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Executive Summary

From 2019 through 2021, the City of Fort Worth contracted HHM & Associates, Inc. (HHM) to complete a multi-phased Citywide Historic Context and Survey Plan.¹ This report combines the historic contexts prepared under Phases I–III. Under Phase I, HHM prepared a historic context for the period from 1900 to 1945. This context was reviewed and approved by both the City of Fort Worth and the Texas Historical Commission in 2019. HHM completed the geographic context and the historic contexts covering the mid-nineteenth century to 1899, and 1946 to 1980 under Phases II and III between 2020 and 2021. This Citywide Historic Context integrates all contexts into one and intends to form a framework that knits together the significance of previously designated landmarks and historic districts, while providing helpful background for potential future designations and preservation planning.

Phase IV of the project, undertaken from 2020 to 2021, consists of a survey plan addendum for documenting historic resources within Fort Worth city limits. The plan recommends a phased approach to be completed over a multi-year period as funding for survey efforts becomes available. HHM employed a methodology for identifying and prioritizing survey areas using GIS analysis of previously designated City of Fort Worth Local Historic Districts and historic annexation boundaries. This process led to deciphering manageable survey areas and their priority order, assigning the oldest survey areas as having the most urgent need for documentation. Additionally, HHM and the City of Fort Worth worked together to determine the type of survey recommended for each survey zone—windshield or reconnaissance—based on the level of evaluation needed for each area. The survey plan also targets approximate costs associated with each phase of the citywide survey. As part of the development of the survey plan, HHM built a custom historic resources database template for the City of Fort Worth using ESRI’s ArcGIS Online Collector App. This tool allows for a survey team to utilize handheld devices, such as mobile phones and tablets, to document historic resources remotely in the field.

The project was made possible with a grant from the Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant Program administered by the Texas Historical Commission (THC).

¹ The Draft Survey Plan (Phase IV of the project) was submitted to the City and the Texas Historical Commission in March 2021.
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Introduction to the Historic Contexts

The geographic and historic contexts within show how extant historic-age resources reflect significant historical themes, events, and individuals in Fort Worth’s past. The contexts establish myriad areas of significance and important themes and subthemes, such as settlement of the city, the cattle drives and the development of the meatpacking industry, expanding transportation networks, suburbanization, and economic diversification. The contexts can be used as a framework for evaluating properties for local historic designation and National Register eligibility during future surveys. The sample statements of significance woven throughout the contexts provide examples of how extant resources meet or may meet designation criteria for association with specific themes and subthemes discussed in the contexts. These samples provide a framework for periods of significance, geographic location, area(s) of significance, and associated property types. These samples may serve as guides for helping identify resources associated with significant themes and subthemes, but each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance to determine exact dates for periods of significance and areas of significance. Also note that many resources may be associated with multiple themes. The bibliography herein also provides relevant sources that may be used for further research on a specific theme and the evaluation of properties associated with that theme.

Additional Information about Historic Designations

National Register of Historic Places Program
Information on the National Register of Historic Places program and how to prepare a nomination for individual properties and historic districts can be found online: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/index.htm.

City of Fort Worth’s Historic Preservation Program
Information on the City of Fort Worth’s Historic Preservation program and designation process for individual sites and historic districts can be found online: https://www.fortworthtexas.gov/departments/development-services/preservation-urban-design/historic-preservation.
OVERVIEW

Fort Worth lies in North Texas, approximately 300 miles inland from the Gulf of Mexico and 75 miles from the Red River and the Oklahoma border (figs. 1-1 and 1-2). The city falls within the Cross Timbers and Prairies region, along the border of the rolling hills and grasslands of the prairie and the more heavily wooded Cross Timbers (fig. 1-3). The land is flat to rolling, carved throughout by the area’s waterways, and the soil is rich. Fort Worth experiences hot, dry summers and mild winters. This geography is greatly tied to the city’s nineteenth-century origins and twentieth-century development.

Figure 1-1. Shaded relief map of Texas. Map of Texas with Fort Worth circled in red. Source: https://gisgeography.com/Texas-map/
This page is intentionally left blank.
Figure 1-2. This is a 1985 USGS topographic map of Fort Worth with elevations, water features, and woodland areas (green) shown. Source: USGS, TopoView, accessed August 2, 2021, https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/topoview/.
Before the first permanent Anglo inhabitants arrived in the mid-nineteenth century, this frontier land was characterized by vast swaths of rolling prairies, bisected by a myriad of rivers and streams. Flowing northwest to southeast across Tarrant County, the area’s largest river, the Trinity, along with its many smaller tributaries, created areas in the city with gently sloping, flora-covered bluffs. Along the rivers and creeks, and in the flat bottomlands created by these waterways, stands of trees grew, including live oaks, sycamore, elm, pecan, and cottonwood. In and along the waterways, fish and fowl were plentiful, and wild animals, including deer, turkeys, and antelope, roamed freely in the river bottomlands and prairies. In part due to the hospitable environment, indigenous tribes including Tonkawa, Caddo, Comanche, Kiowa, and Wichita, lived in this region for centuries before the arrival of Anglo settlers.1 This geographic portrait of the area proved significant in the city’s founding and subsequent growth and development in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

WATERWAYS AND CLIMATE

Flowing from the west, two of the Trinity River’s four forks, the Clear and West Forks, come together at the approximate center of Tarrant County. At their confluence, bluffs overlooking the waterways and nearby lands provided the requisite vantage point for the establishment of Fort Worth in 1849, the military post from which the city evolved (fig. 1-4). Only a few months after the founding of the post, which was located near the bluffs on the banks of the river, its occupants learned of the waterway’s proclivity for flooding. The military moved the camp out of the floodplain to higher ground atop the bluffs, but for the next 100 years, flooding remained an ever-present threat to the city.
Flood Control Measures

Fort Worth’s climate contributed to the waterways’ tendency to flood. Generally subtropical, Fort Worth has hot and humid summers, mild to cool winters, and is prone to tornadoes and severe storms. Precipitation in the area varies considerably from year to year. In years of drought, the city receives less than 20 inches of rainfall, but on average, 37 inches of rain falls annually in Fort Worth. Most of the rainfall occurs during the four-month period beginning in March and ending in June. Consequently, each of the city’s major floods—1889, 1908, 1922, and 1949—occurred in spring after severe storms (figs. 1-5 and 1-6). To protect against floods, which took lives, displaced citizens, and caused millions of dollars in damage to property, the City implemented a series of flood control projects beginning shortly after the flood of 1908. Over the next four decades, the levee-improvement district, various local organizations, and the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) built and strengthened levees, installed a drainage system, and straightened some channels in their flood control efforts. Three dams, Lake Worth, Lake Bridgeport, and Eagle Mountain Lake were also constructed to help control the flow of the West and Clear Forks. The reservoirs also provided drinking water and recreation to city residents.
Despite these efforts, in 1949 Fort Worth experienced its worst flood due to levee failure (fig. 1-7). A sense of urgency for improved flood control followed the event and resulted in the completion of the Fort Worth Floodway project. Finished in 1957, the project included a new dam (Benbrook Reservoir), channeling of the West and Clear Forks, construction of new levees and strengthening existing levees, and more interior drainage. The project, headed by the USACE and the Tarrant Regional Water District, leveed and channeled an eight-mile section of the river in Fort Worth. The work straightened and enlarged the course of the river and guaranteed protection for 1,710 acres in the city (fig. 1-8). The new floodway allowed for greater urbanization and park creation within the city of Fort Worth.

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme of Waterways and Climate, subtheme Flood Control Measures.
## Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Waterways and Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Flood Control Measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Statement of Significance:** Resources significant within the theme of Waterways and Climate reflect not only flood control measures implemented as a result of Fort Worth’s history of flooding, but they also reflect the land use created by flood control. Flood control resources are likely eligible as a district that encompasses a system, rather than as individual resources. These may be eligible under Community Planning and Development as well as Engineering. Resources must retain sufficient integrity to convey significance and association with this theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Significance:</th>
<th>Roughly between 1908 through the 1950s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance Justification:</td>
<td>Broadly covers the period between the flood of 1908 and the subsequent flood control measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geographic Location:** Along the Trinity River, Clear Fork, West Fork, and other tributaries of the Trinity River

**Area(s) of Significance:** Community Planning and Development, Engineering, Landscape Architecture

**Criteria:**
- National Register: A, C
- Local: 1, 2, 5

**Associated Property Types:** Individual resources contributing to a historic district or landscape include a variety of flood control implements including: levees, dams, reservoirs, water gauges, sumps, sluices, and gates. May also include parks.

**Example:** Benbrook Lake

Benbrook Lake, approximately 15 miles southwest of downtown on the Clear Fork, was built between 1947 and 1952 during a period of immense flood control construction. Built by the Army Corps of Engineers, Benbrook was one of several new lakes in and around Fort Worth constructed to help with flooding of the Trinity River and its tributaries. Railroad tracks, rods, utility lines, and even cemeteries were relocated for the building of the project, which included construction of rolled-earth embankments, a concrete spillway, and sliding gates. During heavy rains in 1957, 1989, 1990, and 1991, Benbrook Lake helped prevent massive flooding and damage. The lake also serves as a source of water and as a source of recreation; boat ramps provide access to the lake and several parks are located on the lake’s shores. The lake may be eligible as a local landmark and for listing in the National Register under Criterion A for Community Planning and Development and Criterion C for Engineering.

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*

---

Figure 1-8. Map showing floodway improvements finished in 1957 overlaid on a 1953 aerial. Note the straightened course of the waterway, particularly the Clear Fork southwest of downtown. Source: USGS Earth Explorer aerial, FEMA floodplain data, overlay done by HHM, 2021.
SOILS AND VEGETATION

Fort Worth falls within the northern section of the Grand Prairie known as the Fort Worth Prairie. Around Fort Worth the soil is varied: heavy, dark calcareous prairies soils atop hard limestone make up the western side of the city; light, stony, and sandy noncalcareous soils are found to the east; and terraces of sandy, noncalcareous soils generally follow the course of the Trinity River. Rich in organic matter, due in part to the floodwaters’ ability to stretch over a broad area of flat terrain, the soils supported a diverse collection of trees, plants, and grasses prior to Anglo settlement. Forests of oaks and walnuts covered the flatter land to the east, while the west was characteristically rolling prairieland. On an 1854 survey of the region for the railroad, J. Pope described the area as:

. . . By far the richest most beautiful district of country I have ever seen, in Texas or elsewhere, is that watered by the Trinity and its tributaries. Occupying east and west a belt of one hundred miles in width, with about equal quantities of prairie and timber, intersected by numerous clear, fresh streams and countless springs, with a gently undulating surface of prairie and oak openings, it presents the most charming views, as of a country in the highest state of cultivation, and you are startled at the summit of each swell of the prairie with a prospect of groves, parks and forests, with intervening plains of luxuriant grass, over which the eye in vain wanders in search of the white village or the stately house, which seem alone wanting to be seen.

The vegetation and landscape of Pope’s memory changed vastly throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, though an undisturbed portion of the native prairie remains at Tandy Hills Natural Area (fig. 1-9). Despite some areas of shallow soil, deeper soils throughout the region proved conducive to agricultural endeavors. To the east and along the river, farmers found the land good for dairy farming and the soils favorable for a variety of fruit, vegetable, and grain crops including watermelons, potatoes, corn, cotton, and wheat. The grasslands to the west also supported crops as well as cattle and sheep. Substantial farming and livestock grazing by early settlers transformed the prairieland into a mix of rangeland, pastureland, and cropland. Oftentimes settling near waterways, farmers and ranchers cleared the land of trees, using the timber for building. These early agriculturalists left the first real permanent mark on the land, creating a cultural landscape that was also largely lost as the city grew in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

NOTES


4 Prior, Peter, and Murphey, “Below the Bluff,” 80.

5 Prior, Peter, and Murphey, “Below the Bluff,” 80.


8 E. J. Dyksterhuis, “The Vegetation of the Fort Worth Prairie,” Ecological Society of America, 5.

2 | Initial Settlement and Development: Mid-Nineteenth Century–1899

The 50-year period between the creation of the military outpost on the Trinity River in 1849 and the end of the nineteenth century was one of significant growth for Fort Worth. From its military beginnings, the city of Fort Worth became a county seat, a cattle drive stop, a railroad hub, and a regional center of commerce and trade in just five decades. By the end of the nineteenth century, Fort Worth was on the precipice of major economic and developmental expansion thanks to the foundation laid by the events of the nineteenth century.

### National Register Eligibility of Resources

Various themes associated with this period in Fort Worth’s history include: Initial Settlement, Early Government and Public Institutional Development, Agriculture, Economic and Commercial Development, Suburbanization and Residential Development, and Cultural and Social Development. Many of these themes can further be broken down into subthemes, such as Military Development and Cattle Drives. These themes played out simultaneously during the period and each played a role in the development of Fort Worth. Because this period of history took place over a century ago, many of the resources associated with these themes are no longer extant. Among the resources from this period that likely may be extant include: cemeteries, government buildings, public utility buildings, parks, farmsteads, houses, commercial buildings, railroad depots, and churches. These resources are most likely located within the city limits that existed in 1899 (fig. 2-1). Historic districts associated with this period may include residential areas, such as streetcar suburbs and exurban agricultural communities that developed outside of Fort Worth city limits during the period but were eventually incorporated. Resources from this period may be eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A under the following Areas of Significance: Agriculture, Commerce, Community Planning and Development, Education, Ethnic Heritage, Exploration/Settlement, Politics/Government, Social History, and Transportation. Extant resources may also have significance under Criterion C in the area of Architecture. See the one-page examples of statements of significance throughout this section, which explain how extant resources meet, or may meet, designation criteria under certain themes.

### INITIAL SETTLEMENT

### PRE-ANGLO POPULATIONS

Native American tribes lived in north central Texas for centuries before the area was settled in the mid-nineteenth century by Anglo Americans. The Wichita, Comanche, Caddo, Waco, Tonkawa, and Cherokee Tribes camped and roamed the region, as did smaller tribes including the Kiowa.1 The tribes were largely migratory and used a network of trails to travel from region to region. The myriad waterways and springs in the area provided ideal camping locations for the roaming tribes.

Beginning in the sixteenth century, Europeans began expeditions in what would later become Texas. Colonization attempts under both French (1684 to 1689) and Spanish (1690 to 1821) rule were primarily focused to the south. North Texas was largely above the colonization line, and the Spanish are not known to have built any presidios or missions in the area. As such, the Native American tribes in the region encountered little conflict until the arrival of Anglo settlers in the nineteenth century.
Figure 2-1. Map showing Fort Worth’s successive stages of annexation. Original city limits in pink. Note the large areas annexed between 1946 and 1975 in blue and purple. Source: HHM, 2021.
MILITARY DEVELOPMENT

Anglo American colonization in Texas generally began in 1820 under Spanish rule and continued under Mexican rule (1821–1835) and Texan rule (1836–1845) in the mid-nineteenth century. It was during these periods of various rule that north Texas saw its first permanent white settlers. Enticed by the availability of free land grants offered by the various governments of Texas, more settlers ventured further west into the unsettled frontier in the nineteenth century. Under Mexican rule, the land grant policy included individual grants of approximately 4,600 acres and larger “empresario” grants to entities colonizing at least 100 families, who typically received 230 acres each. The Republic of Texas initially offered “headright grants” worth 1,476.1 acres for existing settlers, though the size of grants decreased gradually between 1837 and 1842 and ranged from 320 to 1,240 acres. The Republic of Texas also gave land grants to veterans of the Texas War for Independence. Around 3,000 Anglo American, English, and European American settlers came to north central Texas as part of the Peters Colony in the early 1840s. Spread out over approximately 2,500 square miles, some of the families settled in what would become Tarrant County and Fort Worth. Other land grants in what became Fort Worth belonged to absentee landowners, who would later sell their lands to settlers, including John Peter Smith. Not all land grant recipients were absentee though and, some of the area’s earliest settlers and city founders, including the York and Gilmore families and Ephraim Merrell Daggett and Charles Biggers Daggett, moved to the area upon receiving land (fig. 2-2).

As more settlers entered into north central Texas, the Republic of Texas sponsored militia-led expeditions into the territory to clear it of the perceived Native American threat. The encroachment of white settlers and militia expeditions created tension between the Native American tribes and settlers, resulting in raids on both Anglo and tribal settlements. Such was the case along Village Creek, a tributary of the Trinity River that now forms the city limits of Fort Worth and Arlington, where several Native American tribes—including Caddo, Cherokee, and Tonkawa—had settlements. In response to the tensions in the area, a company of around 70 volunteers led by General Edward H. Tarrant raided the Native American camps on Village Creek in 1841. The militia burned several villages, and the subsequent clash between the tribes and Texas militia, known as the Battle of Village Creek, reportedly led to the death of 12 Native Americans and the confirmed death of one soldier, Captain John B. Denton, for whom neighboring Denton County is named.
After the skirmish between Native Americans and white settlers in 1841, General Edward H. Tarrant ordered the construction of a fort near the battle site to further protect the area for white settlers. The Texas militia, under Major Jonathan Bird, constructed several buildings at Fort Bird (or Bird’s Fort) on the Trinity River in late 1841, but by March 1842, once the militiamen’s terms of enlistment expired, the fort was abandoned.9 With the fort uninhabited, tensions and violence between Native Americans and settlers in the area persisted. In an effort to establish peace in the region, representatives for the Republic of Texas, including General Tarrant, met nine Native American tribes at the fort in 1843.10 On September 29, 1843, the representatives signed the Treaty of Bird’s Fort, one of the only Native American treaties ratified by the Republic of Texas. The treaty, in which both sides pledged cooperation and peace, also established a line, running roughly from present-day Fort Worth southwest to Menard County, separating Native American territory to the west from white settlement to the east.

The boundary between Anglo and Native American lands pushed westward as more settlers, motivated by the availability of land grants, made their way into the region after the signing of the peace treaty. With sustained tension in the region, the US government, which annexed Texas in 1845, ordered the construction of military posts along the boundary of the state’s settled regions to protect white settlers from Native American attack (fig. 2-3). Tasked with establishing a new northern anchor for the line of posts was Major Ripley Arnold, a veteran of the Mexican War and head of Company F of the Second Dragoons.11 Major Arnold chose a spot near the confluence of the Clear Fork and West Fork of the Trinity River during a May 1849 scouting expedition. The site, “a high, healthy locality surrounded by rich fertile land,” overlooked the waterways and distant lands and provided the requisite vantage point to monitor and prevent potential attacks.12 Arnold returned with his men in June and began construction of Fort Worth, named after the late General William Jenkins Worth, with whom Arnold fought during the Mexican War.

Figure 2-3. Map showing the first line of forts, including Fort Worth (named the Twiggs-Worth-Brooke Line on the map), and the second line (the Smith Line on the map). Source: Richard F. Selcer and W. B. Potter, The Fort That Became a City: An Illustrated Reconstruction of Fort Worth, Texas, 1849-1853 (Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press, 1995).

---

1 The nine tribes were: Delaware, Chickasaw, Waco, Tah-woc-cany, Keechi, Caddo, Ana-Dah-kah, Ionie, Bioloxi, and Cherokee.
Fort Worth occupied several acres atop the bluff at the approximate location of the present-day Tarrant County courthouse (fig. 2-4). A rope-line fence enclosed the post, which consisted of approximately 17 buildings constructed around a parade ground. The men used available materials—split logs, mud, handmade wooden pins, and sticks—in the construction of the buildings, which included living quarters, stables, offices, storerooms, and a guardhouse (fig. 2-5). The men, of which fewer than 70 were stationed at the fort at one time, spent their time drilling, maintaining the fort, and occasionally hunting. Because the fort was not located on a military road, like Fort Bliss and Fort Lancaster, its role was limited in regards to escorting settlers. Additionally, the fort never came under attack, and interactions with the Native American tribes were limited to bartering and trading. Despite the lack of military engagement, a handful of deaths necessitated the need for a cemetery. The first burials at the new cemetery, located approximately one mile northeast of the fort on land owned by a local settler, were that of Major Arnold’s two children, Willis and Sophia Arnold, who are said to have died of cholera in 1850. Over the next three years, disease and accidents took the lives of 11 soldiers who were also laid to rest in the cemetery.
After only four years, the US military decommissioned Fort Worth in 1853. As the area grew safer, increased Anglo migration pushed westward into previously unsettled land, rendering Fort Worth obsolete. A new defense line ran from Fort Belknap to Fort Clark, and many of the men stationed at Fort Worth were reassigned to these new posts (see fig. 2-3). Major Arnold returned to his old post at Fort Graham on the Brazos River where he died in September 1853. The fort and its buildings were abandoned and left to nearby settlers who used the buildings and site as the nucleus of a new frontier town: Fort Worth.18

The only extant resource from this period of military history is the cemetery, renamed Pioneers Rest Cemetery in the twentieth century (fig. 2-6). Located at 600 Samuels Avenue, Pioneers Rest Cemetery was listed in the National Register in February 2021. Several important figures in Fort Worth’s history are buried at the cemetery, including Major Arnold who was reinterred there in 1855, and General Tarrant, who was reinterred there in 1928.
**Statement of Significance***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme: Initial Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes: Pre-Anglo Populations, Military Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Statement of Significance:** Potential resources associated with this theme reflect the early history of the area and its early and migratory inhabitants, as well as the subsequent military response to these communities in the mid-nineteenth century. Any extant resources may be significant in the areas of Exploration/Settlement, Archeology, or Military. Resources; resources must retain sufficient integrity in order to convey their significance and association with this theme.

**Period of Significance:** Pre-history to 1853.

**Period of Significance Justification:** Native Americans lived in the area for centuries prior to Anglo settlement, and archeological remains may be present. Anglo American colonization generally began in 1820 and the military fort opened in 1849. The fort was decommissioned in 1853. Periods of significance may extend past 1853, particularly for cemeteries.

**Geographic Location:** Citywide. Archeological evidence may be located near waterways.

**Area(s) of Significance:** Exploration/Settlement, Archeology, Military, Community Planning and Development

| Criteria: National Register: A, D, Criteria Consideration D | Local: 1, 6, 7 |

**Associated Property Types:** Known extant resources include a cemetery. Other property types associated with this theme have largely been lost, but potentially may include archeological sites, religious sites, fort buildings, and cultural landscapes.

**Example:** Pioneers Rest Cemetery, 600 Samuels Avenue

Pioneers Rest Cemetery was established in 1850 as the primary burial ground for the military fort. Military figures including Major Arnold and General Tarrant are buried at Pioneers Rest. Pioneers Rest was Fort Worth’s only cemetery until 1879, though burials continued there throughout the twentieth century. The cemetery is listed in the National Register under Criteria A and C in the areas of Community Planning and Development and Art and meets Criteria Consideration D for cemeteries. The cemetery may also potentially be eligible under Exploration/Settlement and as a local landmark.

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*

Between the time of the establishment of the fort in 1849 and 1900, Fort Worth’s population grew from less than 100 to 26,688 (see table 2-1). Population growth in the two decades after the establishment of the military outpost was slow, actually declining during the Civil War when men went off to fight. Prior to the Civil War, white farmers and ranchers from the American South and Midwest accounted for the majority of population growth. Some enslaved African Americans also migrated with the white settlers. Enslaved men and women accounted for a portion of Tarrant County’s early growth. The countywide enslaved population grew from around 65 in 1850 to around 700 in 1860 and more than doubled during the Civil War. The availability of land grants and agricultural opportunities drove population growth across Tarrant County during this period, while the growing trade and county seat designation in 1860 helped attract more settlers to Fort Worth. The opportunity to start afresh in a new city also drew settlers. Ephraim Merrell Daggett described the motivation for moving to Fort Worth in the early 1850s:

I came, a young lawyer, to grow up with the country. The nearest railroad was over 200 miles distant. Owing to the liberal homestead provisions in the Constitution of 1845, since made more liberal and definite by the Constitution of 1876, a superior class of early settlers were attracted hither. Business men who had failed in other States came here with the remnants of their fortunes and secured homes and property free from the writ of scire facias.20

A large population increase in Fort Worth occurred after the Civil War, between 1865 and 1900. During this time, Fort Worth’s population increased over 7,000 percent, and for the first time, in 1890, the city became the fifth largest in Texas, with a population of 23,076 (following Dallas, San Antonio, Galveston, and Houston, in that order). The two primary factors for this dramatic population growth were the cattle drives and the arrival of the railroad. As in the pre-Civil War period, native-born Anglo- and European Americans accounted for the largest percentage of the city’s population growth. By 1900, native-born residents accounted for 93 percent of the city’s population.22 Many native-born residents migrated from Southern states, while others moved from within Texas to Fort Worth for job opportunities.

