little time for changes to occur. The same is true of the previously surveyed neighborhoods/subdivisions. Finally, the area within Route 4 already contained urban resources—neighborhood houses, commercial areas, and the central business district—and has not undergone the almost complete transformation that once rural areas have experienced in the past two decades.

By contrast, the Phase II survey area is populated primarily by resources inventoried almost thirty years ago during the 1987-1988 comprehensive rural survey of Mecklenburg County. Many of these properties were neither listed in the National Register nor designated historic landmarks, and some were already in deteriorated condition when first surveyed. Perhaps most significantly, much of the Phase II study area, still largely rural and agricultural in the 1980s, has been confronted with intense suburban development pressure and the corresponding highway construction. Despite this trend, few of the forty-three (43) National Register or locally designated properties have been lost, heavily altered, or deteriorated. Only two (2) National Register properties—the J.W. McKinney House

(MK1227) and the Green Morris Farm (MK1228)—have been demolished. The Dinkins House and Lodge (MK0007) (National Register) has been moved and altered, and the Siloam School (MK2441), also listed in the National Register, is now in deteriorated condition. No local landmark has been demolished, and only the Henderson-King House (MK2462) and Hennigan Place and Boundary Expansion (MK1180 and MK2917) have been moved.

Thirty (30) properties are on the Study List. Nine of these had been recorded as gone at the start of the Phase II survey. However, this number included the original site of the Grier-Rear House (MK1719), which has been moved and listed in the National Register under a new survey number (MK2698). The other eight were scattered throughout the study area, and all but Murkland Presbyterian Church (MK1721), which was lost in a fire, were demolished for redevelopment. Of the remaining twenty-one (21) Study List properties, only the Oehler Log House (MK1311) and the John Grier House (MK1365) have lost much of their integrity while the others retain sufficient integrity to remain on the Study List.

#### Previously Surveyed Properties: Recommended for Intensive-Level Investigation

The resources listed below are recommended for intensive-level survey and possible Study List designation. These resources have all been surveyed during past investigations but not listed in the National Register or designated as local landmarks in Mecklenburg County. Within the Phase II survey population of 361 previously surveyed properties, these twenty-seven (27) individual properties and six (6) neighborhoods warrant further study to evaluate their potential historical and architectural significance. They were selected for a variety of reasons. Some possess architectural significance with their design features sufficiently intact to illustrate important local, regional, or national trends in architecture styles or building types. Some resources are surviving examples of building types—mainly farmhouses or outbuildings—that were once common in Mecklenburg County but are now almost nonexistent. Others are well-preserved vestiges of rural communities that have been absorbed by suburban expansion or resources associated with African American heritage. Still others reflect the explosive suburban growth of Charlotte after World War II and include diverse postwar neighborhoods that developed around the periphery of the Phase I survey area (Route 4 radius) as well as individual examples of midcentury Modernism.

MK1229	Robinson House – 1908, Queen Anne farmhouse
MK1309	Nisbett House – 1899, picturesque, T-plan farmhouse
MK1525	George Williamson House – 1870s I-house
MK1540	W.L. Davis House – 1902, picturesque farmhouse
MK1551	P.T. Christenbury Store – 1909 rural store
MK1680	Hoover-Duncan House – circa 1858, traditional farmhouse
MK1686	Nance House – 1917, American Foursquare house
MK1687	Paw Creek Presbyterian Church and Cemetery – 1882, 1928, 1949, rural Neoclassical Revival church
MK1691	Store (in the Hoskins Mill Village) – circa 1900, brick, mill-owned store
MK 1711	Mulberry Presbyterian Church and Cemetery – 1929, Gothic Revival church
MK1716	WBT Building – 1929 Art Deco transmitter building owned by the first licensed radio station in the South.
MK1743	Old Sardis Cemetery – early nineteenth century cemetery associated with Sardis Presbyterian Church, one of the oldest churches in the county
MK1744	Sharon Presbyterian Church and Cemetery – 1891 Gothic Revival church
MK2112	Cotswold Homes – 1954, 1959 residential superblock development