Also included in the city’s native-born population were African Americans. A large number of freedmen were said to have left Fort Worth after the Civil War, but with the arrival of the railroad, African Americans returned to the city. African Americans accounted for around 15 percent of Fort Worth’s population from 1880 to 1900, growing from around 1,000 to around 4,200.23 Most African Americans held jobs in the railroad and cattle industry, as well as a variety of service-related jobs including domestic servants, laborers, porters, and janitors.24 By 1882, the city had at least one Black physician, Dr. Franklin Trabue, a former enslaved person, and by the late nineteenth century a small Black middle class began to emerge in the city.25

A small number of immigrants moved to Fort Worth during this period; by 1900 foreign-born residents accounted for less than seven percent of the city’s population.26 Europeans from across the continent represented the majority of the city’s foreign-born population. The 1887 agricultural report for Tarrant County shows that German, Irish, and English immigrants were the largest groups in the county, but immigrants also came from Austria, Italy, Poland, Russia, and a dozen other European countries.27 Some came directly to Fort Worth, while others migrated from other American cities or from rural areas where they had originally settled. The European immigrants worked skilled and unskilled jobs in a variety of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>23,076</td>
<td>26,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent increase</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>350%</td>
<td>614%</td>
<td>166.5%</td>
<td>246.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sectors, and some also opened their own businesses. The O. B. Macaroni Company, founded by Italians Giovanni Laneri and Louis Bichocchi in 1899, remains in operation today.

While most of Fort Worth’s foreign-born population originated from Europe, small numbers of immigrants from Mexico and China also settled in the city. Though large-scale Mexican immigration to Texas and Fort Worth occurred in the twentieth century, around a hundred Mexicans likely settled in the city before 1900. Census records indicate fewer than 10 individuals born in, or born to a Mexican parent, lived in Fort Worth prior to 1880. Using the city directory and US Census records, Kenneth N. Hopkins, former local historian and archivist at the Fort Worth Public Library, estimated that between 50 to 100 Mexican-born or second-generation Mexicans lived in Fort Worth by 1900. Many were single men and laborers. A small number of Chinese men, who likely worked on the railroad, also settled in Fort Worth during this period. City directories from the 1880s and 1890s show around 10 Chinese-run laundries in the city, and census records show some Chinese cooks and domestic servants. Forty Chinese people lived in Fort Worth in 1890. This number dropped to 22 by 1900.

**EARLY GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**FORMATION OF TARRANT COUNTY**

Throughout the 1830s and 1840s, Anglo settlers and enslaved African Americans slowly made their way to north central Texas. Though they were largely dispersed, separated from one another on large tracts of land, several small communities had emerged in the region by the late 1840s, including Dallas, Grapevine, Johnson’s Station (present-day Arlington), and Lonesome Dove (in northeast Tarrant County) (fig. 2-7). With a population around 600 in the area encompassing present-day Tarrant County, and the anticipation of more settlers in the wake of Fort Worth’s (the military fort) establishment, the Texas legislature created a new county in December 1849. Tarrant County, named for General Edward Tarrant, covered nearly 900 square miles. The 1850 US Census recorded 664 inhabitants in the newly formed county.

The first elections in Tarrant County occurred in 1850 at Traders Oak, a massive live oak tree and the site of Fort Worth’s first trading post (present-day Traders Oak Park on Samuels Avenue, fig. 2-8). Here, the first county officials were elected, and Birdville was designated the county seat. Chosen for its location in the geographic center of the new county, Birdville was a small farming and ranching community approximately 10 miles northeast of Fort Worth. By 1855 Fort Worth had become a small frontier community and several of its prominent citizens wanted to move the county seat from Birdville to Fort Worth; the men called for another election to determine the matter. Fort Worth won the 1856 vote in an election said to have been marred with voter fraud and bribery. Birdville citizens subsequently protested the vote, and another election was held in 1860. Fort Worth again won the vote and was officially designated Tarrant County Seat in 1860.

Over the next three and half decades, Tarrant County oversaw the construction of three different courthouses. The first courthouse, a stone building, was completed around 1870, after the five-year interruption caused by the Civil War. Built east of the former fort buildings atop the Trinity River bluffs, the courthouse burned in 1876. The second courthouse was completed in 1877 in the same location. In 1893, the Tarrant County Commissioners Court voted to allocate $500,000 for a new courthouse that reflected the city and county’s growing wealth and prominence. Completed in 1895 and designed by Kansas City architects Gunn and Curtis and built by Probst Construction Company of Chicago, the new (extant) pink granite Renaissance Revival building atop the bluff became the focal point of the burgeoning city. The Tarrant County courthouse (100 East Weatherford Street, listed in the National
Register, Recorded Texas Historic Landmark), which resembled the Texas State capitol building, did lend an air of importance to Fort Worth while also cementing its status as a governmental center (fig. 2-9).

Figure 2-7. Map of Tarrant County in 1849 showing early settlements. Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram Collection, University of Texas at Arlington, UTA Libraries Digital Gallery, accessed May 24, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/img/10000112.
North of the courthouse square, on West Belknap Street, the creation of a county government district took root during this period (fig. 2-10). The first county jail, which was built in Fort Worth in 1856 as part of the city’s attempt to gain the county seat from Birdville, was located at Jones and Belknap Streets. In 1883, the county commissioners court approved a bond for a larger jail that would be located near the courthouse. The new jail was completed in 1884 north of the courthouse square at 100 West Belknap.
Street (currently Paddock Park). Though a new jail was later built a block west at 200 West Belknap Street in 1918, the construction of the jail in its original location on West Belknap Street in 1884 helped create the cluster of county government buildings that still exists north of the courthouse.

Figure 2-10. Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1885, showing the county courthouse and jail. Source: Fire Insurance Company, Fort Worth, 1885, sheet 3, from the University of Texas at Austin, http://legacy.lib.utexas.edu/maps/sanborn/d-f/txu-sanborn-fort_worth-1885-03.jpg.

FORT WORTH INCORPORATION AND EARLY MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

After a period of decline and instability caused by the Civil War, Fort Worth’s population and economy rebounded by the early 1870s. In large part bolstered by the thriving cattle drive industry and the businesses and jobs it spawned, the city’s economy stabilized, and its population nearly reached 2,500. The city expected continued economic prosperity and population growth in the coming years, as the arrival of the first railroad seemed imminent given that it was scheduled to reach Fort Worth in 1874. Prior to the arrival of the railroad, though, residences dotted the areas east and west of the commercial district that stretched from the courthouse south to around 14th Street. With a large transient population of cattlemen in an area that lacked any sort of law enforcement, an “unsavory” district arose in the southern end of town. Dubbed “Hell’s Half Acre,” saloons, dance halls, gambling, and prostitution defined the area. In general, the city retained a frontier atmosphere: it lacked law enforcement, its streets were not paved, there were no public utilities or public education, garbage piled up outside businesses, and pigs roamed the streets.

In recognition of the city’s growth and its growing need for order, several prominent citizens wrote a charter for the city’s incorporation. In March 1873, after the Texas state legislature approved the city charter, Fort Worth was officially incorporated with a mayor-council form of government. The new municipality occupied approximately 4.2 square miles, stretched roughly between present-day Northwest 7th Street and Terrell Avenue to the north and south, and present-day Sylvania Avenue and the Trinity River to the east and west (fig. 2-11). In 1877, the city council divided the city into three wards.
Figure 2-11. Map from 1949 showing the various stages of growth and annexation in Fort Worth spanning outward from the original 1873 townsite. Source: University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting University of Texas at Arlington Library, accessed May 24, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth193678/.
As anticipated, the remainder of the nineteenth century proved a period of significant growth for Fort Worth. In the two and a half decades after its incorporation, Fort Worth’s population ballooned to over 26,000, and the city limits also expanded. Through several annexations in 1890 and 1891, the city added an additional 2.1 square miles immediately south of the original townsite, stretching the city limits to present-day Jessamine Street. By 1891 the city had nine wards. During this time, the municipal government enacted ordinances and regulations (including ones on gambling and prostitution), began collecting taxes, and established new departments that oversaw a number of improvements in the growing city. By the end of the period the city had streetlamps, graded streets, and sewers. Included among the City departments and municipal services established and organized during this period were: a police force (1873), public schools (1882), public water and sewers (1884), a Board of Health (1888), public parks and a Board of Park Commissioners (1892, 1897), a public library (1892), and a fire department (1893). Other utilities—including gas (1880s), electricity (1885), telephone (1878), and streetcar service (1876)—were provided by private companies that had franchises with the City.

During this period, Fort Worth’s white majority ran the city. The city’s eight nineteenth-century mayors were prominent white men such as John Peter Smith, a large landowner, and Buckley B. Paddock, a newspaper and railroad man and the namesake of the Paddock Viaduct. The City Council was entirely composed of white men. Though African Americans could not legally be denied the vote, poll taxes and literacy tests minimized their voting rights and power. One of the few arenas in which the Black community was provided some representation was the police force. Hagar Tucker, a freedman, was appointed in 1872 by city council to serve as a “special policeman.” In this role, Tucker was paid less than his white counterparts and was restricted to policing the African American community.

See the Social and Cultural Institutions section for a discussion of the role Black community organizations played in bridging the gaps left by the government.

The municipal government operated out of buildings downtown near the former fort site. Prior to the construction of the first city hall in 1877 (not extant), the first meetings of the mayor and council occurred in the county courthouse and later in a rented office on Weatherford Street. In 1893, a larger city hall built at Throckmorton and West 10th Streets replaced the 1877 building (fig. 2-12). The 1893 building served as city hall until 1937, when it was demolished and replaced with a new building in its place (currently the Public Safety and Courts Building at 1000 Throckmorton Street).

Like the original city hall, many of the buildings associated with early municipal government in Fort Worth do not remain. However, there are several extant resources, including a school, pumping station, and park, that reflect this governmental period and the city’s early transformation from a frontier town into an organized metropolis.

---


---

8 The Central Fire Station, built in 1899 at Throckmorton and 8th Streets, was demolished in 1938. The public library system began in 1892 as the Fort Worth Public Library Association and the first library was built in 1901 at 915 Throckmorton Street (demolished in the 1930s) with the financial support of Andrew Carnegie. The city agreed to finance its yearly budget.
Figure 2-12. The 1893 City Hall at Throckmorton and West 10th Streets. The building was demolished in 1937. Source: Jack White Photograph Collection, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries, UTA Libraries Digital Gallery, accessed April 21, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/img/10004065.

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Early Government Development and Public Institutional Development.
### Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Early Government and Public Institutional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Formation of Tarrant County, Fort Worth Incorporation and Early Municipal Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Statement of Significance:**

Resources significant within the theme of Early Municipal Government may include a variety of resources associated with local and county governments, as well as public infrastructure and utilities associated with the incorporation of Fort Worth and its development into an organized city. Resources may be eligible under a number of areas of significance but must retain sufficient integrity in order to convey significance and association with this theme.

**Period of Significance:** Roughly between 1873 and 1899.

**Period of Significance Justification:**

Broadly covers the period of time between the incorporation of Fort Worth and the subsequent establishment of many of the City’s municipal departments and utilities, including the police force, public schools, and public water and sewers.

**Geographic Location:** Generally within the city limits that existed in 1899.

**Area(s) of Significance:** Community Planning and Development, Education, Government, Entertainment/Recreation, Engineering and Architecture

**Criteria:**

- National Register: A, C
- Local: 1, 2, 3, 5

**Associated Property Types:**

Known extant resources include a school, pumping station, park, and courthouse. Other resources may include: police stations, fire stations, jails, and city hall.

**Example:**

**Sixth Ward School, 319 Lipscomb Avenue**

The *Sixth Ward School* (renamed the *Stephen F. Austin Elementary School* in 1904) is an example of a resource associated with the theme of Early Government and Public Institutional Development. Built in 1892, the school was one of the first constructed after Fort Worth established a public school system in 1878. Built nine years after the city’s incorporation, the school was one of many new public buildings and utilities constructed during this period of municipal development. Designed by local architectural firm Messer, Sanguinet, and Messer, the school reflects Fort Worth’s early civic and municipal development as well as its commitment to education. This building is a local landmark and listed in the National Register under Criteria A and C in the areas of Education and Architecture. The school is also potentially eligible under Criteria A in the area of Community Planning and Development.

---

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*

---

Public Schools

Prior to the establishment of a public education system in Fort Worth, private schools provided the city’s only option for education. Early settler John Peter Smith established the first private school for white children in 1854 and charged five dollars a month for tuition. Despite an interruption during the Civil War, private education continued at a handful of private schools in the city, many operating out of residences, churches, or rented buildings. During Reconstruction, private schools for African American children also opened with the help of James A. Cavile, a leader of the Black community in Tarrant County. Cavile and a board of trustees established schools in several communities in the county, including Fort Worth. Outside of these schools, Black children were also educated privately in churches and homes.

Despite various mid-nineteenth-century efforts at the state level to establish a public school system, it was not until the passage of the Texas Constitution of 1876, which provided funding and public land for establishing and supporting schools, that prompted the creation of a public school system in Fort Worth. Despite some objections to using taxes for public schools, the City passed an ordinance in 1878 that established the city’s first public school system. This milestone, along with the establishment of other municipal utilities during this period, reflects Fort Worth’s transition into an organized municipality and its commitment to its citizens’ education and well-being.

In 1882, nearly three decades after classes began in private households, the first public schools in Fort Worth opened. The school district hired 13 white teachers and four African American teachers, including freedman Isiah Milligan Terrell, considered the father of Black education in Fort Worth. For the first eight years, the school district held classes in rented or donated buildings. Because Texas required the segregation of schools by race, roughly 1,200 white children attended classes in various buildings including the Masonic Hall, and the school district rented several African American churches and other small wood-frame buildings for the city’s 300 or so African American students. Throughout the period, the city’s African American population was instrumental in the organization of the city’s Black public schools. In the early 1890s, the city’s only school for Black children, located at East 9th and Pecan Streets, was inconveniently located for residents in the city’s southside. With the community’s insistence and petitioning to City Council, a second school, the Southside Colored School, opened in 1894, presumably out of Mount Zion Baptist Church. While the district provided schools for its white and African American population, it is not known where the small number of Mexican and other non-white and non-Black children attended school in this era.

In 1890 the first public school built by the district, Fort Worth High School, opened at Hemphill Street and West Daggett Avenue (no longer extant, burned in 1909). The Fourth Ward School also opened during this period (renamed Sam Houston School and demolished around 1930 to allow construction of the extant Central Fire Station No. 2 at 1000 Cherry Street), as did the Sixth Ward School (extant). The City purchased land at 319 Lipscomb Street in 1890 for the Sixth Ward School, which opened in 1892 (renamed Stephen F. Austin Elementary School). Reflective of the importance the City placed on education, they hired architects for the design of both Fort Worth High School and the Sixth Ward School. Haggart and Sanguinet designed the ornate Richardsonian Romanesque and Renaissance Revival high school, while Messer, Sanguinet, and Messer designed the brick Richardsonian Romanesque Sixth Ward School. The only extant nineteenth-century school in Fort Worth, the Sixth Ward School operated until 1977, and was listed in the National Register in 1983 (fig. 2-13). The Williamson-Dickie Manufacturing Company (established in Fort Worth in 1922) now owns and occupies the building.
Public Water
The city’s water originally came from private wells, cisterns, springs, and the Trinity River. In 1882, Buckley B. Paddock, who would later become mayor, organized the Fort Worth Water Works Company, a private water venture that piped water from the Trinity River to businesses and residents. The City purchased the company in 1884 and built the Holly Pump Station at 1500 11th Avenue (extant) on the east side of the Clear Fork of the Trinity in 1892 to meet the growing demand for water (fig. 2-14).
Public Parks
Like many municipal endeavors in Fort Worth, the public park system began during this period. Though park development really began in earnest in the twentieth century, the city laid the foundation for such development during this period. Prominent landowner Sarah Gray Jennings donated to Fort Worth its first park, Hyde Park (Throckmorton and West 9th streets), in 1873. Nineteen years later, the City purchased 50 acres south of West 7th Street on the Clear Fork for public use; land on the west side of the river was set aside for a park (City Park, fig. 2-15). Renamed Trinity Park in 1910, today the park is over 250 acres and one of nearly 300 public parks and open spaces managed by the City.

North of the river, Marine Park (303 Northwest 20th Street) also opened during this period. Falling outside city limits at the time, the 14-acre park was created in 1894. Organized by residents of the community of Marine who used the space for picnicking, the park included a small lake (since drained). A nine-foot picket fence enclosed the park to deter stray cattle from entering. The Fort Worth Park Department incorporated the park when the City annexed North Fort Worth in 1909.

AGRICULTURE
Agriculture played a significant role in the early settlement of Fort Worth, as the area’s fertile lands attracted many of the city’s earliest migrants from the South and Midwest. With these early white settlers, around 700 enslaved African Americans also arrived in Tarrant County prior to the Civil War. These early settlers formed the nucleus of the community’s population. Many of the white men would become involved in the organization of the county and municipal governments, railroad development, and other business ventures. Some freedmen also remained after the Civil War, purchased property, and helped create small communities and organizations in the support of the African American population. In addition to contributing to the settlement of the area, agriculture also emerged as one of the primary economic forces that drove community development. As farms and plantations proliferated in and around Fort Worth, so too did the city’s economic growth as it became a commercial and shipping center for area farmers. Fort Worth not only served as a market and shipping center for agricultural goods, it also developed a significant agricultural processing industry that remained a leading economic sphere into the twentieth century.
EARLY SETTLERS

A handful of settlers arrived in the 1840s prior to the establishment of the military post, including the Seaborn Gilmore and John B. York families from Missouri, both of whom established homesteads north of the river (see fig. 2-2).60 Over the next decade, around 10 other families, many from Tennessee, joined the Gilmores and Yorks north of the river on scattered farmsteads.61 A Denton County native, Merida Green Ellis, also farmed north of the river in the nineteenth century. On his 1,067 acres, Ellis raised cattle and horses, and established four dairies in the 1880s.62 Among the other early settlers to Fort Worth were the Daggett brothers: Charles Biggers, Henry Clay, and Ephraim Merrell, who are considered to be among the founders of Fort Worth. Canadians by birth, the brothers arrived in Fort Worth via Shelby County in East Texas in the late 1840s and early 1850s.63 While Henry went into the merchant trade, both Charles and Ephraim established farmsteads in Fort Worth. In 1870, Charles had 100 acres of improved land and 600 acres of woodland, known as Daggett’s Woods, northeast of Fort Worth on the northern banks of the river. Here, Charles raised horses, milk cows, cattle, sheep, and pigs and grew wheat, corn, and oats.64 By 1880, Charles accumulated over 1,600 acres and his farm was valued at $11,500.65 For his part, Ephraim purchased more land, adding to his headright south of the river. In the 1850s and early 1860s, he established a plantation on over 600 acres south of present-day downtown where enslaved people grew cotton and corn.66 Like many of the agricultural properties in Fort Worth, much of Ephraim Daggett’s property gave way to development growth in the latter half of this period. In the early 1870s, Daggett donated 96 acres of this farm for railroad development, and throughout the rest of the nineteenth century, much of his property was platted into multiple subdivisions, including the Hillside Addition and Daggett’s Addition.

After the arrival of the railroad, many of the agricultural areas within the city limits began to erode as developers eyed land for new residential neighborhoods. Though no resources associated with any of these early farmsteads remain (Ephraim Daggett’s house was presumably located on the site of the Convention Center), the Kbleber Miller (K. M.) Van Zandt homestead at 2900 Crestline Drive is one of the few extant resources associated with early agricultural settlement in Fort Worth (fig. 2-16). Just west of present-day downtown Fort Worth near the western bank of the Clear Fork, the house dates to between 1855 and 1869 and was part of a larger agricultural property, roughly totaling 600 acres.67 In 1869, Major K. M. Van Zandt purchased the farm and house. Van Zandt, though, was a business- and railroad man and not a farmer, and he only lived in the farmhouse until the late 1870s. Van Zandt moved into a new house at the corner of West 7th and Penn Streets and leased the farm property.68

Figure 2-16. View of the ca. 1856 Van Zandt cottage at 2900 Crestline Drive, undated (extant). The property is listed in the National Register. Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram Collection, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries, UTA Libraries Digital Gallery, accessed May 7, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitgalley/img/10000461.
OUTLYING COMMUNITIES PRIOR TO ANNEXATION

Small agricultural communities developed in some areas outside the city limits in the nineteenth century. Unlike the agricultural properties within the city limits, these agricultural-based communities persisted into the twentieth century and were eventually annexed by the city. These communities were settled in much the same pattern as Fort Worth, by farmers from the South and Midwest, but they developed independently of their neighboring city, with their own schools, churches, mills, and cotton gins. Polytechnic Heights, east of Fort Worth, is an example of this trend. Settled in the early 1850s by white farmers and enslaved persons, the community, then called Manchester Mills, boasted a school, church, water works, post office, and cotton mill by the end of the nineteenth century. While founded as a small agricultural community, Polytechnic Heights’ growth was aided by the opening of Polytechnic College in 1890 and the Polytechnic streetcar line in 1892, connecting the area to Fort Worth.

Other early agricultural communities were founded by freedmen. Garden of Eden developed along the Trinity River approximately 15 miles northeast of downtown Fort Worth. After the Civil War, several African Americans, including the Loyd and Boaz families, settled near their former enslavers in the flood-prone river bottoms on land undesirable to white farmers, but therefore affordable for newly freed African Americans. Among the largest landholders in Garden of Eden were Malinda and Major Cheney, who owned over 200 acres along the river. Here, the Cheneys raised cattle and grew a variety of crops that they sold at area markets and in Fort Worth. By the 1880s, there were enough African American households in Garden of Eden to warrant a school. After donating land and petitioning the nearest school district, Birdville, Cheney helped open the Birdville Colored School in 1891. The school no longer exists and a fire destroyed the original Cheney house, though several houses built in the twentieth century by the Cheney family remain on Carson Street.

Approximately six miles southeast of downtown Fort Worth, another freedmen community developed. Purchasing one acre of land located near present-day 1910 Amanda Street for around $45 in 1896, Amanda Davis was one of the first settlers of Cowanville. Davis earned money working as a laundress in Fort Worth, but she also grew cotton and raised chickens on her property. Around the turn of the century, several other African American families, including the Brockmans, Stalcups, and Alonzo and Sarah Cowan established small farms near Davis’s. In the early twentieth century the community was renamed Stop Six, as it was the sixth stop on the Northern Texas Traction Company interurban streetcar that ran between Fort Worth and Dallas. Though the agricultural properties gave way to residential subdivisions in the twentieth century, Stop Six maintained a majority Black population throughout the twentieth and into the twenty-first centuries.

AGRICULTURAL PROCESSING

The rich soils of the nearby prairie favored agricultural production and early settlers adopted crops that did well in the area, including wheat, corn, and cotton. The need for processing and cultivating these crops led to some of Fort Worth’s earliest industries. Captain Julian Field was said to have opened the city’s first flour and corn mill in 1856 on the river near the courthouse. Smaller mills, including Randol Mill east of town and Archibald Leonard’s gristmill west of Precinct Line Road in east Fort Worth, also opened along the Trinity River. A growing cotton trade led to the emergence of cotton yards, including the Battle and Boaz Cotton Yard at 14th and Houston Streets (fig. 2-17). The arrival of the railroad in 1876 strengthened the city’s agricultural industries, as grain elevators, flour mills, and a cotton gin opened along the railroad tracks near the river. By 1890, Fort Worth boasted 5 grain elevators with a capacity of nearly a million bushels and 4 flour mills that turned out 1,700 barrels of flour a day. One of the largest mills, Anchor Mills, was located on Front Street (present-day Lancaster Avenue) near the railroad tracks. Renamed Bewley Mills in the twentieth century, it was one of several large mills that
contributed to Fort Worth’s claim as the largest grain market in the southern US by the mid-twentieth century. Another flour mill, Cameron Mill and Elevator, opened in 1888 at Jennings and Lancaster Avenues. J. Perry Burrus purchased this mill in the early twentieth century and eventually relocated the renamed Burrus Mills to Saginaw, an inner suburb of Fort Worth, where it became the state’s largest flour mill. It was during this period that grain milling became a seminal commercial endeavor in the city, and the foundation was laid for Fort Worth’s twentieth-century emergence as one of the nation’s most important grain markets.

**ECONOMIC AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

The dramatic shift in the city’s land use and growth during this period directly reflects its economic prowess. Between 1849 and 1899, Fort Worth expanded from just several acres to over two square miles. In the decades after the military post’s abandonment, Fort Worth’s commercial district evolved out of the former military post, while residential areas developed away from the commercial core, scattered among agricultural properties that fanned outward past the city’s boundaries. A bird’s-eye view of Fort Worth in 1876 depicts a sparsely developed and populated settlement centered around the county courthouse, with only a few blocks of commercial development surrounded by dispersed residences (fig. 2-18). In contrast, the 1891 bird’s-eye view highlights the city’s expansive transformation over 15 years, depicting a densely developed commercial core, residential subdivisions stretching in all directions, and nodes of industry where agricultural properties once existed (fig. 2-19).
Figure 2-18. 1876 view of Fort Worth showing scattered development. Source: Texas Bird’s-Eye Views, Amon Carter Museum.

Over the second half of the nineteenth century, Fort Worth evolved from a military and frontier outpost and supply center into one of the state’s largest commercial and industrial centers. Growing from its first commercial establishment in 1849, Fort Worth boasted hundreds of businesses by the end of the nineteenth century. The diverse business establishments that reflected the city’s growing metropolitan status included agricultural implements, barbers, breweries, clothing stores, drug stores, furniture stores, groceries and mercantile stores, hotels, meat markets, and restaurants.\(^7\) Several businesses still in operation got their start in Fort Worth during this period, including: Pendery’s spices (1890) and the O. B. Macaroni Company (1899).\(^7\) While agriculture-associated endeavors and a brisk buffalo hide trade were significant sources of money early in the period, the two most significant economic developments during this period were the beginning of the cattle industry and the arrival of the railroads. Though the cattle and meatpacking sector did not flourish until the early twentieth century, the foundation for the industry was laid in this period with the cattle drives and organization of the Fort Worth Stockyards. The arrival of the railroad, on the other hand, had an immediate impact on the economy of Fort Worth. In 1876, when the first railroad arrived, fewer than 60 businesses operated in Fort Worth, and by 1880 there were over 450 retail and wholesale firms in the city.\(^8\)

**1849–1865: EARLY COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND DECLINE**

Prior to the Civil War, Fort Worth saw modest growth as a local trade center, with lawyers, shopkeepers, bankers, and tradesmen moving to the city. But, as in other Confederate cities, Fort Worth lost nearly half of its population during the war as men joined the fight, significantly hindering its economic growth. Though the city served as a supply center for the Confederacy—providing the military with goods such as flour, corn, and beef—a lack of labor, money, and materials inhibited economic and commercial growth during the war.\(^8\)

Two early settlers, Henry Clay Daggett and Archibald Leonard, opened Fort Worth’s first commercial establishment—a trading post—in 1849.\(^8\) Limited by the lack of transportation and availability of goods, the businessmen primarily bought and sold buckskins and pelts with nearby settlers and supplied the fort with beef. A mile northeast of the fort by a grove of live oaks and spring, the log store also served as a meeting place as well as a supply center for soldiers and nearby settlers.\(^8\) After the military abandoned the fort in 1853, Daggett and Leonard moved the business into a former barracks. Following in their footsteps, other entrepreneurs opened businesses in the abandoned log buildings; a hotel and tavern opened in the former stables and the first doctor in the settlement lived and worked in the officers’ quarters.\(^8\) South of the courthouse on present-day Main Street, several wood-frame false front buildings housed other commercial ventures. The parade ground was transformed into a public square where farmers sold produce and locals bartered with travelers passing through on their way west. Fort Worth became a popular stopping point for those traveling into sparsely populated regions to the west. By the end of the war, however, Fort Worth had an air of desolation, as most of these businesses had closed and buildings sat vacant.

**1870–1899: ECONOMIC REBOUND AND BUILDING BOOM**

The three decades after the Civil War were ones of significant economic growth for Fort Worth. After the stagnation of growth during the war, Fort Worth’s economy swiftly rebounded due in part to the cattle drives, the arrival of the railroad, and the beginning of the meatpacking industry.

**Cattle Drives**

Cattle drives in Texas date back to the 1830s, when cowboys drove cattle east to Louisiana where they received higher market prices. In the 1840s and 1850s, cattlemen rode north to the Shawnee Trail, headed to markets in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, and Ohio. After small outbreaks of “Texas fever” (a
fatal disease caused by ticks) in the mid-1850s halted the northern drives, and a Union blockade of the Mississippi River during the Civil War prevented cattle from reaching the eastern Confederacy, there was little market for Texas cattle in the late 1850s and early 1860s. As a result, between three and six million longhorns roamed the Texas countryside at war’s end. The saturation of livestock in the state translated to low prices, with Texas markets offering as little as two dollars a head. In the North, wartime demand for beef and fighting had decimated cattle numbers. As a result of the demand caused by the beef shortage, Northern markets in places like Chicago offered 10 times the price per head. Attracted by the higher prices, Texas cattlemen drove herds north to Kansas, where trains then transported them to market. The trail used by cattlemen, known as the Chisholm Trail, connected South Texas ranchers to Kansas via San Antonio, Waco, and Fort Worth. The trail entered Fort Worth near present-day South Hemphill Street and traveled north along present-day Commerce and Jones streets to the Trinity River (fig. 2-20). Because it was the last community of significant size on the trail for over 100 miles, Fort Worth became a stopping place for cattlemen on the drive.

The cattle drives helped resuscitate the city’s economy after the Civil War. The thousands of men who traveled through Fort Worth stayed at hotels, purchased provisions, and frequented the saloons, dance halls, and brothels in Hell’s Half Acre. The drives added around three million dollars into the state’s economy in 1869 alone, and Fort Worth assuredly benefitted from this influx of money. Reflecting the improved economy, new grocery, mercantile, and drug stores, restaurants, saloons, and hotels opened in Fort Worth in this period. Fort Worth not only served as a provisioning point for cattlemen, but it also catered to the revived stream of settlers heading west. New military forts in northwest Texas also relied on businesses in Fort Worth for goods and supplies. The city’s professional class also began to grow during this period, as doctors, attorneys, and bankers found a steady stream of business. And though the cattle drives all but ended in the mid-1880s—due to barbed wire, a Kansas quarantine law, and the railroad—their impact was twofold: they resurrected the economy after the Civil War and helped usher in the stockyards and meatpacking industry.
Railroad Development

By the end of the nineteenth century, Fort Worth had a robust network of railroads connecting it to cities across the country and to Mexico and Canada (fig. 2-21). Dubbed the “great railway center of the Southwest,” Fort Worth’s status as a major American transportation hub was a far departure from its early days as a remote military outpost.93 Chosen for its location at the edge of the western frontier, Fort Worth remained mostly isolated from other cities and markets during its first years of existence. Without a railroad or a navigable waterway, which the Trinity River was not, travel to and from Fort Worth was largely limited to horse- and oxen-drawn wagons. The first stagecoach, the United States Mail Stage Line, arrived in 1856 and opened some movement and communication to the city. The transcontinental Butterfield Overland Stage Line passed just north of the city, but the Fort Worth–Yuma Stage Line and several local stage lines connected Fort Worth to cities in and out of state through the 1890s.94 By the early 1870s, though, the rapid railroad building experienced in the eastern half of the United States reached Texas.

In March 1871 the US Congress granted a charter to the Texas and Pacific Railway Company (T & P) for a transcontinental line through Texas. Entering the state at Marshall and exiting at El Paso, the line would cross through Fort Worth on a railroad reservation—land donated for railroad use—by several local landowners and businessmen including E. M. Daggett, K. M. Van Zandt, Thomas Jennings, and H. G. Hendricks.95 By 1872 the line reached Dallas, and in Fort Worth, new merchants and businesses arrived in anticipation of the rail. The financial panic of 1873 delayed railroad construction, setting back the railroad’s anticipated 1874 arrival. Consequently, the T & P reached Fort Worth two years later, arriving in July 1876. The rail entered the city to the south, roughly along Lancaster Street on the railroad reservation carved out of the former E. M. Daggett farmstead (fig. 2-22).96
Figure 2-22. Inset of an 1885 map showing the railroad reservation south of downtown. Source: Gray’s New Map of Fort Worth, Texas, 1885, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting University of Texas at Arlington Library, accessed May 24, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth252106/.
By the end of the century, the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway (or the “Katy”); the Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe; the Fort Worth & Denver; the Fort Worth & New Orleans; the Fort Worth & Rio Grande; the St. Louis, Arkansas & Texas; the Houston & Texas; and the Chicago, Rock Island & Texas Railways had also laid tracks through Fort Worth. The rail lines connected Fort Worth to cities in all directions within and outside the state. Within Fort Worth, the network of lines crisscrossed the city in all directions. Two railroad cores, where several lines intersected, developed south of downtown and near the stockyards in North Fort Worth (fig. 2-23). By the end of the nineteenth century, many of the railroad companies had offices and ticket offices downtown, clustered on Main Street.97 Several companies also built both freight and passenger depots.98 Most of the depots from this period, including the T & P’s Romanesque terminal, were later replaced in the mid-twentieth century with larger buildings (fig. 2-24). The Beaux Arts-style Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railroad Passenger Depot (1601 Jones Street, listed in the National Register, Recorded Texas Historical Landmark), built in 1899, is the only extant nineteenth-century depot in Fort Worth (fig. 2-25).
Figure 2-24. The Texas & Pacific Passenger Station (Union Depot). Built in 1900, the building was demolished and replaced in 1930 with the current T&P complex at Lancaster and Throckmorton Streets. Source: Courtesy of the Genealogy, History and Archives Unit, Fort Worth Public Library, accessed May 24, 2021, http://www.fortworthtexasarchives.org/digital/collection/p16084coll26/id/196/rec/3.

The economic impact of the railroads was significant. Prior to the arrival of the T & P in 1876, Fort Worth had fewer than 60 businesses; four years later that number grew to 460, and by 1899 the city directory listed over 500 businesses. A building boom in the north end of town in the late 1870s and early 1880s filled in the area from the county courthouse south, roughly between Belknap and 15th Streets (fig. 2-26). Along the city’s main commercial arteries—Houston, Main, and Commerce (originally named Rusk) Streets—masonry and iron two-part commercial block buildings between two and four stories tall replaced the city’s older wood buildings. The buildings at 312 Houston Street (ca. 1884), 506 Main Street (ca. 1884), and 302 Main Street (ca. 1885) date to this period of construction (fig. 2-27). The building boom continued throughout the 1880s and into the 1890s and brought with it the city’s first “skyscraper,” the eight-story Hurley Building on Main Street in 1889 (burned in 1898) (fig. 2-28). Architect-designed buildings also appeared during this time, most designed by one of the city’s eight architects. Counted among Fort Worth’s architects was M. R. Sanguinet. Sanguinet, a New Yorker, co-founded Sanguinet and Staats, one of Texas’s most prolific architectural firms, in 1903. Among the extant commercial buildings designed by Sanguinet in the nineteenth century are the ornate 1889 Land Title Block (111 East 4th Street), designed with S. B. Haggart, and the Second Empire building at 315 Houston Street, also designed with Haggart (figs. 2-29, 2-30). Built around 1884, the building at 315 Houston Street is among the oldest commercial buildings in the city.

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Nineteenth Century Economic and Commercial Development.
## Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme: Nineteenth-Century Economic and Commercial Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes: Cattle Drives, Railroad Development, Early Stockyards and Meatpacking Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Statement of Significance:</strong> Resources significant within the theme of Nineteenth-Century Economic and Commercial Development may include a variety of commercial properties including stores, hotels, banks, warehouses, and cattle-drive related resources. Clusters or blocks of commercial buildings may also be eligible as historic districts. Many of these buildings have one-, two-, or three-part commercial block forms. Resources significant under this theme reflect Fort Worth’s nineteenth-century economic and commercial development and transformation from a small frontier military outpost into one of the state’s economic leaders. Resources may be eligible under a number of areas of significance, but they must retain sufficient integrity in order to convey that significance and association with this theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Significance:</strong> Roughly between 1849 and 1899.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Significance Justification:</strong> Broadly covers the period of time from the city’s first commercial establishment through the end of the nineteenth century. Historic districts will likely have a longer period of significance that extends into the twentieth century in tandem with further infill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Location:</strong> Generally within the city limits that existed in 1899, as well as areas outside these limits that were platted prior to 1900 and later annexed by the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area(s) of Significance:</strong> Commerce, Community Planning and Development, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria:</strong> National Register: A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated Property Types:</strong> Known extant resources include train depots and one-, two-, and three-part commercial block buildings that filled a variety of commercial functions, including stores, printing presses, and hotels. Other resources may include banks, warehouses, and cattle-drive related resources. Clusters of commercial properties may comprise a historic district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong> Weber Building, 302 Main Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two-part commercial block building at **302 Main Street** in downtown Fort Worth is one of the city’s oldest commercial buildings. Constructed around 1885, the building housed stores and a printing press per the 1898 Sanborn Fire Insurance map. Throughout the nineteenth century, similarly constructed and styled commercial buildings filled in Fort Worth’s main commercial streets – Main Street and Houston Street, from the County Courthouse south to around Tenth Street.

Commercial nodes also developed in newly platted additions along streetcar lines. As a reflection of this early commercial development, this building may be eligible as both a local landmark and the National Register under Criterion A in the area of Commerce and Criterion C in the area of Architecture.


---

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*
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Figure 2-28. The eight-story “skyscraper” known as the Hurley Building in the 1890s. Located on Main Street, the building caught on fire in 1898, only nine years after its construction. Source: Jack White Photograph Collection, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries, UTA Libraries Digital Gallery, accessed May 20, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/img/10001090.
In addition to shops and hotels, new wholesale, manufacturing, and distribution businesses and companies established operations in Fort Worth. The Texas Brewing Company, the city’s first large-scale plant, opened in 1891 near the railroad tracks and was joined by mills, foundries, iron works, grain elevators, a marble works, and brick and lumber yards that also took up shop along the city’s tracks (fig. 2-31). The network of rail lines attracted manufacturing companies as well, and by the end of the nineteenth century, Fort Worth was producing mattresses, carriages, clothing, and windmills. The small industrial nodes developed in large part along the railroad lines, which predominantly carved through historically large, oftentimes agricultural, parcels provided by large landholders. These areas at the time lay at the edge of town; along the eastern bluffs of the Trinity River, and south of downtown (see fig. 2-19). Other small industrial nodes developed on the south banks of the river near the courthouse, including businesses such as a roller mill and grain warehouse, cotton gin, and ice company.
Early Stockyards and Meatpacking Industry

As Fort Worth evolved into a railroad shipping center and the cattle industry grew in the 1880s, several individuals realized that Fort Worth would benefit from its own permanent stockyard and meatpacking plant. The men, including John Peter Smith, Morgan Jones, and J. W. Burgess, formed the Fort Worth
Union Stock Yards in 1887 and purchased 258 acres across the river north of downtown for the stockyards (fig. 2-32). The company reorganized with new out-of-state investors in 1893 and changed its name to the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company. Because of tick infestations, quarantines in out-of-state markets, a dearth of local buyers, and the high cost of shipping, which stifled profitability at the new stockyards, the company sought to add a packing plant to the site. Several packing houses operated in Fort Worth in the 1880s, but for a number of reasons, including the depression in the cattle market in 1883, they never financially prospered. The company purchased one of these failing businesses, the Continental Meat Packing Plant, and moved it next to the stockyard as the renamed Fort Worth Dressed Meat and Packing Company (not extant). Like packing companies before, the new business proved unsuccessful as cattlemen continued to sell to established and larger markets in the north. Even the success of the first Texas Fat Stock Show in 1896 did little to bolster the business. As such, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, together with the Fort Worth Board of Trade, courted major American packing companies to move to Fort Worth. By 1900, both Armour and Company and Swift and Company agreed to build plants near the stockyards, paving the way for the city’s meatpacking boom in the twentieth century.

For more information about Fort Worth’s meatpacking ventures in the twentieth century, see Chapter 3, page 82.

SUBURBANIZATION AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

In the city’s early years, residential development occurred in a somewhat scattered fashion to the west, south, and east of the city’s business district, and residents often built single-pen and dogtrot houses using materials readily available, including stone, logs, and hand-hewn and rough-sawn lumber (fig. 2-33). As Fort Worth continued growing, particularly after the arrival of the railroad and the inauguration of streetcar service, developers opened new additions on historically agricultural lands farther from downtown in all directions (fig. 2-34). Folk Victorian and Queen Anne style houses, built using standardized milled lumber and plans readily available in the city after the arrival of the railroad, filled in these new subdivisions. Though the additions were predominantly residential, religious buildings were interspersed among the houses (fig. 2-35). Small nodes of commerce also developed along the major streets in these newly platted areas, particularly along streetcar lines connecting neighborhoods to downtown, including Vickery Boulevard, Lancaster Avenue, and South Main Street (fig. 2-36).
Figure 2-33. The Isaac Parker cabin now located in Log Cabin Village in Fort Worth (extant). Built around 1848 on Parker’s property near Birdville at present-day East Loop 820 and Hurst Boulevard, the house is an example of the style and materials used in pre-Civil War residential construction in Fort Worth. Source: “Isaac Parker’s Log Cabin, Date unknown,” University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Tarrant County College NE, Heritage Room, accessed May 21, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth14604/.
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Figure 2-34. Map from around 1890 showing the new subdivisions and growth in Fort Worth. Note that not all subdivisions on the map were realized (i.e. Sylvania in east Fort Worth). Source: W. B. King, "Map of the city of Fort Worth and vicinity, c. 1890," retrieved from the Library of Congress, accessed May 21, 2021. [https://www.loc.gov/item/2003627042/](https://www.loc.gov/item/2003627042/)
Initial Settlement and Development, Mid-Nineteenth Century–1899
Just as the availability of standardized milled lumber enabled the construction of houses in the new additions, the streetcar made these new suburbs possible by providing a connection between residential and commercial areas. Between 1876 and 1900, a robust streetcar system developed in Fort Worth. Beginning with one mule-powered streetcar, a network of streetcars, operated by a dozen different companies, crisscrossed the city by the end of the century.109 Owned by individuals and development companies, streetcar lines enabled developers the ability to plat additions in areas along and outside city limits in what was essentially the country, away from the busy and noisy commercial and industrial nodes downtown. As a result, by the end of the century, new residential areas opened both within and beyond city limits.

Several new additions attracted some of the city’s most affluent and prominent citizens. Quality Hill, west of downtown along West 7th Street near the bluffs of the Clear Fork, was home to the city’s cattle barons, bankers, and professional class. The neighborhood fell within the Jennings West Addition. Hyde Jennings, an attorney and judge, developed the addition on a land grant given to his mother for the
service of her husband during the Texas Revolution. Jennings’s house, designed by architect A. N. Dawson, was moved from the neighborhood in the 1940s, and many of the other houses were demolished in the twentieth century. The 1899 Howard Messer-designed Queen Anne Ball-Eddelman-McFarland House (1110 Penn Street, fig. 2-37) and the 1899 Queen Anne-style Pollock-Capps House (1120 Penn Street) are two of the only remaining houses from this period in this section of Fort Worth. Named for Baldwin Samuels, who had a plantation in the area, Samuels Avenue, northeast of downtown, was home to a mixture of physicians, merchants, and laborers moved into the developing neighborhood along the Trinity River bluffs in the 1880s. Two of the city’s oldest houses, the late 1870s Bennett-Fenelon House (731 Samuels Avenue) and the 1880s Getzendaner House (760 Samuels Avenue), are in the Samuels Addition (fig. 2-38).
While the city’s affluent positioned themselves on the bluffs overlooking the river, Fort Worth’s small Black population lived together in pockets in the city’s less-desirable areas: along the railroad tracks, near industrial sites, and in the flood-prone river bottoms. They worked and lived in tenements along Calhoun and Jones Streets, clustered around 9th Street, beginning in the 1870s, in an area dubbed “Little Africa.” As the city grew, the Black population was pushed further east and south out of town, to the other side of the railroad tracks. By the late nineteenth century, a concentration of the city’s Black population lived in the Third Ward in southeast Fort Worth. In the mid-1890s, the African American community organized a public school on the Southside for the growing community. The school rented classroom space until the James E. Guinn School was built in 1927.

South of downtown and outside city limits in all directions, developers platted new subdivisions aimed at attracting working- and middle-class white residents (fig. 2-39). Nearly all laid in a grid pattern, the new subdivisions boasted graveled, curbed, and guttered streets. Developers of some subdivisions even built amusements in their attempt to attract residents. Outside city limits and west of the river, in the newly platted Arlington Heights (1890, annexed 1922), developer Humphrey Barker Chamberlin of Denver built Lake Como on his streetcar line as a source of recreation (fig. 2-40). Because it was outside city limits, Chamberlin also built a power plant on the lake to provide electricity to his streetcar and the neighborhood streetlights and residences. Other new additions included the Hillside Addition (or Daggett’s Hillside Addition) and the Daggett 2nd Addition, both platted in the early 1880s and carved from Daggett’s farmstead. Also in the south, the Fields-Welch Subdivision (1884), Bellevue Hill (1885), Lawn Place Addition (1890), and Fairmount (1890) developed (fig. 2-41). In 1890 and 1891, the City annexed these and other new subdivisions in the south, extending the city limits south to Jessamine Street. Annexation encouraged more development as it brought with it public services, and as a result, a mix of clerks, civil servants, teachers, merchants, and professionals moved into the Southside. Despite the uptick in construction after annexation, most of the Southside would not fill in until the twentieth century, as the streetcar network continued expanding and the city experienced an economic and population growth spurt. One of the first houses built in the Fairmount Addition, the Queen Anne house at 1730 6th Avenue, dates to around 1898 and was constructed for a tobacco company executive (fig. 2-42).
Figure 2-40. Pavilion and recreation site and concession buildings (built in the twentieth century) at Lake Como (lake extant, but pavilion and amusement rides are not). Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram Collection, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries, UTA Libraries Digital Gallery, accessed May 24, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/img/10002077.
Figure 2-41. Map showing from 1907 showing additions and subdivision. Among the nineteenth-century additions include: Hillside Addition, Daggett 2nd Addition, Fields-Welch Subdivision, Bellevue Hill, Lawn Place Addition, Fairmount, North Fort Worth, Riverside, Jennings West, and Evans South. Source: J.E. Head & Co., J.E. Head & Co.'s 1907 Map of the City of Fort Worth, Texas: compiled from original plats, and surveys by actual measurement [map] (Fort Worth: n.p., 1907), from the Portal to Texas History, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth220413/m1/1/?q=map%20fort%20worth.
Developers also platted new subdivisions to the north and east of town in the nineteenth century. Much like in south Fort Worth though, these areas would largely be infilled in the twentieth century. East of the Trinity River and outside city limits, a group of businessmen formed the East Fort Worth Town Company in 1887 with plans to develop a new city, East Fort Worth, in today’s Sylvania area. They platted the Sylvania Addition, but sold much of the land in 1891 to the Fort Worth Land Company without having developed it. The Fort Worth Land Company in turn platted the Riverside Addition (annexed in 1922), a grid-pattern suburb that connected to downtown Fort Worth via a streetcar that crossed over the Trinity River along East 1st Street (fig. 2-43).