MK2116	Sherwood Forest Subdivision – 1950s-1960s mid-century neighborhood
MK2118	Mountainbrook Subdivision – 1950s-1960s mid-century neighborhood
MK2119	Kingswood Subdivision – circa 1960 mid-century neighborhood
MK2121	Lansdowne Subdivision – circa 1960 mid-century neighborhood
MK2122	Overnite Building – circa 1960, Modernist commercial building
MK2130	Central Avenue 66 – circa 1959, Modernist gas station
MK2131	Darby Terrace Apartments – circa 1964, Modernist apartment complex
MK2180	Jones House – circa 1966, Modernist house
MK2189	Charlotte Municipal Airport – circa 1955, Modernist airport terminal
MK2191	William and Penney Little House – 1960, Modernist house
MK2192	Charles Henning House – circa 1960, Modernist house
MK2193	Andrew Hearn House – circa 1960, Modernist house
MK2306	J.H. Gunn Gymnasium – 1963, Modernist school gym for an African American school
MK2307	J.H. Gunn Neighborhood – post-World War II, African American community
MK2317	Mowing Glade AME Zion Cemetery – circa 1890, African American church cemetery
MK2328	Robert Morrow House – 1929, African American-owned farmhouse
MK2668	Williams Memorial Presbyterian Church – 1923, 1949, Gothic Revival church
MK3081	Elmore Trailer Sales and Trailer Park – 1949, International-Style commercial building and trailer park
MK3255	Solomon and Shirley Levine House – 1957, Modernist house

Properties Determined Eligible for the National Register or Designated Local Landmarks:  
Recommended for the Study List

The survey also includes a number of properties that have already been determined eligible for the National Register, usually through environmental studies, or designated as local landmarks but never added to the Study List. The resources listed below retain exterior integrity and have sufficient historical documentation to warrant Study List status. However, all Study List properties must have interior as well as exterior integrity. Therefore, their Study List designation is contingent upon inspection of building interiors which is beyond the scope of this Phase II reconnaissance-level survey.

MK1180	Hennigan Place-Local Landmark
MK1220	Providence Women’s Club – Local Landmark
MK1279	W.B. Newell House - DOE and Local Landmark
MK1321	Welch-McIntosh House – Local Landmark
MK1361	John Douglas House - DOE, Local Landmark
MK1447	McClintock Rosenwald School- Local Landmark
MK1723	Thomas Alexander House - Local Landmark
MK1734	William Lee House - Local Landmark
MK1753	Cochran-Robinson House - DOE
MK2237	Lloyd Presbyterian Church Cemetery - Local Landmark
MK2251	Neely Slave Cemetery - Local Landmark
MK2454	Samuel Neal House - Local Landmark
MK2462	Henderson-King House - Local Landmark
MK2509	McIntyre Historic Site – Local Landmark
MK2910	Standard Chemical Products Plant - DOE
MK2911	Republic Steel Corporation Plant – DOE

MK2912	General Motors Corporation Training Center - DOE
MK2928	Big Rock Shelter – Local Landmark
MK2933	Douglas Airport Hangar – Local Landmark
MK3069	Hunter Avenue Historic District - DOE
MK3070	Everett McConnell House – DOE
MK3251	Cohen-Fumero House - Local Landmark
MK3287	World War II Veterans Memorial - DOE

Newly Surveyed Properties: Recommended for Intensive-Level Investigation

The third group recommended for intensive-level study contains forty-five (45) of the sixty-nine (69) resources newly examined as part of this project. A number of the properties in this group were identified in consultation with John Howard of the Charlotte Historic District Commission and Dan Morrill and Stewart Gray of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg HLC, including several on the HLC's Study List. Listed below, this group includes twenty-eight (28) individual houses; six (6) neighborhoods, including the Thrift Mill Historic District; two (2) mid-twentieth-century post offices; two (2) truck terminals; an airport; a farm equipment building; a farm complex; a church; and a music recording studio. Among those listed are eleven (11) Modernist houses and four (4) Rustic Revival log dwellings.