North of the river, another new suburb, North Fort Worth (annexed 1909), developed in this period. Like the rest of the areas outside city limits, this area north of the Trinity River, known as Marine, was sparsely populated and characteristically agricultural into the 1880s. After the opening of the stockyards in 1887, a group of Fort Worth businessmen saw the area’s potential for development. Together, as the Fort Worth City Company, they purchased 2,500 acres southwest of the stockyards, roughly stretching from the confluence of the West and Clear forks north to the present-day North 20th Street. New York landscape architect and designer of the company town of Pullman, Illinois, Nathan Barrett laid out the new town of North Fort Worth in 1888. Unlike the other grid plats of the nineteenth century, North Fort Worth’s plat incorporated popular suburb design trends inspired by the Romantic and City Beautiful movements. In consideration of the area’s topography and curves of the river, Barrett’s plan incorporated curvilinear streets and vistas with views of Fort Worth to the south. Barrett laid the streets in a skewed grid pattern and included a wide boulevard that stretched from Oakwood Cemetery to a new circular park (fig. 2-44). Barrett also aligned North Fort Worth’s Main Street with Fort Worth’s Main Street, making the courthouse the focal point for travelers heading south. A streetcar route across the Trinity River connected North Fort Worth to downtown, and more than 10 miles of electric streetcar lines opened within the new addition. Though development was slow in the nineteenth century—only several businesses and residences dotted the addition by 1899—construction boomed after the opening of the packing plants in 1902.

See page 68 for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Suburbanization and Residential Development
Figure 2-43. Plat for the Riverside Addition (1891) in east Fort Worth. Source: Hometown by Handlebar blog, accessed May 24, 2021, [https://hometownbyhandlebar.com/?p=4514](https://hometownbyhandlebar.com/?p=4514).
**Statement of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme: Nineteenth-Century Suburbanization and Residential Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Statement of Significance:</strong> Resources significant within the theme of Nineteenth-Century Suburbanization and Residential Development include houses and other domestic buildings and outbuildings. Resources may also include parks and other resources associated with streetcar companies and residential neighborhood development. Neighborhoods and clusters of residential houses may also be eligible as historic districts. Common architectural styles associated with this theme include National Folk, Folk Victorian, and Queen Anne. Resources significant under this theme reflect Fort Worth’s nineteenth-century residential development and the city’s outward suburban expansion enabled by the streetcar. Resources will most commonly be eligible under Community Planning and Development and Architecture but may also be eligible under other areas of significance. Resources must retain sufficient integrity in order to convey significance and association with this theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Significance:</strong> Roughly between the 1870s and 1899.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Significance Justification:</strong> Broadly covers the earliest periods of residential development in the city following incorporation through the end of the nineteenth century. Historic districts will likely have longer periods of significance that extend into the 1920s, 1930s, and even the 1940s, to reflect the period of time that many nineteenth-century additions filled in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Location:</strong> Within the 1899 city limits and generally following the streetcar lines that existed by 1899. Also may include areas outside the 1899 city limits that were platted prior to 1900 and were later incorporated (Arlington Heights is an example).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area(s) of Significance:</strong> Community Planning and Development, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria:</strong> National Register: A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated Property Types:</strong> Residential: Single-family houses, Multi-family houses, Outbuildings. Landscape: Parks. Collections of these resources may be eligible as historic districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong> Benton House, 1730 Sixth Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Benton House** was built in the late 1890s in Fort Worth’s rapidly developing southside. It is an example of a property associated with Nineteenth-Century Suburbanization and Residential Development. The house is a local landmark and is listed in the National Register under Criterion C for Architecture as a representative example of a nineteenth-century Queen Anne residence. It is also listed under several areas of significance under Criterion A for reasons specifically associated with the function of the house in the twentieth century, including Education, Landscape Architecture, and Religion. The house may also be eligible under Criterion A for Community Planning and Development.

*View of the ca. 1898 Queen Anne Benton House at 1730 Sixth Avenue in south Fort Worth, 1987. Source: Texas Historical Commission.*
## Statement of Significance*

**Theme:** Nineteenth-Century Suburbanization and Residential Development

**Example:** Fairmount/Southside Historic District

The **Fairmount/Southside Historic District** is an example of a historic neighborhood platted in the nineteenth century that continued to develop through the late nineteenth century into the first half of the twentieth century. It is listed in the National Register under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development and Criterion C in the area of Architecture. The Fairmount Historic District is also a local historic district.

---

*These samples provide a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*
CULTURAL AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

An independent frontier spirit permeated Fort Worth during the nineteenth century. Gambling and general debauchery earned the city a reputation as the “Paris of the Plains,” and visits by Butch Cassidy, the Sundance Kid, and Wyatt Earp contributed to the city’s Wild West folklore that persists even today.121 Despite this reputation, a number of cultural and social institutions took root during this period that lent the city an air of sophistication. By the end of the century, a nascent arts and entertainment scene had emerged, with Fort Worth boasting an opera house and several theaters downtown and in North Fort Worth (none extant). Social and religious organizations from this period were also instrumental in providing civic infrastructure that helped address some of the voids in the growing city. The growth of the cultural and social sphere during this period attests to Fort Worthians’ commitment to and investment in the growing city. Additionally, the social and cultural fabric woven by these groups and institutions laid the foundation for Fort Worth’s continued social and cultural development in the twentieth century.

RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

Religious institutions contributed to Fort Worth’s social, moral, educational, and cultural fabric. Circuit priests and pastors attended to the earliest settlers and congregations, who met in various places including private residences and businesses, the county courthouse, and the Masonic Hall. The city’s first church buildings were constructed after the Civil War, likely in the early 1870s. As denominations grew and gained financial clout, they replaced the older buildings with some of the city’s first permanent buildings, using masonry and more intentional architectural styles.122 As the city grew, so too did the number of congregations. The makeup of the city’s growing number of religious institutions was a broad reflection of the demographics of the city’s population. While white Anglo-Christian churches accounted for most of the city’s nineteenth-century religious institutions, religious organizations for the city’s European immigrants, religious minorities, and racial minorities also existed. In this period, religious institutions also often provided educational opportunities, as well as meeting spaces for groups.

By 1899, Fort Worth had 40 churches and just as many religious organizations.123 The various denominations represented in the city included two Baptist churches, one Catholic church, three Christian churches, one Christian Scientist church, two Episcopal churches, two German Evangelical churches, one Hebrew synagogue, ten Methodist churches (including one Swedish sect), five Presbyterian churches, one Spiritualist church, four “Undenominational” churches, and six “Colored” churches.124 Many of the sects organized earlier in the second half of the nineteenth century, including the city’s oldest denomination, First Christian Church (1855), and the city’s oldest Black congregation, Allen Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church (1870).125 The lone Catholic church, Saint Patrick Cathedral (1206 Throckmorton Street), was also one of the city’s first organized churches. Founded in the 1860s, the Catholic church first held services in homes and in a hardware store until a small chapel was built in a worshipper’s yard in 1870.126 As the congregation grew, the church, whose first two priests hailed from Ireland and France, built a new limestone Gothic Revival church. Completed in 1892 and designed by Fort Worth architect James J. Kane, the National Register-listed building is the oldest extant and continuously used church in the city (fig. 2-45). In 1889, the Catholic church opened Saint Ignatius Academy (1206 Throckmorton Street) next to the church. Though private classes had been held in other church buildings, Saint Ignatius Academy was the city’s first parochial school.127 Also designed by Kane, the school building educated children in grades two through eight until 1962. Several walls remain of another nineteenth-century church – the 1887 Fourth Street Methodist Church. Like Saint Patrick Cathedral, the Fourth Street Methodist Church replaced an older 1870s wood-frame building. The church served the congregation until 1908 and was later enclosed by a warehouse building. The church was uncovered in 1988 during the demolition of the warehouse.
The city’s Jewish population, numbering around 150 in 1880, was slower to organize than in other Texas cities like Houston, Galveston, and San Antonio. The first Jewish congregation, Congregation Ahavath Sholom, organized in 1892 and built its first house of worship in 1895 at the corner of Jarvis and Hemphill (not extant, and the congregation relocated in 1901). Prior to the organization of this congregation, civic leader John Peter Smith donated land for the city’s first Jewish cemetery, Emanuel Hebrew Rest (South Main Street and Feliks Gwozdz Place), in 1879 (fig. 2-46). A Jewish cemetery association took over maintenance of the cemetery in 1881.
In addition to offering primary and secondary education, religious orders also founded institutions of higher education during this period. By 1899, Fort Worth had two religious-backed colleges: Texas Wesleyan College and Polytechnic College. Texas Wesleyan College, founded by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1881, built a campus in southeast Fort Worth. When the college (renamed Fort Worth University in 1889) relocated to Oklahoma City in the 1910s, the Fort Worth school district took over the campus and eventually demolished the buildings.132 Just east of Fort Worth, Polytechnic College opened in 1890 under the auspices of the Methodist Church South.133 Though none of the original buildings remain, the school, renamed Texas Wesleyan University in the 1930s, continues to educate students from its campus in Polytechnic Heights.

COMMUNITY AND CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Women’s Groups

Among the charitable organizations from this period that advocated for various urban reforms, women’s groups were among the most impactful. Across the nation and in Fort Worth, women formed voluntary associations and clubs that were comprised of women of the same race, and often the same ethnicity, social class, and religion. These clubs reflected their passions and focused on topics deemed important to them and the city, such as fine arts, public beautification, and libraries. Some also addressed the conditions created by the growing city, such as lack of adequate education, shelter, and healthcare. These groups provided women a social network while also helping stabilize the city’s nascent economy and society.

The women’s associations in Fort Worth focused on cultural development, aiding women, and education, and included many benevolent or missionary societies tied to churches or synagogues. They met in private homes, businesses, and churches during this period before some built their own halls in the twentieth century. The women’s clubs that organized during this period include: the Euterpean Club, a music club founded in 1896 that remains active; the Fort Worth Kindergarten Association, which focused on education, was heavily active in civic affairs, and served as a model for cities across the state; and a local auxiliary of the Texas Equal Rights Association, a statewide women’s suffrage organization that held its 1894 convention in Fort Worth.134 Among the most influential clubs of the nineteenth century was the Woman’s Wednesday Club. Founded in 1889, the group is credited with fostering and developing Fort Worth’s cultural sphere. Comprised of the wives of some of the city’s prominent businessmen, the club, which later became the Fort Worth Federation of Women’s Clubs, focused on arts and literature. In 1892, some of its members formed the Fort Worth Public Library Association. With the support and financial backing of philanthropist Andrew Carnegie, the women helped secure a site (915 Throckmorton Street), support from the City, and money for the first public library, which opened in 1901 (demolished in the 1930s). In the twentieth century, the club would go on to sponsor the Fort Worth Symphony and Orchestra Association and the Fort Worth Art Association (now the Modern Art Museum of Fort Worth).135

In addition to the role women’s clubs played in the city’s cultural development, several women served significant roles in stabilizing the city’s social sphere. One of these women was Kate Belle Burchill. A teacher, Burchill moved to Fort Worth in 1875 and opened a private school in the Fourth Street Methodist Church. While serving as the city’s postmistress in the 1880s, Burchill helped establish and supervise one of the city’s first orphanages, the Benevolent Home of Fort Worth. Burchill observed the need for such a home as the number of children without housing grew, a byproduct of the growing city. The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union operated the home, and Burchill and Delia Krum Collins served as superintendent and secretary, respectively.136 In 1888, the Tarrant County Commissioners,
persuaded by these women, purchased a house on Cold Spring Road for the orphanage (burned in 1914).

Read more about women’s clubs during the period 1900–1945 in Chapter 3, page 182.

African American Organizations and Advocacy

Due to segregationist laws and racism, African Americans in Fort Worth lacked some of the critical public and private infrastructure and services enjoyed by the city’s white citizens. In the nineteenth century, Fort Worth had no Black lawyers, orphanages, or banks. Job opportunities were limited and the non-white population had no representation at city hall or on the school board. African Americans did receive fire and police protection, and, though they were not denied City water and sewage, many lived in areas of the city that lacked such infrastructure. As such, the responsibility for providing many of these services fell upon the Black community.

One public amenity that the Black community provided in lieu of the local government was a public park. Fort Worth had only a few public parks in the nineteenth century, reserved for the white population only. Because the city provided few outdoor places where groups of African Americans could legally and safely meet and the municipal government was unwilling to build a public park for the Black community, several Black men took it upon themselves to do so. In 1895, several Black local businessmen purchased roughly six acres of river-bottom land north of the bluff and opened Douglass Park. A large impetus behind creating the park was to create a space for the annual Juneteenth celebration, an event which the city’s Black community had celebrated since the mid-1880s. Douglass Park evolved into a social center for Fort Worth’s African American community in the late nineteenth century and continued in that function until industrial development and flooding led to its sale and demise in the 1920s.

During this period, members of the Black community also organized, forming groups and societies based on similar trades, interests, and religious and political beliefs. Though they lacked much political influence, these groups advocated for African Americans while also providing a social networking and support system. These groups also laid the groundwork for larger, more powerful African American organizations in the twentieth century. Despite having one of the state’s smaller Black populations among its major cities, Fort Worth still boasted a number African American societies in the nineteenth century.

By the mid-1880s, a variety of labor, fraternal, and benevolent societies organized by Black Fort Worthians existed in the city. Included among these groups were the United Brothers of Friendship, the Willing Workers, the Wide-Awake Society, the Young Men of St. Paul, and the Youth Society. Most of the societies, including the Noble Order of the Knights of Labor, were part of larger national organizations and had both white and African American “lodges” in the city. At the local level, the African American Citizens’ Conference formed in the 1890s to promote Black interests. Included among their goals was the hiring of Black men by the school district and local government. The group also hoped to run an African American for city council.

Other groups reflected the emergence of a small Black middle class in Fort Worth. Over 50 Black businessmen organized the Prince Hall Masons in 1885. By 1889, the group had enough members and was financially secure enough to host the state’s 14th annual convention. Another society, the Colored Progressive Club (CPC), founded in the 1890s by Black professionals, functioned as a chamber of commerce and political advocacy group. Unlike other societies of the period, the CPC counted men and women among their members. The Masons and the CPC also were unique in that they had their own halls. The Masons had a hall at 15th and Houston Streets in the nineteenth century (not extant), and the
CPC met at Jones and 8th Streets (not extant). Most other groups struggled to find a space large enough for regular meetings. They met in larger churches and rented the city hall auditorium, but most owners of large buildings did not allow the groups to meet in their buildings. One of the few groups that rented to African Americans was the Deutscher Verein. In 1885, the German group had a meeting hall at the southeast corner of West 7th and Throckmorton Streets (not extant).

NOTES

12 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 6.
15 Selcer and Potter, The Fort That Became a City, 152.
16 Selcer and Potter, The Fort That Became a City, 123.
17 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 8.
18 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 9.


26 USCB, *Population*.


28 Selcer, *Fort Worth, A Texas Original!* 36.


31 Hopkins, “The Early Development.”


41 Selcer, *Fort Worth, A Texas Original!* 28.


44 Selcer, *Fort Worth, A Texas Original!* 28.


47 “Frontier Village Became City in ’73,” *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, October 30, 1949, 141.


55 Selcer, *Fort Worth, A Texas Original!* 28.
Historic Context of Fort Worth

Initial Settlement and Development, Mid-Nineteenth Century–1899


57 J’Nell Pate, North of the River: A Brief History of North Fort Worth (Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press, 1994), 103–104.

58 Pate, North of the River, 101–102.

59 Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 19.

60 Pate, North of the River, 2.

61 Pate, North of the River, 4.

62 Pate, North of the River, 13.


64 Selected Federal Census Non-Population Schedules, 1870, from ancestry.com.


66 Kline, “South Main Street Historic District,” 8–11.


72 Mitchell, McGee, and Woodson, “Living History.”

73 Mitchell, McGee, and Woodson, “Living History.”


78 Based on the 1899 Fort Worth City Directory, from ancestry.com.


80 Talbert, Cowtown-Metropolis, 120.

81 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 13.


84 Prior, Peter, and Murphey, “Below the Bluff,” 14.

85 Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc., Agricultural Theme Study for Central Texas (Prepared for the Texas Department of Transportation, August 2015), 4-9.


87 Prior, Peter, and Murphey, “Below the Bluff,” 49.

88 Prior, Peter, and Murphey, “Below the Bluff,” 49.

89 Prior, Peter, and Murphey, “Below the Bluff,” 50.

90 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 16.


92 Prior, Peter, and Murphey, “Below the Bluff,” 51.

HISTORIC CONTEXT OF FORT WORTH

94 Prior, Peter, and Murphey, “Below the Bluff,” 41.
95 Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Fort Worth 1849–1949: 100 Years of Progress, 13.
96 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 19.
97 Based on information provided in the 1899 Fort Worth City Directory, 47–49, from ancestry.com.
98 1899 Fort Worth City Directory, 47–49, from ancestry.com.
99 Talbert, Cowtown-Metropolis, 2; Cashion, The New Frontier, 18.
100 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 25.
101 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 25.
102 Based on the 1899 Fort Worth City Directory, which lists eight architects, from ancestry.com.
104 Cashion, The New Frontier, 22.
105 Based on the 1898 Fort Worth Sanborn maps from Perry-Castañeda Library.
106 Prior, Peter, and Murphey, “Below the Bluff,” 51.
109 Based on the 1899 Fort Worth City Directory, v–vi.
110 Pate, North of the River, 2.
111 Pate, North of the River, 4.
112 Pate, North of the River, 14.
115 Emrich and Niederaur, “Fairmount Southside Historic District,” 8-1.
121 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 80.
122 Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 57.
125 Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 58.
132 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 30.
133 Selcer, Fort Worth, A Texas Original!, 30.


Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 103.

Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 113.

Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 79.


Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 80.

Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 108.

Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 80, 108.

Selcer, A History of Fort Worth in Black and White, 103.
3 | Early-Twentieth-Century Urbanization, 1900–1945

The period between 1900 and 1945 represented a dramatic shift in Fort Worth’s urbanization in terms of population growth, land use, transportation, industrial and commercial development, and cultural and social depth (fig. 3-1). Between the census of 1900 and the census of 1950, Fort Worth’s population increased more than 13 times over – from 26,688 to 361,258. (See table 3-1.) Although the early 1900s were a time of intense immigration nationwide, in Fort Worth the bulk of population growth resulted from the migration of native-born Euro Americans within the United States (tables 3-2 and 3-3). As the population of Fort Worth grew, the City incorporated new land in surrounding areas (fig. 3-2).

Transportation innovations like streetcars and automobiles, alongside the construction of new roads and bridges, facilitated suburban development patterns. As a result, although Fort Worth’s population grew, density declined (table 3-1). The city’s sprawling layout also related to the growth of industries like railroad distribution, meat packing plants, petroleum processing, and aircraft manufacture (fig. 3-3). From 1909 until 1947, the city’s “value added by manufacture” increased by over 3,900 percent, the largest out of any city in Texas at the time (fig. 3-4). Industrial facilities required the large plots of land and connections with railroad lines and highways that suburban locations outside the city offered. Another major component in Fort Worth’s growth in this era was military development, which needed ample land and transportation access as well. As residential suburbs and industrial and military facilities moved outward, Fort Worth’s central core transitioned into a central business district and cultural hub. This district was enriched with a diverse array of shops, professional offices, churches, philanthropic organizations, and outdoor recreation facilities, as well as facilities for one of Fort Worth’s signature cultural events: the Fort Worth Stock Show and Rodeo.

### National Register Eligibility of Resources

Various themes associated with this period in Fort Worth’s history include: the Meatpacking Boom, Enhanced Transportation Connections, Industrial and Economic Growth, Military Development, Business and Commerce, Urban Growth, and Cultural and Social History. Many of these themes can be broken down further into subthemes, such as Improved Rail Networks, the Garment Industry, and Suburbanization. These themes played out simultaneously during the period, and each played a role in Fort Worth’s growth in the first half of the twentieth century. Many extant resources constructed between 1900 and 1945 are located throughout Fort Worth. Among the many property types associated with these themes, examples include: stockyards, railroad depots and rail infrastructure, roadside motels, gas stations, warehouses, manufacturing facilities, grain mills, airfields, commercial buildings, single- and multi-family housing, public housing, churches, and parks. Historic districts associated with this period include residential neighborhoods, industrial nodes, and commercial nodes. Resources from this period may be eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A under the following Areas of Significance: Commerce, Community Planning and Development, Education, Entertainment/Recreation, Ethnic Heritage, Industry, Landscape Architecture, Military, Politics/Government, Religion, Social History, and Transportation. Extant resources may also have significance underCriterion C in the Area of Architecture.

See the one-page sample statements of significance throughout this section for examples of how extant resources meet, or may meet, designation criteria under certain themes.
### Table 3-1. Census of population, Fort Worth, 1900 to 1950.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>26,688</td>
<td>73,312</td>
<td>106,482</td>
<td>174,575</td>
<td>207,677</td>
<td>361,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent increase</td>
<td>175%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In central city</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>163,447</td>
<td>177,662</td>
<td>278,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside central city</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,128</td>
<td>30,015</td>
<td>82,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-2. Percentages of country of birth among Fort Worth’s residents, 1900-1910 (approximate).4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>93.28%</td>
<td>94.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (Holland) or Belgium</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England, Scotland, and Wales</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway, Sweden, and Denmark</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia and Finland</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (French and English)</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (Russian and unknown)</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other countries</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-3. Census categories by number and percent, for race, Fort Worth, 1900-1950.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>26,688</td>
<td>73,312</td>
<td>106,482</td>
<td>174,575</td>
<td>207,677</td>
<td>361,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (including &quot;Mexican&quot;*)</td>
<td>22,447</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>59,960</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>90,468</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>4,241</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13,352</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16,014</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Negro”</td>
<td>4,219</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13,280</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15,896</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Indian,” “Chinese,” “Japanese,” and “Other”</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Counts of specifically “Mexican” distinguished in 1930 census only</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3-2. Map depicting the phases of Fort Worth’s expansion between 1873 and 1955. Source: Talbert, Cowtown-Metropolis, 19.

Figure 3-3. (Above) This graph shows the relationship between Fort Worth’s swelling population during the first half of the twentieth century as it relates to the dramatic increase in economic activity. Source: Talbert, Cowtown-Metropolis, 116.

Figure 3-4. (Above) This graph charts the indices of growth manufacturing in Fort Worth from 1909–1947. Source: US Bureau of the Census, as depicted in Talbert, Cowtown-Metropolis, 6.
THE MEATPACKING BOOM

Fort Worth’s most rapid growth occurred in the decade between 1900 and 1910, fueled in large part by the arrival of the meatpacking industry. The existing railroad infrastructure helped make Fort Worth an attractive location, and the population swelled 175 percent, from 26,688 to 73,312 (table 3-1). Since ranchers had been driving cattle to the railheads in Fort Worth since the 1870s, the city already contained stockyards for holding and exchanging cattle. Small slaughterhouses and meatpacking facilities had emerged in the 1880s, yet a large percentage of the cattle traveling through Fort Worth rode further north for slaughter. By the early 1900s, rail lines converged at Fort Worth from every direction (figs. 3-5, 3-6, and 3-7), and the City actively began seeking meatpacking investors to seize this opportunity. As described in the National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form for the Fort Worth Stockyards Historic District:

By 1900 the Fort Worth Board of Trade began trying to encourage one of the major U.S. packing companies to locate in the city. As a bonus Fort Worth offered to subscribe $100,000 to the firm that established at the stockyards. After [packing investor L.V.] Niles had assumed management of the stockyards company, J. Ogden Armour, son of the founder of Armour Packing Company in Chicago, visited the yards several times and began to negotiate with the Fort Worth Stockyards Company. But a second firm, Swift and Company soon learned of the agreement and requested to participate in the venture. When Armour vetoed the plan, Swift threatened to build a competing stockyards in Dallas. Finally Armour agreed to admit Swift into the project. Niles then negotiated a contract between the Stockyards Company and the Armour and Swift firms. As the city promised, each company received a bonus of $100,000, and the companies began building their packing plants in 1902. Railroad tracks were built to the packing house site and the plants finally opened for business in 1903 [located north of downtown Fort Worth; figs. 3-8, 3-9, and 3-10].

The volume of trade increased so much in the first month that the yards and pens had to be immediately enlarged. A new exchange building was built in 1902-03 [fig. 3-11] and in 1907-08 a Coliseum was built to house livestock shows and indoor rodeos [fig. 3-12]. The small industrial community, . . ., a one-mile square area containing the stockyards and packing activity, quickly became a financial giant and was known at one time as the richest per capita city in the nation. Surrounding the industrial activity, a commercial community developed which provided businesses, entertainment and lodging for those trading and working in the area. The heyday of cattle barons swelled the local economy with millions of dollars and neighboring Fort Worth benefited from the increased commercial activity. To escape Fort Worth jurisdiction, Niles City incorporated in 1911, but by 1922 Fort Worth was finally able to annex the community.  

Figure 3-5. This detail of a 1900 map of Texas railroads shows the numerous lines connecting Fort Worth and Dallas to the greater rail network. Source: Rand McNally and Company, Texas Railroads [Map Detail] (Chicago, 1900), from the LOC, https://www.loc.gov/item/98688567/.
Figure 3-6. Key map from the 1910 Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps of Fort Worth. Note that masonry construction is designated with pink, while remaining frame construction is designated with yellow. Source: Sanborn Fire Insurance Company, Fort Worth, 1910, volume 1, key map, from the University of Texas at Austin, http://legacy.lib.utexas.edu/maps/sanborn/d-f/chu-sanborn-fort_worth-1910-1v.jpg.
Figure 3-8. Key map of the industrial area that emerged north of downtown Fort Worth by 1911. Note the "Stock Yards" in section 182, "Armour & Co." in section 211, and the adjoining railroad lines. Source: Sanborn Fire Insurance Company, North Fort Worth, 1911, key map, from the University of Texas at Austin, http://tex.lib.utexas.edu/maps/sanborn/d-f/txu-sanborn-fort_worth-1911-178.jpg.
Figure 3-10. Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1911, showing the Armour & Co. meatpacking plant. Source: Sanborn Fire Insurance Company, North Fort Worth, 1911, sheet 211, from the University of Texas at Austin, http://legacy.lib.utexas.edu/maps/sanborn/d-f/tex-sanborn-fort_worth-1911-211.jpg.
When the Coliseum was completed in 1908, it became the home of the Texas Fat Stock Show, shortly thereafter renamed the Southwestern Exposition and Livestock Show. The first Texas Fat Stock Show had been held at the close of the previous century in 1896, when early stockmen showed their cattle along Marine Creek in North Fort Worth. The event grew quickly, as local cattle ranchers used the opportunity to bolster the city’s thriving cattle industry. By the time Samuel Burk Burnett stepped down as the president of the stock show, it was a greatly expanded event attended by ranchers from adjacent states, and featured livestock including sheep, horses, and hogs, in addition to cattle.

Fort Worth’s livestock exchange was the largest in the southwest from approximately 1900 through 1945. Some peaks and valleys characterized the business – such as the boom in the cattle market around 1920 and again in the 1930s, the decline in the hog market around 1930, the bust in the horse and mule market around 1935, and the peak in the sheep market around 1937. Despite these market fluctuations, the thriving livestock business served as a catalyst that encouraged expanded transportation networks and other industries to invest in Fort Worth.

ENHANCED TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS

Improved Rail Networks

At the start of the twentieth century, Fort Worth boasted a robust network of railroad connections (table 3-4). As described above, these connections played a major role in attracting the livestock exchange and the meatpacking industries, which in turn spurred further development of the rail
network for both shipping and transit. Maps of Fort Worth’s rail connections from 1907, 1913, and 1917 show newly developed rail lines including the International–Great Northern Railroad (I–GN) and the Texas Traction Company Interurban Rail commuter line to Dallas (figs. 3-13, 3-14, and 3-15). These maps also show older railroad companies’ massive investment in expansion and new infrastructure. For example, in 1900, the Texas and Pacific Railroad used a “Neo-Romanesque Richardsonian-type design” for its terminal in Fort Worth (fig. 3-16). Around the same time, the railroad also invested a reported $13 million in upgrading its facilities, including warehouses and rail yards. The growth of Fort Worth’s rail operations proved so rapidly that, by 1931, Texas and Pacific replaced its 1900 terminal with a massive new Railroad Passenger Station and Office Building downtown, designed in an exuberant Art Deco style (fig. 3-17).

### Table 3-4. Rail line establishment in Fort Worth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rail line</th>
<th>Date of establishment in Fort Worth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas and Pacific (T&amp;P)</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Coast and Santa Fe (later Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe)</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Kansas and Texas (“Katy”)</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth and Denver City (later Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe; Colorado and Southern; Burlington Northern Santa Fe; Union Pacific)</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe, Fort Worth, and New Orleans</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth and Rio Grande</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Arkansas &amp; Texas (SLA&amp;T)</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Rock Island &amp; Texas/Gulf (CRI&amp;T/G)</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth Belt Railway</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth and Brownwood</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth, Corsicana, and Beaumont</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Southwestern (“Cotton Belt”)</td>
<td>1900 (ca.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Traction Company Interurban Rail</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International &amp; Great Northern (I&amp;GN)</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Enhanced Transportation Connections, subtheme: Improved Rail Networks.
### Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Early-to-Mid-Twentieth-Century Enhanced Transportation Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Improved Rail Networks, Roadway and Highway Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Statement of Significance:</strong></td>
<td>Resources significant within this theme reflect the early growth of the city’s rail network and operations, and the beginning and subsequent growth of the highway network. This enhanced transportation network benefitted the city’s economy and industries and also contributed to new businesses and construction. Resources are mostly likely eligible under Community Planning and Development, Commerce, and Transportation, but they must retain sufficient integrity to convey significance and association with this theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Significance:</strong></td>
<td>Roughly between 1900 and 1942.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Significance Justification:</strong></td>
<td>Includes the twentieth-century pre-war period of expanded rail construction and the pre-war period of highway construction and development in Texas beginning with the organization of Good Roads clubs and the subsequent road paving, construction, and highway designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Location:</strong></td>
<td>Citywide along rail corridors and commercial road corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area(s) of Significance:</strong></td>
<td>Community Planning and Development, Education, Government, Entertainment/Recreation, Engineering, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria:</strong></td>
<td>National Register: A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local:</strong></td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated Property Types:</strong></td>
<td>Resources include train depots, railroad tracks, railroad bridges, highways, automobile bridges, gas stations, roadside motels and tourist courts, and restaurants. Stretches of roadway with extant resources may be considered as historic districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:** Texas and Pacific Terminal Complex, 221 West Lancaster Street

The Texas and Pacific Terminal Complex reflects the early-twentieth-century rail expansion in Fort Worth. As the city’s population and industries grew, the nineteenth century rail infrastructure proved impractical. As a result, the multiple rail companies in Fort Worth engaged in a period of investment in expansion and new infrastructure. The new Texas and Pacific Terminal Complex opened in 1931, just three decades after the company built its first terminal in the city. Architect Wyatt C. Hedrick of Fort Worth designed the massive Art Deco complex. This building is a designated local landmark and is listed in the National Register under Criteria A and C in the areas of Art, Transportation, and Architecture.


---

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.
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Figure 3-13. Map showing rail lines in Fort Worth, 1907. Also note the large areas of undeveloped right-of-way land surrounding the rail lines. Source: J.E. Head & Co., J.E. Head & Co.’s 1907 map of the city of Fort Worth, Texas: compiled from original plats, and surveys by actual measurement (map) (Fort Worth: n.p., 1907), from the Portal to Texas History, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth220413/m1/1/?q=map%20fort%20worth.
Figure 3-14. Map showing the route of the Electric Interurban Rail between Fort Worth and Dallas, 1913. Source: Northern Texas Electric Co. [map] (n.p., 1913), from the University of Texas Libraries, https://legacy.lib.utexas.edu/maps/historical/tcu-oclc-6445490-electric_railway-fort_worth-1913.jpg.
Figure 3-15. Map showing rail lines in Fort Worth, 1917. Source: C. H. Rogers, Map of Ft. Worth Texas [map] (n.p., 1917), from the Portal to Texas History. https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth187673/m1/1/?v=map%20fort%20worth.
Roadway and Highway Development

Although automobiles arrived in Texas in the early twentieth century, poor roadway conditions initially slowed their integration. In 1903, the Texas state legislature authorized use of county funding for road improvement, and counties began the daunting task of straightening and paving their road networks. Tarrant County played a lead role in Texas, allocating $1.6 million toward roadway paving in 1912, followed by sizeable road bonds from 1913 to 1914. Private citizens’ organizations also helped advocate for road improvement. Informal coalitions of Good Roads clubs and Women’s Clubs worked together with county governments to establish early roadways, like the Bankhead and Meridian...
Highways. These highways provided the first opportunities for transcontinental auto travel, though they were patched-together stretches of county and local roads with no formal governmental oversight. Both the Bankhead Highway and the Meridian Highway traveled through Fort Worth (fig. 3-18). The Bankhead Highway largely followed the alignment of the Texas and Pacific rail line. Similarly, the Meridian Highway followed segments of the Fort Worth and the Denver City Railways and the Gulf–Colorado and Santa Fe Railway.

In 1916, the Federal Aid Road Act provided the first federal appropriation for highway construction and the Texas Highway Department followed in 1917. Thereafter state funding for highway construction supplemented federal funding. In Fort Worth, the Bankhead Highway became known as State Highway 1, while the Meridian Highway became State Highway 2 (fig. 3-19). Though funding remained sparse for several years, a large increase in state funding in 1925 allowed the entirety of State Highway 1 to be hard-surfaced through Tarrant County to Dallas by 1926. The route of State Highway 1 continued to travel along Camp Bowie Boulevard and West Seventh Streets (fig. 3-20) – city streets with multiple stops, quite different from the contemporary idea of a highway (figs. 3-21 and 3-22). Similarly, the route of the Meridian Highway traveled through downtown, running along Throckmorton and Hemphill Streets (fig. 3-23). Throughout the 1920s, most highways leading to Fort Worth remained winding (fig. 3-24) and irregularly paved. Federal funding for work on both highways came from increased New Deal funding and legislation meant to improve roadway access to vital military installations. (Read more about Fort Worth’s military development from 1900 to 1945 below under the “Military Development” heading.) By 1933, all of the US Highways and many of the state highways in Tarrant County were hard-surfaced. As late as 1940, Fort Worth’s highways still traveled through downtown Fort Worth (fig. 3-25).

Along both the Bankhead and Meridian Highways, new auto-related businesses and businesses that catered to travelers opened. The new businesses—which included gas and service stations, roadside motels, and restaurants—opened outside of downtown and created new commercial corridors in the city.

Bridge Development

The earliest bridges spanning the Trinity River and serving Fort Worth were constructed of wood or steel. Steel truss bridges were largely designed and prefabricated by state firms, and the trusses themselves distributed by local firms. One such dealer, Montague S. Hasie, was listed in the Fort Worth City Directory in 1900 as a bridge builder. Hasie and his son would later go on to establish the Texas Bridge Company, Inc., in Dallas.

As Fort Worth expanded, interest in bridges that could survive the frequent floods of the Trinity River grew. In 1911, the residents of Tarrant County supported a bond-funded building initiative for a new concrete spandrel bridge spanning the Clear Fork of the Trinity River, and three replacement bridges. These new, more resilient bridges would connect the city’s central business district to surrounding areas. The Paddock Viaduct (listed on the National Register), which was completed in 1914, connected the city’s core with the North Side, where the meatpacking industry and the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company were driving rapid growth (fig. 3-26). This was only the first of several concrete spandrel bridges that would soon cross the Trinity River. The 1930 Royal Street Bridge (later renamed the Henderson Street Bridge and listed on the National Register) also formed a major arterial roadway connecting the central business district of Fort Worth with developing areas to the northwest of Fort Worth’s downtown.
**HISTORIC CONTEXT OF FORT WORTH**

### Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Early-to-Mid-Twentieth-Century Enhanced Transportation Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Improved Rail Networks, Roadway and Highway Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Statement of Significance:** Resources significant within this theme reflect the early growth of the city’s rail network and operations, and the beginning and subsequent growth of the highway network. This enhanced transportation network benefitted the city’s economy and industries and also contributed to new businesses and construction. Resources are mostly likely eligible under Community Planning and Development, Commerce, and Transportation, but they must retain sufficient integrity to convey significance and association with this theme.

**Period of Significance:** Roughly between 1900 and 1942.

**Period of Significance Justification:** Includes the twentieth-century pre-war period of expanded rail construction and the pre-war period of highway construction and development in Texas beginning with the organization of Good Roads clubs and the subsequent road paving, construction, and highway designations.

**Geographic Location:** Citywide along rail corridors and commercial road corridors.

**Area(s) of Significance:** Community Planning and Development, Commerce, Transportation, Architecture, Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria:</th>
<th>National Register: A, C</th>
<th>Local: 1, 2, 3, 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Associated Property Types:** Resources include train depots, railroad tracks, railroad bridges, highways, automobile bridges, gas stations, roadside motels and tourist courts, and restaurants. Stretches of roadway with extant resources may be considered as historic districts.

**Example:** Hillcrest Service Station at 4101 Camp Bowie Boulevard

The gas station at 4101 Camp Bowie Boulevard is an example of the new auto-oriented property types that appeared on newly built and designated highways in Fort Worth in the early-to-mid-twentieth century. In Fort Worth, this type of commercial development occurred on major highways including the Bankhead Highway and Meridian Highway. These highways traveled along Lancaster Avenue, Camp Bowie Boulevard, W. 7th Street, N. and S. Main Street, Throckmorton Street, and Hemphill Street. This gas station was built around 1922 and is a Fort Worth local landmark. The building may also be eligible for listing in the National Register under Criteria A and C in the areas of Commerce and Architecture.

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*

---

*Former gas station at 4101 Camp Bowie Boulevard in 2013. Source: HHM.*

---
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Figure 3-18. Map entitled “Meridian Highway International” showing the full north-south length of the highway (above) and a detail of Texas (above right). Source: Highways: Related/Joining Folder, Old Spanish Trail Association Archives, Louis J. Blume Library, St. Mary’s University, San Antonio, Texas.
Figure 3-19. (Right) Detail of Tarrant County from the Map Showing Proposed System of State Highways, 1917. Source: Texas State Library and Archives, Map Collection, Map No. 6254, https://www.tsl.texas.gov/sites/default/files/public/ths/ exhibits/highways/former/maps/544data.jpg.

Legend
- Devon Tourist Guide (1921)
- Alternate
- Historic US 367/SH 30, 1930-34
- Auto Trail Map (1930)
- Historic SH 1 (ca. 1906-40)
- Highway Department Maps (1961)

Figure 3-21. View of the Bankhead Highway (State Highway 1) traveling through downtown Fort Worth. Source: Views of Division 2. Headquarters at Fort Worth [photo album], (n.p.), from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) archives, Austin, Texas.

Figure 3-22. Photos of the Bankhead Highway (State Highway 2) west of Fort Worth. Source: Views of Division 2. Headquarters at Fort Worth [photo album], (n.p.), from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) archives, Austin, Texas.
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HISTORIC CONTEXT OF FORT WORTH

3 | Early Twentieth Century Urbanization, 1900–1945

Figure 3-23. Map showing the evolution of routes of the Meridian Highway/SH 2/US 81 through the Fort Worth vicinity. Source: Hardy·Heck·Moore, Inc., “The Meridian Highway in Texas” (prepared for the Texas Historical Commission, May 2016), from the THC, http://www.thc.texas.gov/meridian-highway-survey.
Figure 3-25. Highway map of Fort Worth, 1940. Source: General Highway Map, Detail of Cities and Towns in Tarrant County, Texas [Fort Worth and vicinity] [map], (Austin: Texas State Highway Department, in cooperation with the US Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Public Roads, 1936, revised 1940), from TSLAC, Map No. 05001, https://www.tsl.texas.gov/apps/arc/maps/maplookup.php?mapnum=05001.
A System of Major Streets and the Decline of Railways

Meanwhile, Fort Worth’s civic leaders directed their attention toward improving internal transportation within the city limits. Streetcars continued to provide inner-city transportation in the early years of the twentieth century, as they had since the 1870s (figs. 3-27 and 3-28). However, as automobiles grew in popularity, Fort Worth's rail transportation network began to be seen as an impediment to roadway development. At-grade crossings, where roadways and rail lines met, were a significant danger. Fort Worth’s first significant grade-separated railroad crossing—the Jennings Avenue Underpass—was constructed in 1903 (fig. 3-29). Yet, as late as 1927, Fort Worth had 100 at-grade railroad crossings and only 22 grade-separated crossings. That same year, the City of Fort Worth hired Harland Bartholomew & Associates of St. Louis to prepare A System of Major Streets for Fort Worth, Texas. Bartholomew immediately noted that, “The presence of so many railroad lines unsystematically placed in the structure of the city makes the problem of grade separation extremely serious,” and recommended prompt construction of more grade-separated crossings. Bartholomew’s 1927 plan also recommended a comprehensive program of roadway paving and widening and the development of wide scenic boulevards along Rosedale Street and towards Lake Worth along North Henderson Street (now Jacksboro Highway/SH 199). These roadway improvements encouraged a significant increase in automobile and truck use in the decades to come. From 1933–1944, Texas’s vehicle registration rose from 1,216,535 to 1,573,502 – with trucking rising from 16.47 percent to 18.91 percent of that traffic. The majority of new vehicles were personal, especially in urban areas.
Figure 3-27. Photo showing streetcar lines traveling through downtown Fort Worth, ca. 1907. Source: Smith Photo Co., Houston Street Looking North in Ft. Worth, Texas c. 1907 [photograph], (n.p., ca. 1907), from the Portal to Texas History, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth38537/m1/1/.
HISTORIC CONTEXT OF FORT WORTH

Early Twentieth Century Urbanization, 1900–1945

Figure 3-28. Map of Fort Worth, 1919. Note the interurban rail line and streetcar lines shown in red. Also note the numerous industrial oil sites, differentiated by the round footprints of the oil tanks. Source: C.H. Rogers, Greater Fort Worth City (map), [Fort Worth: n.p., 1919], from the Texas Government Land Office via Medium, https://medium.com/save-texas-history/greater-fort-worth-city-1919-b6d60ac20b116.
With the widespread adoption of personal automobile use, Fort Worth’s urban rail and streetcar use decreased. As early as 1927, transit maps of Fort Worth showed bus lines supplementing the interurban and streetcar lines (fig. 3-30). The Northern Texas Traction Company replaced most streetcar lines with buses by the early 1930s, and the Fort Worth–Dallas Interurban Line ran for the last time on December 24, 1934. Although symbolic of the end of the era, this change also signaled Fort Worth’s determination to progress with the technology of the day in order to keep its industrial economic foundations viable.
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INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Improvements to Fort Worth’s transportation network encouraged continued industrial growth, especially in Fort Worth’s Southside. As shown in figure 3-13, access to the Texas and Pacific Railway (T&P) made the Southside especially attractive to industry, but it had been inaccessible to the labor force that still largely lived in Fort Worth’s central city. Completion of the Jennings Avenue Underpass facilitated transportation between downtown and the Southside via streetcar or automobile.31 By 1910, Sanborn Fire Insurance maps showed the Darnell Lumber Company established on the Southside. By the 1920s and 1930s, the Southside industrial area had grown to include enterprises including Manning’s Dyeing and Cleaning Company, the Southern Publishing Association, the Dickson-Jenkins Company garment factory, the Branch-Smith Publishing Company, and a broom factory.32 The map of land uses accompanying the 1927 Bartholomew plan indicated that the booming industry lining the T&P railroad on the Southside rivaled the meatpacking industrial complex on the North Side (fig. 3-31). Through the 1930s and 1940s, continued highway improvements led companies to locate along State Highway 1 (US Highway 80), which roughly followed the T&P alignment. Some of the most influential industries developed during this era were the garment industry, oil related industries, agricultural processing, auto manufacturing, and—especially—the aviation industry.
Figure 3-31. Map showing the existing land uses in Fort Worth in 1927, as well as the probable future land use arrangement according to Bartholomew’s plan. Source: Harland Bartholomew & Associates and the Fort Worth City Planning Commission, A System of Major Streets for Fort Worth, Texas (Prepared for the Fort Worth City Planning Commission, 1927), from the Bartholomew Plan Collection, Fort Worth Public Library Digital Archives, http://www.fortworthtexasarchives.org/digital/collection/p16084coll17/id/214/rec/2.
The Garment Industry

Garment factories appeared on the Southside in the early twentieth century, largely focused on sewing work clothing like overalls. The Southside’s first garment factory, the Miller Manufacturing Company, began producing work clothes like overalls in its new facility at 311 Bryan Avenue in 1911 (fig. 3-32). The company began its operations in 1903, from a site on South Boaz Street in East Fort Worth, under the name “Hawkins-Miller Manufacture Company.” The name changed to the “Miller Manufacturing Company” in 1905, and the company continued to grow. A competing overalls manufacturer—the US Overall Company, later bought by and named Williamson-Dickie Company—entered Fort Worth’s market in 1918, and eventually expanded its facilities in a new factory at South Jennings Avenue facing north on Rio Grande Avenue in 1924 (fig. 3-33). Other garment manufacturing firms included the Dickson-Webb Company, the Jenkins Manufacturing Company (later the Dickson-Jenkins Manufacturing Company), and the H. J. Justin & Sons boots manufacturer on the Southside in 1939 (fig. 3-34). Garment and footwear manufacturing remained a major employer throughout the era, despite slowdowns during the Great Depression and material shortages during World War II. In fact, during World War II, the Dickson-Jenkins Manufacturing Company manufactured clothes for the US Army under their “Kangaroo” brand.33
Figure 3-34. Photo of the H. J. Justin & Sons Boot Company, which opened in 1939 at 610 W. Daggett Avenue (building originally constructed in 1911). The extant building is a local landmark and contributes to the NR-listed Jennings-Vickery Historic District. Source: Kline, “Jennings-Vickery Historic District,” citing the Commercial Photography Collection, Special Collections, University of Texas at Arlington, photo no. AR 430452471, March 7, 1945, courtesy of W. D. Smith.