Five (5) historically African American resources are recommended for intensive-level study, including a post-World War II neighborhood (Hyde Park Estates); three (3) ranch houses associated with Civil Rights champions (Kelly Alexander, Julius Chambers, and Fred D. Alexander); and a circa 1910 dwelling built for a leader in the Hickory Grove community (Lawrence Orr).

MK3341	Derita Avenue Neighborhood -- 1920s-1940s, bungalows, two blocks
MK3345	Paw Creek US Post Office – circa 1950, Modernist post office
MK3452	Thrift Mill Historic District -- 1912-1965; approximately twenty blocks
MK3346	Thrift United Methodist Church
MK3347	Thrift Mill Supervisors' Houses
MK1683	Thrift Mill (previously surveyed)
MK1684	Thrift Mill Village (previously surveyed)
MK3348	House, 7533 Tuckaseegee Road -- circa 1940, Colonial Revival house
MK3349	House, 2112 Mingus Cabin Road -- circa 1925, Rustic Revival house
MK3351	House, 9011 Mount Holly Road -- circa 1940, rock-faced, Minimal Traditional house
MK3353	Lawrence Orr House -- circa 1910 home of African American Leader, Lawrence Orr
MK3354	House, 77290 Old Concord Road -- circa 1900 I-house
MK3401	Farm Complex, 2030 McKee Road -- circa 1925 bungalow and farm outbuildings
MK3405	Arthur Smith Studios, 5457 Monroe Road – 1965 building associated with musician/entertainer, Arthur Smith (Local Landmark Study List)
MK3406	Wallace House -- circa 1930, Colonial Revival house (Local Landmark Study List)
MK3407	House, 1200 Buttonwood Circle -- circa 1960, Modernist dwelling
MK3408	House, 7201 Benita Drive -- circa 1960, Modernist house
MK3409	Mitchum House, 7212 Benita Drive -- 1960, Modernist house (Local Landmark Study List)
MK3410	House, 5801 Coatbridge Lane -- 1960, Modernist house
MK3411	House, 5630 Riviere Lane -- circa 1960, Modernist house



MK3410	House, 5801 Coatbridge Lane -- 1960, Modernist house
MK3411	House, 5630 Riviere Lane -- circa 1960, Modernist house
MK3412	House, 5602 Riviere Lane -- circa 1960, Modernist house
MK3413	House, 1141 Lynbrook Drive -- 1960, Modernist house
MK3412	House, 5602 Riviere Lane -- circa 1960, Modernist house
MK3413	House, 1141 Lynbrook Drive -- 1960, Modernist house
MK3414	Grove Airport – 1941 hanger and repair shop
MK3417	House, 6631 Williams Road -- circa 1960, Modernist house
MK3419	House, 1808 Marlwood Circle -- 1959, Modernist house (Local Landmark Study List)
MK3421	Hyde Park Estates -- circa 1962-1970, African American neighborhood of ranch and split level houses, approximately ten blocks (John Howard, HDC Consultation)
MK3422	Puckett's Farm Equipment Company Building -- circa 1940 commercial building
MK3423	Derita US Post Office -- circa 1950, Modernist post office
MK3424	House, 4100 Carmel Acres Drive -- circa 1960, Modernist house
MK3425	House, 3201 Carmel Road -- circa 1960, Modernist house
MK3426	House, 5930 Lakeview Road -- circa 1925, Rustic Revival house (Rustic Revival Survey, 2005)
MK3428	Frederickson Motor Express Company Building -- 1948, Modernist house
MK3429	Mitchell Distribution Company Plant -- 1958, Modernist house
MK3431	Julius Chambers House, 3208 Dawnshire Avenue -- 1964 home of African American Leader, Julius Chambers (Local Landmark Study List)
MK3432	Kelly Alexander House, 2128 Senior Drive – 1964 home of African American Leader, Kelly Alexander (Local Landmark Study List)
MK3433	Fred D. Alexander House, 2140 Senior Drive – 1960 home of African American Leader, Fred D. Alexander (Local Landmark Study List)
MK3435	Sloan-Porter House, 10124 Walkers Ferry Road -- circa 1830, 1890 I-House (Local Landmark Study List)
MK3436	Oakhurst Baptist Church -- 1957, Neo-Classical Revival/Modernist church (East Charlotte Survey, 2013)
MK3437	House, 2029 Mandarin Boulevard -- 1932, Neo-Classical Revival house (East Charlotte Survey, 2013)
MK3438	House, 2021 Lanier Avenue -- 1931, Italian Renaissance house (East Charlotte Survey, 2013)
MK3442	House, 4115 Hiddenbrook Drive -- circa 1930, Rustic Revival house (Rustic Revival Survey, 2005)
MK3443	House, 2107 Mandarin Blvd -- circa 1930, Rustic Revival (Rustic Revival Survey, 2005)
MK3444	House, 2039 Lanier Avenue -- circa 1925, Colonial Revival house (East Charlotte Survey, 2013)
MK3445	House, 5101 Monroe Road -- 1928, Neo-Classical Revival (East Charlotte Survey, 2013)
MK3446	Seversville -- circa 1900-World War II neighborhood of bungalows and Minimal Traditional houses, approximately ten blocks (John Howard, HDC Consultation)
MK3447	Enderly Park—circa 1900-1950s neighborhood of bungalows and Minimal Traditional houses, approximately forty blocks (John Howard, HDC Consultation)
MK3451	Oakhurst—circa 1930-1960s neighborhood of bungalows and Minimal Traditional houses, approximately forty-five blocks (John Howard, HDC Consultation)

#### **IV. Further Recommendations**

There remain areas both inside and beyond Route 4 that have received little attention in previous architectural inventories of Charlotte. Of note is west Charlotte around Rozelle's Ferry Road, Tuckaseegee Road, and Freedom Drive, an area that is partially located within the Route 4 radius but that also extends westward past I-85. In contrast to the northern, southern, and eastern outskirts of the city, which developed after World War II, portions of the west side took shape in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The west side retains much of its historic character, in part because recent development has largely bypassed this area and instead been concentrated in south Charlotte, near the university, or near Lake Norman. Served by historic roadways (Rozelle's Ferry and Tuckaseegee roads), as well as both the Southern and the Piedmont and Northern railways, much of the west side emerged as an industrial area with textile mills, houses for mill workers, and other factories and warehouses. In consultation with the HPO staff and John Howard of the Charlotte Historic District Commission, the principal investigators recommend this area for intensive-level architectural survey. Furthermore, a number of postwar residential subdivisions for African Americans were built on the west and northwest sides, and these Modernist subdivisions warrant investigation too.

## V. Bibliography

- Charlotte-Mecklenburg Historic Landmarks Commission. Survey and Research Reports, 1973-2014. Charlotte. <http://www.cmhpf.org/homehistoricproperties>.
- Cox, Wendell. "The Evolving Urban Form: Charlotte." New Geography. 8 January 2014. [www.newgeography.com](http://www.newgeography.com).
- Francis, David. "Anatomy of a Boomtown: The Real Story Behind the Rise of Charlotte." [www.atlanticcities.com](http://www.atlanticcities.com). September 4, 2012.
- "Can Charlotte Rise Again?" [www.atlanticcities.com](http://www.atlanticcities.com). September 6, 2012.
- Gatza, Mary Beth. Comprehensive Architectural Survey of Rural Mecklenburg County. North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, Raleigh, 1987-1988.
- Gray, Stewart. "Log Construction in Mecklenburg County, 1920-1945." Charlotte-Mecklenburg Historic Landmarks Commission, Charlotte, 2005.
- Gray, Stewart, and Paula Stathakis. Survey of African American Historic Sites in Mecklenburg County. North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, Raleigh, 2001-2002.
- Norman, Leonard. Survey of Oakhurst Neighborhood, Charlotte. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Historic Landmarks Commission, Charlotte, 2013.