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Industrial and Economic Growth, subtheme: The Garment Industry.
**Statement of Significance***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme: Early-to-Mid-Twentieth-Century Industrial and Economic Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes: The Garment Industry, Oil Pipelines and Oilfield Supplies, Agricultural Processing, Auto Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Statement of Significance:</strong> Resources significant within this theme reflect the industrial growth of Fort Worth, encouraged by its improved and expanded rail and road networks during the period. Resources are mostly likely eligible under Community Planning and Development, Industry, and Architecture. Social History may apply to some resources associated with labor unions and strikes. Eligible resources must retain sufficient integrity in order to convey significance and association with this theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Significance:</strong> Roughly between 1900 and 1945.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Significance Justification:</strong> Covers the twentieth-century pre-war period of industrial growth. Some periods of significance may extend past 1945 to reflect the ongoing significance of the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Location:</strong> Citywide; industrial nodes from this period are generally located on the Southside and Northside, and along rail lines and highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area(s) of Significance:</strong> Community Planning and Development, Industry, Social History, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria:</strong> National Register: A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated Property Types:</strong> Resources include manufacturing facilities, warehouses, offices, and grain mills and elevators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong> Miller Manufacturing Company Building, 311 Bryan Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Miller Manufacturing Company Building reflects the early-twentieth-century emergence of the garment industry as one of Fort Worth’s most significant economic contributors. Miller Manufacturing was the first of several Southside garment factories that opened in the first three decades of the twentieth century. Established in 1903, Miller had this building constructed in 1911, approximately three blocks from a rail line. Miller and many of the other factories manufactured work clothing such as overalls. In 1922, employees at the factory went on strike and the company subsequently relocated out of the city. Despite its departure, garment manufacturing remained an important industry in Fort Worth into the postwar period. The building is also an excellent design example of a typical early-twentieth-century industrial building. This building is listed in the National Register under Criteria A and C in the areas of Industry, Social History, and Architecture and may be eligible for designation as a local landmark.  

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*

---

Oil Pipelines and Oilfield Supplies

Another prominent new industry in early twentieth century Fort Worth revolved around oil. Geographically, Fort Worth sat at the center of the cluster of oilfields in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana (fig. 3-35) – making it an ideal terminus for oil pipelines. In 1909, Lone Star Gas (now Enserch Corporation) began construction on a pipeline from Petrolia to Fort Worth that was one of the world’s longest pipelines at the time. The 90-mile pipeline enabled more than 3,000 Fort Worth customers to receive gas through the Fort Worth Gas Company. By 1911, the Gulf Refining Company (fig. 3-36) and the Pierce Oil Company both had sizable oil refineries in the city, and the Fort Worth Star Telegram boasted that Fort Worth was the “state’s leading inland refining and pipeline city.”

Continued oil expansion led new companies to establish facilities in the city, like Texas Arizona Petroleum, White Eagle Refining, Montrose Oil, Magnolia Petroleum, Texas Continental Oil, Federal Oil, Home Oil, and Invader Oil. These companies generally established their industrial sites at the far periphery of town, adjacent to rail lines, while management functions took place in offices downtown (fig. 3-28). (A selection of company locations is included in table 3-5.) Expansion continued throughout the era, so that by 1921 the city had 50 companies manufacturing oil field supplies, and by 1925, Fort Worth claimed to be “the leading pipeline [oil] center in the United States.”
Figure 3-35. Map showing Fort Worth’s location relative to oil fields. Source: Fort Worth is the geographical and transportation center of the Mid-Continent Oil Fields [map], (Fort Worth: n.p., 1930), from the Portal to Texas History, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth190477/m1/1/?q=map%20fort%20worth.
Figure 3-36. Photograph of the view toward the Gulf Refinery in Fort Worth, 1925. Source: South East to Gulf Refining Co. Fort Worth, Texas [photo], [n.p., 1925], from the Online Archive of California, https://oac.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/kt0d5nc006.

Table 3-5. Selected oil company locations, 1912. 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oil Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth Gas Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1001 Throckmorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Rear 1215 N. Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Refining Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“whol. dealers illuminating oils and greases”</td>
<td>400 E. Magnolia Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinery</td>
<td>“1 mile e. of stock yards, N. Ft. Worth”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Star Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>807–810 First National Bank Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Fordyce Oil Ass’n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Moore Building (5th fl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>2426 Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto supply station</td>
<td>109 E. 10th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agricultural Processing

Fort Worth’s rail connections, combined with livestock industry’s need for abundant feed, further encouraged the development of the agricultural processing industry. Farmers brought grain and cotton grown on the surrounding Blackland Prairies to Fort Worth for processing – primarily using the rail lines, but increasingly using trucks as the highway system improved by the 1930s and 1940s. One prominent agricultural processing company was the Kimbell Milling Company (originally the Beatrice Milling Company). Founded Sherman in 1912, the company eventually landed in Fort Worth at 1900 South Main Street by 1925. 39 In the following decades, Kimbell developed a massive grain milling and storage complex along the Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway (figs. 3-37 and 3-38). In 1938, Kimbell Mills consolidated under the Producers Grain Corporation. 40
During World War II, mills throughout Fort Worth saw an expansion of “flour mill production and grain storage” as well as an increase in the demand for processed meat. By the end of the era, the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce emphasized the significance of milling within the city:

...because Fort Worth is the largest milling and storage center in the South the grain industry is one of the strongest links in Fort Worth’s economic chain. The grain mills here have a daily
capacity of 8,000 barrels of flour and 1,500 of corn meal. Feed mills have a daily capacity of 5,500 tons. Grain storage capacity is 26,597,000 bushels.42

Auto Manufacturing

The rapidly developing highway system—combined with competitive local tax incentives—also attracted the General Motors Company, and a Chevrolet assembly plant was constructed in Fort Worth.43 The plant was located south of West Seventh Street, west of Trinity Park (fig. 3-39). It operated from 1917 until 1922, when the City ended the tax breaks that had lured the auto maker.44 Other automakers operating in Fort Worth around the same period are listed in table 3-6.

Table 3-6. Selection of known auto manufacturers in Fort Worth.45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Approximate Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chevrolet</td>
<td>1917–1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges Motor Car &amp; Rubber Company</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Motor Car Association</td>
<td>1918–1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill Motor Car Company</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILITARY DEVELOPMENT

The presence of the aviation industry and the development of Fort Worth’s military complexes were interrelated in the period from 1900 to 1945. Until the military arrived, the West Side of Fort Worth had lagged behind other areas in terms of infrastructure like roads, water, and sewers. During World War I, the “Army established Camp Bowie (in the Arlington Heights area [west of downtown, fig. 3-40]), which trained 100,000 men, and the United States Army Air Corps converted three airfields into centers of aviation training.”46 The value of the improvements around Camp Bowie, including road-paving, railways, and streetcars, totaled approximately $2.2 million.47 When the military’s presence decreased after the war’s end, real estate developers capitalized on the opportunity and “millions of dollars of new construction was launched on the west side of town in the first month of peacetime.”48 As summarized by Tarrant County archivist Susie Pritchett, the development of Camp Bowie and surrounding airfields “pulled us into the 20th century like no other event and changed us from provincial to worldly in outlook.”49
The Aviation Industry

Fort Worth’s mild climate and rail connections led to the establishment of airfields around the city by 1917. By 1922, the US Army began aviation operations in Fort Worth. Meacham Field began as a 100-acre site located north of downtown in 1925. Commercial flights via Braniff Airways and “Texas Air Transport” (which later became American Airlines) departed from Fort Worth’s Meacham Field beginning in 1927 (figs. 3-41 and 3-42).
Figure 3-42. Map showing the growth of Fort Worth through 1949. Note the location of Meacham Field north of downtown, as well as the Consolidated plant and Carswell Airfield northwest of downtown. Source: Successive stages of Fort Worth’s growth from four square miles in 1873 to approximately 100 square miles [map], (Fort Worth: n.p., 1949), from the Portal to Texas History, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth193678/m1/1/?q=map%20fort%20worth.
To build upon its existing aviation industry and growing military complex, the City of Fort Worth enticed the Consolidated Aircraft company (later Consolidated-Vultee) to open an aviation manufacturing plant in 1941, and the “City Council purchased 526 acres of land, at the time outside of city limits, for $99,750 and turned it over to the United States Army for a bomber plant.”\textsuperscript{52} The land lay northwest of downtown, along the shores of Lake Worth (fig. 3-42). As part of a military-industrial partnership, the Army funded the plant’s construction, but Consolidated-Vultee oversaw manufacturing operations. By 1942, the Army finished the plant for Consolidated-Vultee Corporation, which then produced B-24 “Liberator” bombers and employed over 30,000 workers at its peak, including thousands of women who went to work to support the war effort (figs. 3-43 and 3-44).\textsuperscript{53} After 1943, the corporation’s name changed to Corvair, and later, General Dynamics and Lockheed-Martin, eventually becoming “the largest manufacturing establishment in the Southwest.”\textsuperscript{54} The facility expanded to encompass 528 acres and over 4 million square feet of buildings, valued at $52 million.\textsuperscript{55} The area’s concentration of skilled workers enticed other manufacturers, and initiated new trades including steel processing, food processing, and the manufacturing of plastics, chemicals, and air conditioners.\textsuperscript{56}
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Once Fort Worth became a hub for airplane manufacturing, the Army Air Corps built the Tarrant Field Air Dome (later Carswell Air Force Base) next door to the Consolidated-Vultee plant. The military build-up before and during World War II also led to the rapid expansion of Carswell Air Force Base. (See Appendix A for additional information about the base’s development). By the end of the 1940s, “Payrolls of the 5,000 officers, airmen and civilians at Carswell Field, along with commercial bills and local expenditures, put more than $1,000,000 a month in circulation in Fort Worth.”

BUSINESS AND COMMERCE

Fort Worth’s industrial success and military growth translated into great prosperity for the city’s businesses. Between 1900 and 1945, clerical and professional occupations skyrocketed, as did employment in the wholesale and retail trades (fig. 3-45). Banking and finance played a key role in this transition. Fort Worth entered the twentieth century with seven banks and six savings-and-loan associations in operation. Two of these were national banks – the Fort Worth National Bank and the First National Bank. The meatpacking boom led to the founding of another national bank, the Continental National Bank in 1903, headquartered at 317 Houston Street. Over time, the Continental National Bank gained a reputation as the “oil man’s bank,” playing a key role in investment in oil-related businesses as they flourished in Fort Worth.

The oil business also played a key role in Fort Worth’s commercial development. The same oil companies that operated industrial plants on the outskirts of Fort Worth also often maintained business offices downtown. The discovery of oil led to a frenzy of business and legal transactions to gain mineral rights, and one witness described the frenzy in Fort Worth as the “hotbed of oil transactions.” Early on, the “center of activity was the Westbrook Hotel, where the management was forced to remove all furniture in the lobby to clear space for the oil mart” (fig. 3-46). Meanwhile, the oil companies began constructing downtown office buildings of their own (as documented in table 3-5), and by 1921 more than 340 oil companies officed in Fort Worth.
By 1936, Fort Worth proclaimed itself “a complete market center,” with more than 250 wholesalers handling more than $200 million in sales annually. Fort Worth’s wholesale trade included goods processed locally—like meat, textiles, grain, oil, and petrochemical products—as well as other goods brought in from around the country. About half of Fort Worth’s wholesale trade was distributed around the state and nation via its rail and highway network. The remaining local retail sales that year amounted to over $100 million shared among nearly 10,000 retailers. Fort Worth’s commercial prosperity continued to grow during the World War II years, and by the end of the 1940s the city “ranked 36th in the nation in total volume of retail sales.”

URBAN GROWTH

Central Core
The rapid industrial, military, and commercial growth experienced by Fort Worth between 1900 and 1945 resulted in the transformation of the city’s urban fabric. Prior to 1900, the city’s physical growth was largely confined to a central core, bound on three sides by the Trinity River, with some very limited residential development south of downtown (figs. 3-47 and 3-48). With the city’s meatpacking boom and the concomitant population growth, the city’s center grew dense, and new buildings including high-rise office buildings. The growing density had its risks, and in 1909 a raging fire swept through the Southside, destroying hundreds of homes. By 1910, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps of Fort Worth included a detail of the “Congested Area” downtown (fig. 3-50). Over time, fireproof construction replaced many of downtown’s nineteenth-century wooden buildings, and the area’s frontier character faded and was replaced by modern masonry construction following popular nationwide styles and forms. For example, the Farmers and Mechanics National Bank Building at 714 Main Street was constructed in 1921 in the American Commercial style; at 24 stories, it was the tallest building in the southwest at the time (fig. 3-51). (Additional examples of notable buildings are included in table 3-7.)
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Figure 3-47. Map showing the eras of growth of the City of Fort Worth, created in 1927. Source: Harland Bartholomew & Associates and the Fort Worth City Planning Commission, A System of Major Streets for Fort Worth, Texas (Prepared for the Fort Worth City Planning Commission, 1927), from the Bartholomew Plan Collection, Fort Worth Public Library Digital Archives, http://www.fortworthtexasarchives.org/digital/collection/p16894coll17/id/714/rec/1.
Figure 3.48. Map showing approximate construction dates from 1900 to 1945. Source: Overlay by HHM using Tarrant County Tax Assessor data, with base map from ESRI.
Figure 3-49. Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1910, showing the "congested area" of downtown Fort Worth. Note the masonry construction (in pink) lining N. Main Street and the adjacent blocks, rising two stories in height or more, as well as the courthouse at the intersection of N. Main Street and W. Weatherford Street. Source: Sanborn Fire Insurance Company, Fort Worth, 1910, volume 1, sheet 1c, from the University of Texas at Austin, [http://negds.lib.utexas.edu/maps/sanborn/3f/txu-sanborn-fort_worth-1910-1s.jpg](http://negds.lib.utexas.edu/maps/sanborn/3f/txu-sanborn-fort_worth-1910-1s.jpg).
The city’s growth during World War I contributed to a boom in construction downtown, prior to any systemic effort by the City to plan or zone for future growth. 1923 marked the creation of the City Plan Board, and was followed in 1925 by an ordinance establishing a City Plan Commission. Another explosion of new construction downtown occurred between 1924 and 1926, amid the nationwide financial prosperity of the 1920s (fig. 3-51). In 1925, the Board and Commission directed their first initiatives toward the infrastructure needed to support the health and sanitation of Fort Worth’s rapidly growing population. The City had secured a reliable water supply in 1914, when it dammed the West Fork of the Trinity River to create Lake Worth, yet significant infrastructure gaps remained. In 1925, Fort Worth’s citizens passed a bond for $7,659,000 to be directed toward “street widening, paving, sewer, and water extension, swimming pools, additional park sites, and an annex to the City-County Hospital” – reportedly the largest bond ever approved in Texas at the time. The City’s planning efforts continued in 1927 with the decision to hire Harland Bartholomew to complete A System of Major Streets (discussed above). Bartholomew’s work extended far beyond street planning, including the full text for a

### Table 3-7. Selection of notable examples of popular architectural styles in downtown Fort Worth, 1900–1945.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name/Address</th>
<th>Construction Date</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flatiron Building/1000 Houston Street</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Renaissance Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Burnette Building/500 N. Main Street</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Neoclassical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil P. Anderson Building/411 W. 7th Street</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Chicago Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank Building/711 Houston Street</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Beaux Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone Hotel/100 N. Houston Street</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Art Moderne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recommended *Zoning Enabling Act.* However, the City postponed adoption of a formal zoning ordinance until 1940.

The Great Depression marked the intervening years, with major redevelopment programs funded by the federal New Deal, including the construction of schools, public housing, institutions, parks, and roadways. Federal funding helped construct two important public housing projects near Fort Worth’s downtown core: Ripley Arnold Place for white residents and H. H. Butler Place for African American residents (figs. 3-52 and 3-53). Ripley Arnold Place (no longer extant) was located northwest of downtown near the intersection of W. Belknap and N. Henderson Streets (fig. 3-54). H. H. Butler Place was sited southeast of downtown at 1201 Luella Street (listed in the National Register). Both sites were situated on land that had been so far undeveloped, located in the floodplain of the Trinity River and deemed undesirable for private development for its risk of flood. Other notable New Deal projects include the Alice Carlson School Addition, Amon Carter-Riverside High School, the City Hall (now the Public Safety and Courts Building, fig. 3-55), Elmwood Sanatorium, Fort Worth Botanical Garden, John Peter Smith Hospital, Fort Worth Zoo Improvements, Lincoln Park, and Oakhurst Scenic Drive. Overall, most of these projects were suburban in character, continuing the trend of pushing Fort Worth’s urban character further out from the city’s core; a model endorsed by prominent planners of the day. When the City of Fort Worth finally passed its zoning ordinance in 1940, its main effect was to segregate commercial uses from residential uses, driving residential building use out of downtown and toward the growing suburbs.
Figure 3-51. Map showing location of new buildings in Fort Worth, 1924-1926. Source: Harland Bartholomew & Associates and the Fort Worth City Planning Commission, A System of Major Streets for Fort Worth, Texas (Prepared for the Fort Worth City Planning Commission, 1927), from the Bartholomew Plan Collection, Fort Worth Public Library Digital Archives, [http://www.fortworthtexasarchives.org/digital/collection/p16084coll17/id/714/rec/1](http://www.fortworthtexasarchives.org/digital/collection/p16084coll17/id/714/rec/1).
Figure 3-52. The Ripley Arnold Place (not extant) housing development was one of two housing projects built between 1938 and 1940. This development housed white residents, while its partner, H. H. Butler Place, housed African American residents (fig. 3-54 below). Both developments included landscaping, play areas, administrative buildings, and community facilities for “social gatherings, educational work, health clinics, and any other beneficial use.” Source: The Housing Authority of the City of Fort Worth, Texas, “Public Housing Fort Worth Annual Report, 1938-1939,” Genealogy, History and Archives Unit, Fort Worth Public Library, http://www.fortworthtexasarchives.org/digital/collection/p16084coll3/id/148

Figure 3-53. Photo of the H. H. Bulter Place public housing project, constructed from 1938 through 1940 to house black residents. Like its partner development, Ripley Arnold Place (fig. 3-56 above), H.H. Butler Place included landscaping, play areas, administrative buildings, and community facilities for “social gatherings, educational work, health clinics, and any other beneficial use.” The housing project is listed in the National Register. Source: The Housing Authority of the City of Fort Worth, Texas, “Public Housing Fort Worth Annual Report, 1938-1939,” Genealogy, History and Archives Unit, Fort Worth Public Library, http://www.fortworthtexasarchives.org/digital/collection/p16084coll3/id/148

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Urban Growth, subtheme: Central Core.
**Statement of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme: Early-to-Mid-Twentieth-Century Urban Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes: Central Core, Suburbanization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Statement of Significance:** Resources significant within this theme reflect the transformation of the city’s urban fabric as a result of rapid population, industrial, military, and commercial growth. The city’s central core experienced a boom in construction of commercial and government buildings, while undeveloped areas outside of downtown experienced residential construction booms that were aided in part by the streetcar, and later by an expanded road network. Local architects also designed a number of buildings during this period, contributing to a local design aesthetic. Clusters of these resources may be eligible as historic districts. Resources and districts may be eligible under a variety of areas of significance but must retain sufficient integrity to convey significance and association with this theme.

**Period of Significance:** Roughly between 1900 and 1945.

**Period of Significance Justification:** Covers the twentieth-century pre-war period of commercial and residential growth. Historic districts may have longer periods of significance that reflect continued buildout.

**Geographic Location:** Citywide

**Area(s) of Significance:** Community Planning and Development, Commerce, Ethnic Heritage, Government, Architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria:</th>
<th>National Register: A, C</th>
<th>Local: 1, 2, 3, 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Associated Property Types:** Resources include a variety of residential buildings such as single- and multi-family residences. Bungalows built in the Craftsman and Tudor Revival style were common. Commercial buildings include one- and two-part commercial-block buildings and high-rise buildings that housed a variety of commercial functions. A variety of styles, including American Commercial and Art Deco, were popular. Also includes government buildings like city hall and educational buildings. Clusters may be considered historic districts. See the NPS National Register Bulletin *Historic Residential Suburbs* for more information.

**Example:** Farmers and Mechanics National Bank Building, 714 Main Street

The Farmers and Mechanics National Bank Building reflects the pre-war construction boom experienced in Fort Worth’s central core as a result of the city’s economic prosperity. As a result of the booming cattle, meatpacking, and industrial growth, banking demands increased. Built in 1921, the new 24-story bank building was one of several notable buildings constructed downtown during the period. The building reflects downtown’s changing skyline as well as its architectural aesthetic. The building was designed in the popular American Commercial style by local architects Sanguinet and Staats. The firm designed numerous commercial and civic buildings across the state and in Fort Worth, where they helped define the architecture of the growing city, between the turn of the century and 1926. This building is a designated local landmark and is listed in the National Register under Criteria A and C in the areas of Commerce and Architecture.

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*
Figure 3-54. Map showing the Ripley Arnold Place Development near West Belknap and North Henderson Streets. Source: Sanborn Fire Insurance Company, Fort Worth, 1910 (updated through 1951), volume 1, sheet 7, from the University of Texas at Austin.
Suburbanization

The process of suburbanization began organically, decades before the enactment of the zoning ordinance in 1940. Fort Worth’s residential development began stretching outward with the arrival of streetcars in the 1890s, but the process accelerated in the twentieth century. Until 1920, it was the streetcar lines that determined the locations of most of Fort Worth’s suburban growth (figs. 3-28 and 3-48).

As soon as the Swift and Armour meatpacking plant opened on the North Side, commercial nodes sprung up to support workers. One of these nodes—now the Marine Commercial Historic District (listed in the National Register)—exemplifies this trend, as described below:

This area...centered along Exchange Avenue and North Main Street developed with one-, two-, and three-story commercial buildings. These buildings housed hotels, bars, restaurants, leather shops, western wear stores, and other enterprises that serviced the needs of cattlemen and others engaged in the livestock industry.76

Similar commercial nodes appeared surrounding downtown in all directions, especially along the streetcar lines (fig. 3-28). South of town, a grouping of commercial buildings arose near the intersection of South Jennings Street and West Vickery Avenue (near the present-day Jennings-Vickery Historic District, listed in the National Register).77 Additional commerce developed east of Fort Worth along the interurban line and the Fort Worth–Dallas Pike. One node, for example, formed around the Handley railroad stop, where the Northern Texas Traction Company located its car barns and power plant. By the 1920s, the commercial district along East Lancaster Avenue featured one- and two-story brick buildings housing the post office, feed stores, a car dealership, and a variety of other small businesses.78 As the city commerce moved outward, the downtown corridor lost its retail monopoly as well as its residential anchor, beginning the trend of urban disinvestment that would mark the decades to come.79

SOUTHSIDE

By 1927, a map of population density showed downtown virtually devoid of residences (fig. 3-56), but with most suburbs still tightly adjoining downtown. However, increased automobile ownership and roadway improvements allowed suburbanization to continue its spread further outward. Fort Worth’s twentieth-century suburban growth initially stretched to the south. The prevailing winds from the south and southeast kept the air fresh and free from the smells of the stockyards to the north. Infrastructure development, like the completion of the Jennings Avenue underpass, also made the Southside “easily accessible to the downtown as it was not cut off from the central city by the Trinity River as were the east, west, and north sides of town.”80 The availability of streetcar lines made the Southside even more attractive.81
Figure 3-56. Map showing population density in 1927. Note the lack of residences remaining in downtown. Source: Harland Bartholomew & Associates and the Fort Worth City Planning Commission, A System of Major Streets for Fort Worth, Texas (Prepared for the Fort Worth City Planning Commission, 1927), from the Bartholomew Plan Collection, Fort Worth Public Library Digital Archives, http://www.fortworthtexasarchives.org/digital/collection/p16084coll17/id/214/rec/1.
One early residential suburb on Fort Worth’s Southside was Fairmount. Although Fairmount’s development began in the 1880s, the bulk of its housing construction occurred between 1905 and 1920. Fairmount’s population in the early twentieth century was economically diverse, including middle class tradesmen, civil servants, teachers, and office workers, as well as bank presidents and local business leaders. The area was also home to a significant Jewish community.