**APPENDIX**

**Dilworth Historic District Assessment**

**Dilworth Historic District** (National Register 1987; National Register Boundary Amendment 2000; Locally Designated 1992)

### Introduction

Established in the 1890s, Dilworth is historically significant as the city's first streetcar suburb and architecturally significant for its variety of building types and architectural styles from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Streetcar suburbs differed from the later auto-oriented subdivisions, which typically contain streets of similarly-sized, single-family houses built from a small repertoire of designs. In contrast, streetcar neighborhoods, were denser developments organized around the streetcar routes and had a greater socio-economic mix. Grand houses of the wealthy occupied the most convenient locations along the streetcar routes with middling dwellings situated on secondary streets, and worker houses lining the streets farthest away from transportation. While Dilworth also incorporates areas built in the automobile era, the tight organizational pattern of the streetcar neighborhood is still reflected in areas of the historic district. Large, architecturally sophisticated houses and apartment buildings are on East Boulevard, along the original streetcar line, with substantial bungalows lining East Kingston and East Worthington avenues, the two streets that parallel East Boulevard one block to the north and south. The smaller houses along Tremont Avenue reflect their distance from the streetcar route. The variety of bungalows, historic revival dwellings, and 1920s quadraplexes and apartment buildings that constitute the contributing resources within the historic district express both the neighborhood's origins as a streetcar suburb and its later development as a more exclusive, auto-oriented suburb after World War I.

The Dilworth Historic District was nominated to the National Register in 1987 under Criterion A for community planning; Criterion B for its associations with industrialist and New South advocate, Edward Dilworth Latta; and Criterion C for architecture and landscape architecture. The period of significance specified in the nomination extends from 1891 to 1941. A boundary amendment in 2000 expanded the district by twenty-three resources but did not change the period of significance.

During the 2013-2014 Phase I survey of Charlotte, a reconnaissance-level review was conducted of both the Dilworth National Register Historic District (1987), the National Register Boundary Amendment (2000), and the Dilworth Local Historic District (1992). While the National Register districts and the local historic district generally conform to the same boundary, the local district also encompasses several streets of post-World War II houses along the periphery of the National Register historic district. These streets were excluded from the National Register nomination because they postdated the nominated period of significance.

The Phase I project was conducted to assess the overall integrity of the two historic districts and their boundaries but not to evaluate the integrity of each constituent resource. Typical of all historic districts, the boundaries of the Dilworth Historic District were drawn to encompass the greatest concentration of properties that contributed to the historical and architectural significance of the district at the time it was nominated. Historic district boundaries should delineate a cohesive group of properties that as a collection illustrate the criteria under which the district is nominated to the National Register. National Register historic district boundaries must also have historical justification, and in the case of Dilworth, the boundaries corresponded to the original 1891 grid plan of the streetcar suburb, the 1911-1912 Olmsted Brothers-designed expansion, and the 1920 curvilinear sections of the post-World War I neighborhood.

### Summary of Phase I Project Results

(See: *Final Report: Charlotte Comprehensive Architectural Survey, Phase I, Charlotte, North Carolina*. Charlotte: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department, 12 August 2014)

The Phase I project concluded that both the National Register and local historic districts remain largely intact. However, it was noted that there have been a number of alterations, additions, and demolitions since the districts were designated, and the boundaries of the districts have been compromised in certain areas by new construction. The principal investigators also noted that the end of the period of significance for the National Register historic district could be extended from the listed end date of 1941 to 1964 (the fifty-year cut-off date for National Register eligibility at the time of the Phase I project). The Phase I found that the historic district contains a number of well-preserved houses erected between 1941 and 1964, including two-story Colonial Revival residences as well as some ranch-style and Modernist dwellings, that might be contributing if the period of significance were reassessed.

### Phase II Survey of Dilworth: Scope of Work and Methodology

As part of the second phase of the Charlotte Comprehensive Architectural Survey, a more in-depth field examination of the Dilworth National Register Historic District was conducted to evaluate the current integrity of each principal resource. The National Register historic district contains a total of 1,040 principal resources (1,022 in the original nomination and eighteen in the boundary expansion). During the Phase II field work, the National Register nomination inventory list of Dilworth was used to compare the appearance of each property at the time of the nomination to its current condition. The inventory list includes a brief physical description of each property, by address, and also assesses integrity. In the inventory list, each property is classified as either contributing or noncontributing. For Dilworth, contributing resources enhance the district's historical importance under Criterion A as the city's first streetcar suburb; its historic association with Edward Dilworth Latta under Criterion B; and its architectural significance under Criterion C. Noncontributing resources, whether because of modern dates of construction, remodelings, or additions, detract from the significance of the district.