A variety of multifamily apartment buildings also was constructed just south of downtown, helping to meet the demand for housing amid Fort Worth’s rapid population growth. Apartment buildings typically clustered along streetcar lines, and typically were small in scale and rose to only two or three stories in height, to best fit within the surrounding single-family neighborhood. Notable examples include the Markeen Apartments at St. Louis and Daggett Avenues (listed in the National Register), as well as the apartments within the Leuda-May National Register Historic District, primarily constructed between 1920 and 1940 (fig. 3-57).

Early on, residents of Southside neighborhoods predominantly were white, even within multifamily apartments. Many of the single-family subdivisions in the area even included restrictive deed covenants forbidding the sale of properties to African American families. One of the earliest subdivisions with such deed restrictions was platted along Elizabeth Boulevard in 1911 by developer John C. Ryan, Sr., who “envisioned Fort Worth as ‘the oil center of the southwest’ and sought to make Elizabeth Boulevard ‘the residence section of oil men located here.’” Between 1911 and 1929, prominent oil men and professionals constructed grand homes in the styles popular at the time, such as the Classical Revival, Renaissance Revival (see fig. 3-58), Spanish Colonial Revival, Mission Revival, and Prairie styles.
After 1920, though, prominent white families increasingly purchased automobiles and moved to newer suburbs to the west. As white families moved away, African American neighborhoods shifted from the city’s core to the Southside, as well as to the southeast. The Near Southeast neighborhood, for example, began around 1900 as a working-class white neighborhood of National Folk and Folk Victorian houses. Beginning around 1910, a prominent African American community leader named William Madison McDonald purchased land near the intersection of East Terrell Avenue and East Humbolt Street to develop as an African American neighborhood and commercial district. The neighborhood evolved into “the historic premier African American neighborhood in Fort Worth” – with African Americans forming a majority of the residents by 1926. Occupations represented in the neighborhood ranged from “prominent African American doctors, business and professional people, religious leaders, and educators” to working-class African Americans “employed in the Fort Worth Stockyards, the railroad industry, and as domestics.” (The core of the neighborhood is listed in the National Register as the Near Southeast National Register Historic District, and a small portion is also listed as the Locally-Designated Terrell Heights Historic District.)

NORTH SIDE

Around 1906, streetcar lines also reached across the Trinity River to the west and northwest (fig. 3-28). One early suburb lay northwest of downtown along Grand Avenue (listed in the National Register as the Grand Avenue Historic District). Grand Avenue’s subdivision plat dated to 1888, but the lack of bridges across the Trinity River discouraged development until around 1906. Between about 1906 and 1925, middle-class families constructed modest homes like Bungalows on lots with broad front yards (fig. 3-59). This followed suburban development patterns popular across the nation at the time.


Following World War I, Fort Worth annexed several suburban and manufacturing areas, doubling its geographic size. By 1924, annex communities included Arlington Heights, Riverside, Niles City, and Polytechnic neighborhoods (fig. 3-2). Fort Worth’s footprint grew to nearly 62 square miles – as compared with 3.7 square miles when originally platted in 1873 (see fig. 3-48). The population continued to grow as well, and a construction boom ensued, so that “During the 1920s a new residence was constructed for every 4.0 persons added to the population.” By 1922, bridge and roadway improvements enabled suburbs to extended in every direction, as residents could rely on personal
automobiles. The only remaining undeveloped land lay along the flood-prone Trinity River valley and the right-of-way adjoining the city’s many railroad lines.\footnote{101}

The locally designated Hillcrest Historic District provides a representative example of an automobile-oriented neighborhood constructed west of downtown after World War I. At the outset of World War I, developer Robert McCart purchased land west of downtown and donated a portion to the US Army to construct Camp Bowie (discussed above). The Army and the City then added extensive infrastructure linking Camp Bowie with downtown — including Camp Bowie Boulevard, water and sewer lines, electricity, and power lines. After World War I, McCart platted his remaining land as residential suburbs, benefitting from the remaining infrastructure. Between 1925 and around 1945, McCart’s Hillcrest development evolved to include middle-class brick bungalows reflecting popular revival architectural styles, especially the Tudor Revival style (fig. 3-60).\footnote{102}

Another example of a suburban neighborhood that developed west of downtown in the 1920s is found within the locally designated Linden Historic District. The area was platted in 1907, but development stalled until the 1920s and 1930s, when working-class railroad and industrial employees invested in building an exemplary collection of Craftsman bungalows in the area.\footnote{103}

GARDEN SUBURBS

Fort Worth’s neighborhood planning efforts reflected the nationwide shift toward the concept of the “Garden Suburb,” which aimed to integrate more natural and recreational open space into suburban planning to promote health. These neighborhoods used curvilinear streets to slow traffic and recreate bucolic streetscape views.\footnote{104} These neighborhoods also frequently made use of exclusionary deed covenants, which were discriminatory and prevented non-white residents from purchasing the homes. In the early 1920s, John C. Ryan (developer of Elizabeth Boulevard) platted the Morningside development to the southeast of downtown. Morningside targeted middle-class white homebuyers.\footnote{105} Like his earlier developments, Morningside included deed covenants that restricted the population of homebuyers, as well as the physical character of development. As quoted from LopezGarcia Group’s 2008 “Survey of Five Urban Villages,” these included:

- Restriction against the sale to Negroes or those of African descent, but servants’ quarters could be erected
• Only can erect a private dwelling and outbuildings, no apartments or garage apartments
• No school house, old house moved in, store, saloon or other business or shop can be erected on a residential lot
• The houses had a minimum cost of construction
• Required a 20-foot set back from the front property lie, five feet on the side
• No stable or barn erected within 90 feet of the front property line
• Established setbacks for hedges and fences
• No houses built on rear of lot or alley for rental purposes

The 1927 Bartholomew plan for A System of Major Streets codified the ideas of the Garden Suburb by setting forth recommendations for future subdivision plats. Key recommendations of the Bartholomew plan included:

• Laying out streets to fit the topography
• Platting curved streets rather than angular ones
• Connecting street systems and lot setback patterns with adjacent subdivisions where possible
• Setting minimum standards for lot sizes
• Placing utility poles along rear lot lines
• Encouraging alleys for utility service
• Encouraging reservations of land for future parks and schools

However, realization of Bartholomew’s recommendations lagged as Fort Worth’s construction market stalled between 1929 and 1935 due to the Great Depression (fig. 3-61). The limited housing constructed during this period was typically built in remaining lots within earlier subdivisions, using more modest and utilitarian forms and styles. Within the locally designated Linden Historic District, for example, “in the mid to late 1930s the economic crisis and a looming World War caused a departure from decorative detailing,” and Minimal Traditional housing sprung up beside earlier Craftsman-style housing. Fort Worth’s housing market finally began to recover in 1936, aided by new federal polices promoting home ownership. In 1934, President Roosevelt and Congress introduced the National Housing Act, which over the next decade boosted home ownership and influenced the adoption of new standards for neighborhood planning and subdivision design. Part of the Act included creation of the Federal Housing Authority (FHA), which provided federal insurance for home mortgages deemed low risk. Racial biases of the day also factored into risk assessment, preventing minorities from accessing the same federal mortgage assistance as whites; effectively continuing their exclusion from traditionally white neighborhoods. The US government-backed Home Owners’ Loan Corporation (HOLC) prepared maps for cities across the nation that identified areas based on risk with grades of “Best,” “Still Desirable,” “Definitely Declining,” and “Hazardous.” In Fort Worth and throughout the country, predominantly non-white residential areas and areas of industrialization received the riskiest grades (fig. 3-62). As a result, these areas received little investment during the period due to the perceived risk the government associated with lending money to racial minorities.
Figure 3-61. Graph showing the volume of housing construction over time. Source: Talbert, Cowtown-Metropolis, 172.
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In addition, in 1936 the FHA introduced pamphlets setting standards for subdivision and neighborhood planning. By providing these standards as factors influencing project approvals, FHA planners hoped to influence developers to design neighborhoods that would fit the garden suburb ideal. Initially, the FHA released the following minimum requirements for new subdivisions:

- Location exhibiting a healthy and active demand for homes.
- Location possessing a suitable site in terms of topography, soil condition, tree cover, and absence of hazards such as flood, fog, smoke, obnoxious odors, etc.
- Accessibility by means of public transportation (streetcars and buses) and adequate highways, schools, employment and shopping centers.
- Installation of appropriate utilities and street improvements carefully related to the needs of the development.
- Compliance with city, county or regional plans and regulations, particularly local zoning and subdivision regulations to ensure that the neighborhood will become stable.
- Protection of property values through “appropriate” deed restrictions (including setbacks, lots sizes and minimum costs of construction).
- Guarantee of a sound financial setup, whereby subdividers were financially able to carry through their sales and development program, and where taxes as assessments were in line with the type of development contemplated and likely to remain stable.109

With the boost provided by FHA financing, Bartholomew’s subdivision prescriptions finally came to fruition in the 1939 West Oakhurst Addition. This middle-class suburb had begun in 1924 and originally used a rectilinear street grid. Construction in Oakhurst slowed after 1927, as it did in the rest of the city, but when it revived in the late 1930s the developers adapted the plan to include more curvilinear streets.110 To do so, the neighborhood’s developers hired landscape architects Hare and Hare of Kansas City, Missouri. Hare and Hare formulated a site plan with curvilinear streets following the topography, resulting in irregularly shaped lots and scenic views.111 The new design had the added benefit of meeting FHA standards.

Despite the increased interest in the new suburban homes, Fort Worth’s housing construction rates did not rise to pre-depression levels again until 1943 because of rationing of construction materials at the outset of World War II. By 1943, population growth from wartime expansion of the Carswell Airfield and aircraft manufacturing industry finally led the City and the federal government to construct new housing for war workers (fig. 3-63).112

During World War II, the Fort Worth Housing Authority also constructed several housing projects for war workers using $600 million in federal emergency housing funding.113 One example, known as “Liberator Village” was constructed near the Consolidated-Vultee plant to house employees (fig. 3-63; the Consolidated-Vultee plant and associated development is discussed earlier, see also figs. 3-43 and 3-44).114 The project consisted of 500 apartment units, but demand far outstripped supply, with 690 families immediately applying for housing in 1943.115 As a result, maps depicting Fort Worth’s growth in the 1940s show very little expansion through 1945—primarily clustered around Carswell Air Force Base and the Meacham Field airport (see fig. 3-43). In the postwar years to come, though, pent-up demand would create a housing boom 350 percent larger than the boom in the 1920s.

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Urban Growth, subtheme: Suburbanization.
**Statement of Significance***

**Theme:** Early-to-Mid-Twentieth-Century Urban Growth

**Subthemes:** Central Core, Suburbanization

**Summary Statement of Significance:** Resources significant within this theme reflect the transformation of the city’s urban fabric as a result of rapid population, industrial, military, and commercial growth. The city’s central core experienced a boom in construction of commercial and government building, while undeveloped areas outside of downtown experienced residential construction booms, aided in part by the streetcar, and later by an expanded road network. Local architects also designed a number of buildings during this period, contributing to a local design aesthetic. Clusters of these resources may be eligible as historic districts. Resources and districts may be eligible under a variety of areas of significance but must retain sufficient integrity to convey significance and association with this theme.

**Period of Significance:** Roughly between 1900 and 1945.

**Period of Significance Justification:** Covers the twentieth-century pre-war period of commercial and residential growth. Historic districts may have longer periods of significance that reflect continued buildout.

**Geographic Location:** Citywide

**Area(s) of Significance:** Community Planning and Development, Commerce, Ethnic Heritage, Government, Architecture

**Criteria:**
- National Register: A, C
- Local: 1, 2, 3, 5

**Associated Property Types:** Resources include a variety of residential buildings such as single- and multi-family residences. Bungalows built in the Craftsman and Tudor Revival style were common. Commercial buildings include one- and two-part commercial-block buildings and high-rise buildings that housed a variety of commercial functions. A variety of styles, including American Commercial and Art Deco, were popular. Also includes government buildings like city hall and educational buildings. Clusters may be considered historic districts. See the NPS National Register Bulletin *Historic Residential Suburbs* for more information.

**Example:** Leuda-May Historic District, Southside

The Leuda-May Historic District is associated with the city’s rapid population growth and subsequent residential development in the pre-war 20th century. Comprised of three 1920s and 1930s two-story apartment buildings and two garage apartments, the district is largely surrounded by early-twentieth-century single-family homes. Though the area was platted in the nineteenth century, like many subdivisions, it did not fill in until the 20th century, when the streetcar extended further south. Between 1920 and 1926, when the first apartment was built, the city’s population was estimated to have grown by more than 50,000, creating a housing shortage. As a result, apartments like those in the district began to appear in neighborhoods along with single-family homes. The district is listed in the National Register under Criteria A and C in the areas of Community Planning and Development and Architecture. The district may also be eligible as a local historic district.

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*

CULTURAL AND SOCIAL CONTEXT

As Fort Worth’s economy and urban fabric expanded from 1900 to 1945, its cultural and social fabric grew richer as well. The major anchors of culture and society from 1900 to 1945 were religion, education, outdoor recreation, and the arts. Women’s groups also continued their role in the community that began in the nineteenth century, advocating and advancing issues such as suffrage, the arts, education, and the health and wellbeing of Fort Worthians. At the same time, the spirit of frontier independence and cowboy flair lived on from Fort Worth’s early days and continued to permeate all aspects of society and culture.

Religious Institutions

Census numbers show that, by the end of the 1940s, Fort Worth supported 775 clergymen (or one clergymen per 446 residents). In 1902, the City Directory listed 37 churches – four Baptist, one Catholic, three “Christian,” two Episcopal, two Evangelical, 11 Methodist, five Presbyterian, two Christian Scientist, one Seventh Day Adventist, one “Spiritualist,” three “Miscellaneous,” and five “Colored Denominations” as well as one “Hebrew Synagogue.” Many of these churches had earlier and more modest roots, but later expanded their buildings in the early twentieth century to meet the
needs of the growing population and their growing congregations. One example is the First United Methodist Church, established in 1853 with an itinerant pastor and no permanent building. The First United Methodist Church moved into a larger brick church at 7th and Taylor Streets in 1908, and then moved into an even larger stone church at 800 West 5th Street in 1930, designed in a grand Gothic Revival style (fig. 3-64).\(^{118}\)

In Fort Worth’s African American community, the Kentucky Avenue Baptist church holds a similar story. The original frame church building was constructed in 1905 at Kentucky Avenue and East Terrell Avenue, but it burned in 1920. Between 1923 and 1927, the congregation replaced it with a more substantial Classical Revival brick church at 1801 Evans Avenue (now known as Tabernacle Baptist Church or Mount Pisgah Missionary Baptist Church, listed in the National Register, fig. 3-65).\(^{119}\) At the same time, a plethora of new churches were established, and by 1938 the city held over 200.\(^{120}\) The first church specifically serving Mexican immigrants and their families was the Mexican Presbyterian Church, established in 1927 when Reverend Guillermo A. Walls led the first service in “an old frame building on the corner of West Bluff and Lexington Streets, which had previously been a speakeasy.”\(^{121}\) Almost a dozen churches served the Spanish-speaking communities by the 1940s, a testament to the rapidly growing Mexican-American population.
Fort Worth’s religious life also influenced the development of institutions of higher education. By 1910, the city had three colleges: Texas Christian University, Southwestern Baptist Seminary, and Our Lady of Victory Academy.122 These institutions employed 269 “College presidents, [professors, and] instructors” by the end of the 1940s.123 The largest of these colleges, Texas Christian University, played a major role in the city’s economy and in the urban character of the surrounding neighborhood. The University was founded in Fort Worth after the Civil War as an all-male Christian college, but it moved to Waco in 1895. The Waco campus burned in 1910, and Texas Christian University returned to Fort Worth and constructed a campus of brick and stone buildings in a reserved Greek Revival style (fig. 3-66).124 Oil baroness Mary Couts Burnett left the University a sizeable donation in the 1920s, which the school used to help fund its expansion into a sprawling campus spread over hundreds of acres.125

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Cultural and Social Context, subtheme: Religious Institutions.
**Statement of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Twentieth-Century Cultural and Social Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Religious Institutions, Parkland &amp; Recreation, Women’s Clubs, Civil Rights &amp; Integration, Emerging LGBTQ Scene and Community, Arts &amp; The Cultural District, Heritage &amp; Cultural Preservation Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement of Significance:</td>
<td>Resources associated with this theme and its many subthemes highlight the development of the city’s rich cultural and social fabric in the early twentieth century through the postwar period. This theme covers the welfare and cultural development of the city and its people, and the institutions involved in this work. Progressive issues, civil rights advocacy, parks, and the arts are among the subjects associated with this theme. Resources may be eligible under a variety of areas of significance but must retain sufficient integrity in order to convey significance and association with this theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance:</td>
<td>From 1900 to 1980.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance Justification:</td>
<td>Covers the twentieth-century period of cultural and social development. Some resources may have periods of significance that begin earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location:</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area(s) of Significance:</td>
<td>Art, Community Planning and Development, Entertainment/Recreation, Ethnic History, Health/Medicine, Landscape Architecture, Performing Arts, Social History, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria:</td>
<td>National Register: A, C, Criteria Consideration A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Property Types:</td>
<td>Local: 1, 2, 3, 5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td>Resources include churches, synagogues, parks, club houses, medical clinics, residences, bars, theaters, and museums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong></td>
<td>Saint James Second Street Baptist Church, 210 Harding Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saint James Second Street Baptist Church (now called Greater Saint James’ Missionary Baptist Church) is home to one of the city’s oldest Black congregations, founded in the 1890s. The congregation’s church, built between 1913 and 1922, was designed by Frank Singleton and constructed by George R. Powell, a local African American contractor. The building is a local landmark and is listed in the National Register under Criteria Consideration A for Religious Properties for its architectural significance. The church may also be significant for its role as a social institution and meeting space for Fort Worth’s Black community. The church hosted numerous events and speakers, including the National Director of the NAACP and the National Association of Federated Colored Women’s Club. The local Federated Women’s Club also used the church as a meeting location before it had its own club home.

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*
Parkland and Recreation

In the early 1920s, a nationwide beautification movement led to the creation of the State Parks Board in Texas, as well as investment in numerous municipal parks across the state. As part of this movement, the City of Fort Worth developed a Recreation Department in 1922, to facilitate public spaces for leisure activities, such as public pools, parks, and golf courses. The City Health and Welfare Department was established in 1925, and several hospitals were built during the 1920s. The expansion of Fort Worth’s park space is beautifully illustrated in a 1928 map showing pockets of green scattered across the city, especially along waterways (fig. 3-67).
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Figure 3-67. Map from ca. 1928 indicating park spaces in green. Source: Llewellyn & McConnell (Firm), Map of city of Fort Worth: where the west begins [map] (Fort Worth: n.p., ca. 1928), from the Portal to Texas History https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth220515/m1/1/?q=map%20fort%20worth.
In the Depression era, the federal government invested in the continued improvement of Fort Worth’s parks. The crowning gem was the Fort Worth Botanic Garden, completed between 1932 and 1933 (fig. 3-68). A 1949 publication described the garden as follows:

The Fort Worth Botanic Garden, located in the beautifully wooded southwestern section of Trinity Park was the crystallization [sic] of years of thoughtful preparation and careful planning by the Fort Worth Park Board, local rose societies and prominent citizens. Where once Texas cowboys stopped to water cattle, there stands today a garden with lakes, perennial springs, waterfalls, winding paths, entrancing vistas and a library of living plants collected from all parts of the world. The garden, only two miles from the downtown business district, was built entirely with relief labor in 1932 and 1933. It required fifteen months to complete the project.129

All the while, Fort Worth’s stock show and rodeo remained the time when people from across different cultures and social classes would come together in Fort Worth. The earliest coliseum was constructed in 1908 (fig. 3-12; more information about its history can be found under the “Meatpacking Boom” heading above), and the larger and grander Will Rogers Coliseum was completed in 1936 using New Deal funding from the federal Public Works Administration (fig. 3-69).130 These coliseum spaces enabled the stock show and rodeo to be moved indoors—a novel luxury at the time—adding a sense of refinement befitting the City’s prosperity while retaining the city’s western roots.
Women’s Clubs

By the early 1920s, Fort Worth boasted an impressive repertoire of woman’s clubs. Their focuses ranged from religion, literature, music, and education to gardens and beautification. Women’s groups also advocated for progressive reforms such as child labor laws and public health programs. In cities across the country, women’s clubs were beginning to organize under one federation. Together, as a federation, these clubs gained more political clout, as well as financial leverage. In Fort Worth, around 11 women’s clubs formed the Woman’s Club of Fort Worth in 1923 and made their headquarters on Pennsylvania Avenue in Quality Hill (the complex of four early- and mid-twentieth-century houses is listed in the National Register). The group was active in social, cultural, civic, and educational affairs in the city. They supported the Fort Worth Free Baby Hospital, the Orphan’s Home, the Tarrant County jail, and the Tarrant County Poor Farm, as well as a number of national charitable organizations. Culturally, the group is credited with saving the Fort Worth Symphony during the Great Depression by sponsoring the organization when donations dried up.

The Woman’s Club of Fort Worth was the largest women’s organization in city, though it counted only white women as members. Denied entry into the club, the city’s Black women established their own clubs. Like the white clubs, the African American clubs focused on a variety of issues and interests, but a dedication to the betterment and support of the African American community permeated the groups. They helped advocate for services and in some instances provided services when the City failed to do so. One of the earliest groups, the Phyllis Wheatley Club, an affiliate of the National Association of Colored Women (NACW), organized in the city around 1900 with a focus of improving Black neighborhoods and lives. Another early club, the Alphin Charity and Art Club, focused on local charitable work and “the development of Fine Arts” among its members. The Ethel Ransom Cultural Club, named after local clubwoman Ethel Blanche Wilson, organized in 1933 with a focus on advancing the arts in the Black community.

Similar to the white women’s clubs, African American women’s clubs began merging under federations. In Texas, the Texas Federation of Colored Women’s Clubs (TFCWC) organized in 1905 and hosted the NACW annual convention in Fort Worth in 1937 – the first such meeting in the state. Under president Ethel Blanche Wilson of Fort Worth, one of the TFCWC’s primary causes was anti-lynching. In Fort Worth, a city federation of Black women’s groups organized in 1917. The Fort Worth Association of Federated Women’s Clubs (FWAFWC) worked to improve public education, advocated for increased access to public spaces like libraries and parks, and helped establish a home for delinquent girls. During the period, the club met at St. James Second Street Baptist Church (local landmark, listed in the National Register) on Harding Street, the Sixteenth Street YMCA (not extant), and the Pulaski Street YWCA (not extant) while it raised money for a club home of their own; a goal they achieved in 1954 (extant at 1051 Evans Avenue).
### Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Twentieth-Century Cultural and Social Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Religious Institutions, Parkland &amp; Recreation, Women’s Clubs, Civil Rights &amp; Integration, Emerging LGBTQ Scene and Community, Arts &amp; The Cultural District, Heritage &amp; Cultural Preservation Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement of Significance:</td>
<td>Resources associated with this theme and its many subthemes highlight the development of the city’s rich cultural and social fabric in the early twentieth century through the postwar period. The theme covers the welfare and cultural development of the city and its people, and the institutions involved in this work. Progressive issues, civil rights advocacy, parks, and the arts are among the subjects associated with this theme. Resources may be eligible under a variety of areas of significance but must retain sufficient integrity to convey significance and association with this theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance:</td>
<td>From 1900 to 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance Justification:</td>
<td>Covers the twentieth-century period of cultural and social development. Some resources may have periods of significance that begin earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location:</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area(s) of Significance:</td>
<td>Art, Community Planning and Development, Entertainment/Recreation, Ethnic History, Health/Medicine, Landscape Architecture, Performing Arts, Social History, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria:</td>
<td>National Register: A, C, Criteria Consideration A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Property Types:</td>
<td>Resources include churches, synagogues, parks, club houses, medical clinics, residences, bars, theaters, and museums.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:** Fort Worth Association of Federated Women’s Clubs Home, 1051 Evans Avenue

The Fort Worth Association of Federated Women’s Clubs Home on the Southside is associated with both the Women’s Club movement and the city’s African American social history movement. Denied membership into white women’s clubs, Black women organized the FWAFWC in 1917, during the Progressive Era. The group focused on the betterment and welfare of the city’s Black community. After meeting at various locations, the group moved into its permanent home at 1051 Evans Avenue in 1954. The building is potentially eligible as a local landmark and for listing in the National Register under Criterion A in the areas of Ethnic Heritage and Social History.