To evaluate the current integrity of each resource (i.e., whether the resource is contributing or noncontributing), the principal investigators followed the National Register guidelines for determining integrity set forth in *National Register Bulletin No. 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (National Park Service 1991).

*National Register Bulletin No. 15* states:

Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the National Register criteria, but it also must have integrity. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance.

Historic properties either retain integrity (that is, convey their significance) or they do not. Within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognize seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity.

The seven aspects of integrity are location, setting, association, feeling, design, workmanship, and materials. To retain integrity, a property usually possesses most of these aspects. *Bulletin No. 15* acknowledges that although all properties change over time, buildings that are contributing resources in historic districts must retain their “essential physical features that convey their historic identities. The essential physical features are those features that define both *why* a property is significant (Applicable Criteria and Areas of Significance) and *when* it was significant (Periods of Significance). They are the features without which a property can no longer be identified as, for instance, a late nineteenth century dairy barn or an early twentieth century commercial district.” Consequently, modern alterations and additions affect whether an individual resource contributes to a district’s significance. For example, houses with relatively modest additions that have little effect on the historic design of the original dwelling are classified as contributing. On the other hand, dwellings with renovations that significantly change the original massing and size, introduce major incompatible stylistic features, and disrupt the spatial organizations of historic streetscapes in the district are classified as noncontributing.

When evaluating the extent to which the addition changes the dwelling’s individual character and the character of the streetscape of which it is a part, it is important to consider the size, scale, and design of the addition. The construction of a rear, one-story kitchen wing or modest-sized dormers on a story-and-a-half house are unlikely to affect significantly the integrity of the dwelling, but the addition of a full, second story by “popping up” the roof alters the character of both house and streetscape. Thus, in the latter example, the individual resource is no longer contributing and thus compromises the overall integrity of the district.

The Dilworth Historic District was examined not only to assess the integrity of each inventoried resource but also to evaluate the integrity of the historic district as a whole. The historic character and scale of streetscapes and the rhythm and organization of building forms must be largely intact to remain eligible. Because of the importance of overall integrity in the district, some leeway may be given to such alterations as replacement windows, doors, or other added architectural elements that would otherwise diminish the integrity of a historic resource that was *individually* eligible. In a historic district, form, size, scale, and massing of the resource, as well as the rhythm and character of the overall streetscape, are paramount, and alterations to these lead to a reassessment of contributing status. As a general rule, houses should maintain their original roof ridgelines so that any addition is subordinate to the original scale, form, and massing of the property. A large, rear addition should not render a historic building noncontributing if it is located behind and lower than the roof ridgeline. However, an upper addition that begins immediately behind the original facade creates an essentially modern, two-story house which has used a vestige of the historic property as a subordinate architectural element. In such cases, the house would be noncontributing.

### Phase II Survey of Dilworth: Summary of Findings

The Phase II reconnaissance survey of Dilworth found that the Dilworth National Register Historic District remains largely intact despite the preservation challenges caused by rising land values. Amidst changes, many owners have been good stewards of their historic houses and the district as a whole.

The original 1987 National Register nomination contained 1,022 principal resources (846 contributing and 176 noncontributing). (By definition, a principal resource is the main building on the tax parcel and does not refer to garages or other outbuildings.) The 2000 boundary expansion added fifteen contributing principal resources and three noncontributing properties to the historic district, bringing the principal resource count to 1,040.

The Phase II field work--conducted in November and December 2014-- recorded 801 contributing and 265 noncontributing properties for a total of 1,066 principal resources. The new total is greater than the nominated number of 1,040 both because the district contains some new construction on formerly vacant or subdivided lots (in addition to modern buildings that have replaced contributing or noncontributing resources) and because, in a few cases, the nomination inventory list left out resources that were extant in 1987 and should have been recorded. These numbers may belie the extent of alterations and, to a lesser degree, demolitions in the district. New construction is counted as noncontributing rather than given a separate designation. Consequently, modern houses replacing noncontributing resources do not alter the original resource count.

The survey revealed several types of common modifications that led to a loss of contributing status. Because of their relatively small size, bungalows and other forms of one-story houses are particularly vulnerable to additions that threaten contributing status, whereas additions are less apt to overwhelm larger, two-story houses. Many bungalows have had either one-half or full story upper additions to create two-story houses. In other cases, bungalows have been given "pop-up" sections that rise from the otherwise gable or hip roof. There are also a few cases of modern construction so extensive that the original house is now largely reduced only to the front elevation. Where the original massing, form, and number of stories are no longer discernible, the house is recommended as noncontributing. Some upper-story additions are acceptable if the new construction is positioned well to the rear of the main block, and the original roof configuration and original house form are intact and clearly discernible. Similarly, rear upper additions that are below the original roof ridge line so as not to obscure the original design may also remain contributing.

Outbuildings were not examined during this investigation, but it was observed that garages, the commonest form of outbuilding in Dilworth, have often been heavily altered or demolished and replaced with larger buildings. Although secondary structures, large garages, often with upper stories, negatively affect the historic character of the district. If a review of all resources in the historic district were conducted, the inventory list would include both primary and secondary resources, and the total number of noncontributing resources would increase. (This project examined only *primary* resources.) During the historic period, most garages were one-story, one- or two-car designs while a few of the larger houses had garages with upper stories for servant's quarters. Thus, no modern garage should be more than one story or two cars wide, and no garage should be attached to the house.

Finally, Dilworth contained a number of postwar houses, notably along Romany Road and Dilworth Road West, which are being replaced with much larger houses. Although these postwar houses were noncontributing, the new houses should maintain the scale and massing of either the original house or nearby dwellings. Of particular concern are new houses that have been allowed to use current building codes for height rather than the limits set by historic precedents in the district. No house should be as tall as current building codes allow because these exceed historic height limits and alter the overall scale of the street.



### Phase II Survey: Recommendations

Despite the pace and sometimes extensive nature of alterations, the Dilworth Historic District remains generally intact although it is recommended that the boundary should be redrawn slightly to exclude heavily altered and now demolished properties concentrated near the edges of the district. In particular, the boundary could be revised along Euclid Avenue and the streets to the west where commercial and multiple-family development have encroached. The Dilworth Crescent development, bordered by Dilworth Road, Mount Vernon Avenue, and Lexington Avenue, should also be eliminated from the district boundary.

With rising land values and development pressures, Dilworth and other inner city historic districts face challenges. Of particular concern for Dilworth, demolitions, new construction, and heavy alterations and additions are reducing the percentage of smaller dwellings, duplexes, and other forms of multiple-family residences. More and more, these changes are creating a district of large, single-family houses that obscures the mixed socio-economic composition and variety of land uses that once prevailed and were expressed architecturally at the time of the nomination. Some of the alterations are so heavy-handed that they amount to demolition and new construction.

Fortunately, the Dilworth National Register Historic District is contained within the boundaries of the local historic district in which exterior changes must meet design guidelines. In order to protect the historic district, the design guidelines should be revised, applied uniformly, and enforced by the City to ensure that the district maintains sufficient historic fabric to illustrate the areas of significance under which it was nominated.

The Phase I project noted that the period of significance could perhaps be brought up to the current fifty-year cut-off date. Construction continued in Dilworth through the 1950s, and it is conceivable that a historically justifiable case could be made for extending the period of significance to the mid-1960s. The district contains a number of properties that were defined as noncontributing in the nomination because they were built after 1941, but many of these appear to retain sufficient integrity to be contributing. The greatest concentration is found along Romany Road where thirty properties were built between 1941 and 1952. The present study observed that twenty-two of these still have integrity. In addition, Belgrave Place, within the local historic district, might be included within an expanded National Register boundary. Although amending the period of significance and expanding the boundary may be feasible, reassessing the district and preparing the National Register nomination amendment is beyond the scope of this project.