*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*
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4 | Postwar Suburbanization and Development, 1946–1980

Though the postwar period was marred by several challenges, Fort Worth experienced explosive population, economic, and cultural growth during the three and a half decades after World War II. Despite a devastating flood in 1949, Fort Worth emerged from the 1940s economically prepared for the coming decades, having established itself as a center for national defense. Boosted by a growing manufacturing sector and highway construction, a period of suburbanization transformed the once-rural outlying farmlands into tract homes and strip malls. Growing pains created by the booming population and physical expansion challenged leaders and citizens, who collaborated on urban renewal projects, cultural endeavors, and heritage preservation. Together they restored the vibrancy of downtown, and the city emerged as one of the nation’s premier museum destinations by the end of the period. The city’s growth, coinciding with the civil rights movement, also highlighted existing racial tensions and activists helped usher in change for the city’s growing racial minorities. After an eventful postwar period characterized by growth and change, Fort Worth entered the 1980s with the same frontier spirit of independence that it started with in 1849.

**National Register Eligibility of Resources**

Various themes associated with this period in Fort Worth’s history include: Economic Diversification, Suburbanization, and Cultural and Social Development. Many of these themes can be broken down further into subthemes, including: Defense and Commercial Aviation, Continued Highway Development, Urban Renewal and Historic Preservation Efforts, Civil Rights and Integration, and Arts and The Cultural District. These themes played out their roles simultaneously during this period of Fort Worth’s history. Many extant resources constructed between 1946 and 1980 are located throughout Fort Worth, though high concentrations of these properties are likely located in areas annexed by the City during the period. Among the various property types associated with these themes, examples include: manufacturing facilities, air fields and airports, freeway and highway infrastructure, residential suburbs, commercial shopping strips and malls, motels, museums, Civil Rights Movement sites, LGBTQ sites, and parks and other civic improvements. Resources from this period may be eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A under the following Areas of Significance: Commerce, Community Planning and Development, Entertainment/Recreation, Ethnic Heritage, Industry, Landscape Architecture, Performing Arts, Social History, and Transportation. Extant resources may also have significance under Criterion C in the Area of Architecture.

See the one-page statement of significance examples throughout this section for examples of how extant resources, meet, or may meet, designation criteria under certain themes.

**POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS**

Fort Worth experienced explosive population growth in the immediate postwar years, nearly doubling its population between 1946 and 1960 (table 4-1). Despite a slight population decline in the 1970s, Fort Worth maintained its rank as one of the five largest cities in Texas in 1980. The city’s defense and aviation industries, as well as its robust manufacturing and retail sectors, attracted returning veterans, and men and women from rural areas across the state and the South seeking better paying jobs. The baby boom, and the doubling of the city’s square mileage, also contributed to Fort Worth’s growth.  

1
Although the majority of Fort Worth’s citizens were white, the city grew more diverse after World War II (table 4-2). Whereas the white population increased 10 percent between 1950 and 1980, the African American population grew 137 percent, and the Latino population increased nearly 200 percent between 1960 and 1980. The diversification of the city’s population coincided with the Civil Rights Movement and desegregation, and played out in various aspects, including housing trends and governmental representation.

### Table 4-2. Population makeup of Fort Worth, 1950 to 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>241,651 (86.7%)</td>
<td>299,346 (84%)</td>
<td>312,521 (79.4%)</td>
<td>265,451 (68.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td>36,933 (13.2%)</td>
<td>56,440 (15.8%)</td>
<td>78,324 (19.9%)</td>
<td>87,723 (22.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic/Latino</strong></td>
<td>8,139 (2.9%)</td>
<td>16,388 (4.6%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>48,696 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>90 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>201 (0.1%)</td>
<td>422 (0.1%)</td>
<td>2,340 (0.06%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION

#### MANUFACTURING AND BUSINESS DIVERSIFICATION

While the aviation and defense industries anchored the city’s economy in the postwar period, a diversification of the city’s manufacturing contributed to Fort Worth’s robust economy. Between 1948 and 1963, the number of manufacturing plants in the city grew from 601 to 937, and in 1971, manufacturing firms employed more than 94,000 people, a third of the city’s population. While the end of an economic era occurred when the Armour and Swift meatpacking plants closed in 1962 and 1971 respectively, existing and new industries and companies helped bolster the city’s economy (fig. 4-1).

Fort Worth’s expanded and modern highway network and air travel opportunities made it an attractive inland center of trade, manufacturing, and distribution (see Continued Highway Development beginning on page 199). Greater collaboration with Dallas, and an early 1970s advertising campaign branding the two cities as “The Metroplex,” also helped lure businesses to North Texas. In boasting of the city’s diverse industries in the 1970s, the head of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Bill Shelton, cited the various plants that contributed to the city’s growth during this period, including firms specializing in manufacturing umbrellas, false teeth, ballpoint pens, boats, glass eyes, and water skis.

**Figure 4-1.** Fort Worth Star-Telegram article from 1962 reporting on the abandoned Armour meatpacking plant. After closing in 1962, the plant remained vacant until it burned down in 1971. Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram, December 6, 1962, S8.

During the postwar period, Fort Worth maintained its status as an important apparel, oil, and grain center. For its part, the garment industry added millions of dollars to the economy and employed
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around 2,000 employees throughout the 1950s and 1960s. New companies, including the Big State Garment Company (125 South Jennings Avenue), opened factories in Fort Worth, joining existing companies including the Williamson-Dickie Company and H. J. Justin & Sons in the cluster of Southside garment factories. The oil industry also sustained its presence in Fort Worth. Though the East Texas Oil Field’s significance diminished as West Texas and the Permian Basin emerged as the state’s largest oil producer, some oil and petroleum companies with offices in Fort Worth benefited from the global energy crisis and inflated oil prices in the 1970s. Despite the dismantling of Gulf Refining Corporation’s Fort Worth refinery in the 1950s, other companies including Western Company of North America and Texas Refinery Corporation maintained offices downtown. Grain dealers and elevators continued operating in Fort Worth in the postwar period, making Fort Worth one of the nation’s most important grain markets. As the headquarters of the Texas Grain and Feed Association, Fort Worth was home to dozens of grain dealers, many with offices downtown. Grain elevators dotted the city’s landscape, including those belonging to Kimbell Milling Company, who added onto their complex on South Main Street in the early 1950s.

Food processing and manufacturing firms in the city also prospered, with many investing in multimillion-dollar expansions: Pangburn’s Candies added on to its West 7th Street building in 1946 (not extant), Waples Platter processing plant relocated to a larger facility in the suburb of Richland Hills (7133 Burns Street in Richland Industrial Park), and Great Western Foods, a wholesale food manufacturing company, built a new seven-and-a-half-story cooker for their famed Ranch Style beans in the late 1960s at 1734 East El Paso Street in southeast Fort Worth. Mrs. Baird’s Bakery, founded in 1908, also expanded. In 1971 the company built a new $6 million facility on 30 acres at 7301 South Freeway to replace its 1919 plant at 814 6th Avenue (fig. 4-2). The new facility was in far south Fort Worth, approximately 13 miles from downtown, in Carter Industrial Park, one of several new industrial districts in the city. Carter Industrial Park, like Rancho-North and Richland Industrial parks, developed in the period on the outskirts of the city on newly completed highways like the North-South Freeway (fig. 4-3). In addition to Mrs. Baird’s Bakery, other companies including MillerCoors Brewery (1964; 7001 South Freeway) and Container Corporation (1970; 6701 South Freeway) had manufacturing plants in Carter Industrial Park (figs. 4-4, 4-5). With so many manufacturing firms in the city needing to package their goods for transport, the Container Corporation was just one of 14 companies manufacturing boxes in Fort Worth during this period.

In addition to the myriad manufacturing companies in operation in Fort Worth, banking, insurance, and other non-manufacturing businesses established headquarters and satellite offices in Fort Worth. One man in particular, businessman Charles Tandy, played a large role in the diversification of businesses. Tandy, whose father cofounded Hinckley-Tandy Leather Company in Fort Worth in the early twentieth century, joined the business after World War II. There he pioneered mail ordering and direct advertising and began expanding and diversifying the business. Under the new name Tandy Corporation, Tandy acquired a number of businesses that relocated their headquarters to Fort Worth, including Pier 1 Imports, Color Tile, Merribee Art Embroidery Company, and Radio Shack in 1963.\(^\text{15}\) In the late 1970s, the company ventured into the field of personal computers with Tandy Computers, one of three companies in the United States that made computers.\(^\text{16}\) Tandy Corporation worked out of an office building on West 7th Street until the Tandy Center opened downtown in 1978 (see the Downtown Decline and Revitalization Efforts discussion beginning on page 231).
Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Postwar Economic Diversification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Manufacturing and Business Diversification, Defense and Commercial Aviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Statement of Significance:** Resources significant under this theme reflect the various industries and businesses that contributed to this period of economic prosperity in Fort Worth. Resources are likely to be eligible under the areas of Commerce, Industry, Military, and Transportation. Resources must retain integrity to convey significance and association.

**Period of Significance:** Roughly between 1946 and 1980.

**Period of Significance Justification:** Covers the post-World War II economic development and period of diversification, as well as the establishment of significant industries and businesses that greatly contributed to Fort Worth’s prosperity.

**Geographic Location:** Citywide, though concentrations may be found downtown and in areas of post-World War II suburbanization and development.

**Area(s) of Significance:** Commerce, Industry, Military, and Transportation

**Criteria:** National Register: A, C  
Local: 1, 2, 5

**Associated Property Types:** Among the many resources associated with this theme include: manufacturing facilities, industrial complexes, office buildings, defense sites and buildings, airports and aviation-related buildings and infrastructure. Clusters of buildings may be a historic district.

**Example:** Carter Industrial Park, 6000–8000 South Freeway

Carter Industrial Park in South Fort Worth is an example of an industrial park comprised of multiple manufacturing facilities, warehouses, and offices. It is associated with the theme of Postwar Economic Diversification and the subtheme of Manufacturing and Business Diversification. Located along the newly built South Freeway, the complex was a new property type that developed during this period alongside the expanded highway and freeway network. Carter Industrial Park opened in the early 1960s and was home to companies including Mrs. Baird’s Bakery, MillerCoors Brewery, and the Container Corporation. One of several industrial parks that opened during the period, the companies in these new complexes manufactured a myriad of goods including boxes, boats, ballpoint pens, and candy, and contributed to Fort Worth’s status as one of the nation’s significant inland centers of trade and manufacturing. Dependent on integrity, the industrial park, or individual buildings in the park, may be eligible as a local landmark and for the National Register under Criterion A in the areas of Commerce and Industry.

*Aerial view of the MillerCoors facility at Carter Industrial Park on the South Freeway. Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram, July 2020.*

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.
DEFENSE AND COMMERCIAL AVIATION

Defense Aviation
Though World War II ended in 1945, the Cold War and continued conflicts in Korea and Vietnam provided steady business and federal contracts for the established defense firms in the city. Carswell Air Force Base also contributed to Fort Worth’s important defense role during the Cold War. Growing in the immediate postwar years with an influx of trainees, Carswell Air Force Base served as a major Strategic Air Command base and was home to the Seventh Bombardment Wing, whose mission during the Cold War was to support warfare and operations “utilizing the latest technical knowledge and advance weapons.”

This included training flyers of B-29 and B-36 aircraft, the only aircraft in the fleet capable of carrying an atomic bomb. The presence of Carswell Air Force Base in combination with the US government’s policy of military preparedness created business opportunities for both established and new defense firms in Fort Worth throughout the period.

The Convair bomber plant cut jobs at the end of World War II, but the plant continued production of bombers, including the B-36 Peacemaker and B-58 Hustler in the late 1940s and early 1950s. In 1954, General Dynamics assumed operations of the bomber plant, and by 1957, in the wake of the start of Vietnam War, more than 31,000 people worked at the plant. During this period, the plant supplied bombers to Carswell Air Force Base and the Seventh Bombardment Wing. By the 1960s and 1970s, production at the plant had shifted to fighter jets, and employment numbers fluctuated between 8,000 and 30,000. In 1980, General Dynamics was the largest employer in Fort Worth and Tarrant County.

Fort Worth also welcomed new aviation companies with federal defense contracts. In 1949, Marine Aircraft Corporation began operations involving “secret military air service projects” at Eagle Mountain Lake northwest of downtown. Helicopter manufacturer Bell Aircraft relocated its headquarters from Buffalo to Fort Worth in 1951. The company chose Fort Worth for its strategic location, large population, and the number of established aviation firms already located in the region. The company’s new $3-million plant, located on a 55-acre tract near Hurst, northwest of downtown, opened in 1951 with around 2,000 employees and over $75 million worth of helicopter orders (fig. 4-6). Together, Convair, Marine Aircraft, and Bell Aircraft had an annual payroll over $105 million in 1952. By 1976, Bell had eight other facilities in the Metroplex, including one west of downtown Fort Worth at 2501 Montgomery Street (not extant), in addition to warehouses and storage buildings on over 900 acres of land, mostly in Fort Worth. In 1980, Bell (reorganized as Bell Helicopter Textron) employed 9,300 people and was Tarrant County’s second largest employer, and a leading employer in Fort Worth.

Commercial Aviation

As early as the 1920s, Fort Worth aspired to have a large regional airport located midway between Fort Worth and Dallas in eastern Tarrant County. Despite an agreement with Dallas and groundbreaking and initial construction of a new airport in north Arlington in the early 1940s, conflicts between the two cities led to their abandonment of the site, leaving Meacham Field as the city’s only commercial airport by the end of World War II. Without the collaboration and funding from Dallas, Fort Worth annexed the abandoned site and continued development of a regional airport with the support of American Airlines in the late 1940s. In 1953, Amon G. Carter Field (renamed Greater Fort Worth International Airport in 1962) officially opened (terminal demolished in 1980) (figs. 4-7, 4-8).28

Figure 4-7. Photograph of Amon Carter Field, also known as Greater Fort Worth International Airport (not extant). The airport opened in 1953. Source: Aerial photo of Amon Carter Field, photograph, 19XX, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, from UNT Libraries Special Collections, accessed May 14, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc851413/.

Figure 4-8. The American Airlines ticketing area at Greater Fort Worth International Airport (not extant). Amon Carter, one of the founders of the airline, was influential in opening the airport and bringing American Airlines to the city. Source: “Amon Carter Field ticketing area,” Meacham-Carter Papers, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries Digital Gallery, n.d., accessed June 10, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/image/20109993.
Serviced by five airlines, including Braniff, American, and Delta, the new airport had three runways and 17 gates. In 1957, American Airlines opened its Stewardess Training College, the first of its kind in the country. The facility, located near the airport, incorporated housing and training facilities in a country club-like setting (demolished in 2020) (fig. 4-9). Despite efforts at creating the region’s premier airport, Greater Fort Worth International Airport (GFWIA) never reached flight or passenger capacity. Dallas’s continued expansion and improvements to Love Field were in part responsible for the slow traffic through GFWIA, as few Dallasites chose to travel through Fort Worth. New runways and other improvements in the 1960s failed to increase the number of passengers, and by 1965 the airport handled less than one percent of the state’s air traffic, compared to 49 percent at Love Field.29

By this time, the Federal Aviation Agency declared it would no longer fund both Fort Worth’s and Dallas’s airports, and the Civil Aeronautics Board ordered the two cities to work together on a new regional airport.30 The project broke ground in 1968 after the cities approved a 17,500-acre site near Euless and Grapevine that incorporated part of the old GFWIA.31 The new Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport, designed by architect Gyo Obata of Helmuth Obata and Kassabaum of St. Louis, also included a hotel, post office, and shops and restaurants (fig. 4-10). The first flight into the airport occurred in January 1974, and by 1980 Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport was the world’s seventh-busiest airport.32
The new international airport had much the same impact on Fort Worth as the railroad did in the nineteenth century. Open to new markets and more easily accessible, Fort Worth attracted new businesses after the opening of DFW. Arguably the largest company to relocate to Fort Worth during this period was American Airlines, which already had the Stewardess College, a reservation center, and a flight academy at the old GFWIA. In 1978 the company relocated its corporate headquarters to Fort Worth from New York City, and in the early 1980s it opened a new campus headquarters across from the old GFWIA on Amon Carter Boulevard south of Highway 183 and west of Highway 360 (demolished in 2016) (fig. 4-11). With around 6,000 employees, the airline was the county’s fourth-largest employer in 1980, behind General Dynamics, Bell, and the Fort Worth Independent School District.33
SUBURBANIZATION

Fort Worth experienced significant physical growth during this period. A series of annexations increased the city’s size from 46 square miles to approximately 180 square miles between 1946 and 1975 (see fig. 2-1 in Chapter 2). Facilitated by expansive highway development, the new boundaries stretched in all directions away from the central core. New industrial parks and residential subdivisions with commercial nodes filled in these new areas within the city limits. As the city’s population grew less dense and more suburban, the city experienced a decentralization of retail activity downtown. In response to the challenges created by suburbanization, both the City and private individuals spearheaded various planning and redevelopment efforts aimed at reviving downtown.

CONTINUED HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT

By 1946, a network of federal and state highways connected Fort Worth with other cities in North Texas and the state (fig. 4-12). Dating to the 1920s through early 1940s, these highways were predominantly single-lane and followed city streets while traveling through and converging downtown. The main north-south arterials, US Highway 81 and 81A, traveled along Hemphill and Main Streets, and the east–west connections, US 80 and US 377 ran along Lancaster Avenue, Belknap Street, and Camp Bowie Boulevard (fig. 4-13). The population boom and a dramatic rise in automobile ownership placed strains on the existing transportation network, contributing to rapid freeway and interstate construction that significantly altered the flow of automobile traffic in the city (see figs. 4-14, 4-15, and 4-16 for a progression of highway building throughout the period). The expanded and modern road network changed land-use patterns in the city, facilitating new residential, commercial, and industrial development on the outskirts of Fort Worth while also disrupting some of the older neighborhoods and commercial areas. As happened across the nation, the transportation authorities responsible for the highway construction in Fort Worth during this period often selected affordable land for new roadways. These areas, typically in low-lying areas and along railroad corridors, were also home to non-white communities. To accommodate highway construction, the authorities acquired swaths of land and demolished historic homes and neighborhoods. Additionally, the new network of roads divided historic neighborhoods and often made travel from one side to the other difficult. As a result, the areas cut off by the highways experienced disuse and disinvestment. Fort Worth was an early leader in the state in highway construction. Having planned routes prior to World War II, and successfully secured right-of-way funding from its citizens upon the war’s completion, Fort Worth had more miles of freeway in 1951 than any other Texas city. Prior to the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1956, which provided federal funding for freeway construction and right-of-way acquisition, Fort Worthians approved a $9 million bond for “constructing, improving and extending the streets, thoroughfares and storm sewers . . . and acquiring the necessary lands therefor” in 1945. Shortly thereafter, work began on the North–South Freeway. Following the alignment of US 81, parts of the southern portion opened in 1949. Completed to downtown in 1955, the South Freeway cut through the Morningside neighborhood, a historically white residential area comprised of early-twentieth-century houses and commercial buildings (figs. 4-17, 4-18). After a delay due to right-of-way obstacles and litigation over a gravel pit, work on the North Freeway began in 1958 and was completed to Denton in 1969. The freeway was absorbed into the Interstate Highway System in 1956 and designated Interstate Highway (IH) 35W in 1959. Traffic on the roadway easily surpassed its capacity, and by 1980 the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) began widening part of IH 35W.
Figure 4-15. General highway map of Tarrant County, 1984. Source: General Highway Map, Tarrant County, Texas [map], (Austin: State Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Transportation Planning Division, in cooperation with the US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 1976, revised 1984), from TSLAC, Map No. 06075, https://www.tsl.texas.gov/apps/arc/maps/maplookup/06075.
Figure 4-16. General highway map of Tarrant County, 1972. Source: General Highway Map, Tarrant County, Texas [map], (Austin: Texas State Highway Department, Planning Survey Division, in cooperation with the US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 1963, revised 1972), from TSLAC, Map No. 05665. https://www.tsl.texas.gov/apps/arc/maps/maplookup/05665.

Faced with disapproval and protest over sections of the route, Fort Worth delayed construction of the east-west companion to the North–South Freeway several years after passage of the bond issue. Led by the Highway Information Committee, comprised of some downtown business owners including Ben E. Keith, protests against the East–West Freeway focused on the demolition of buildings and displacement of downtown businesses along sections of the proposed alignment (fig. 4-19). Of issue was a section east of downtown that proposed a 369-foot sunken trench north of Lancaster Avenue that would remove over 60 buildings and displace over 70 businesses in its path (fig. 4-20). Because the acquisition cost of these properties was high, and solely the responsibility of the City, Fort Worth drew up a new plan for a smaller, surface-street alternative that was ultimately rejected. Though a new plan, known as the Lancaster Elevated, did not avoid demolition of buildings, in 1952 City Council approved the plan’s 10-block elevated four-lane freeway along Lancaster Avenue between Taylor and Jones Streets. This eastern section opened in 1960, six years after the completion of the western section to present-day SH 183 (fig. 4-21). Absorbed into the interstate system, the freeway was first designated IH 20 in 1959 and then IH 30 in 1971, after the realignment of IH 20 to its current location. Like the North–South Freeway, the East–West Freeway design was obsolete by the late-1970s, and by the 1980s the City and TxDOT worked on reconstructing and expanding the roadway.
Figure 4-20. Advertisement opposing the routing of East–West Freeway (IH 30) through downtown on Lancaster Avenue from the late 1940s. Placed by the Highway Information Committee, the ad highlights the businesses that would be impacted by the route’s alignment. Source: Box No. 2989-90, Bureau of Public Roads Classified Central File, 1912-50, Record Group 30, Bureau of Public Roads, National Archives at College Park, College Park, Maryland.


The completion of the Lancaster Elevated had been especially critical, as it connected the western portion of the East–West Freeway to another new freeway, the Dallas–Fort Worth Turnpike, the first limited-access highway in North Texas.42 Also planned before the passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, the $55.8-million project was funded by the sale of bonds, to be repaid by the collection of tolls.43 Completed in only 30 months, the 30-mile stretch of toll road connecting Fort Worth to Dallas opened to traffic in 1957 and cost 50 cents (fig. 4-22).44 The turnpike entered Fort Worth from the east,
near White Lake, on a new alignment before it turned south and roughly followed 20th Street where it terminated at its planned convergence with the East–West Freeway just southeast of downtown (figs. 4-23, 4-24). By 1977, the collection of tolls covered the cost of the project, and TxDOT assumed authority over the roadway and removed the tollbooths in 1978. The turnpike was redesignated IH 30.


A new four-level interchange, the first of its kind in Texas, opened in 1958 as a connector between the North–South and East–West Freeways (replaced in 2003) (fig. 4-25). Dubbed the “Mixmaster” due to its resemblance to the kitchen appliance with the same name, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram reported upon its completion that it “at first glance, appears to be some kind of monster gadget designed for the purpose of hopelessly confusing motorists.” Located near Boaz Street just southeast of downtown, the massive concrete interchange compounded the presence of the freeways by essentially separating the predominantly African American residential area—including the 1940 Butler Place public housing project, wedged between the freeways and the Trinity River—from downtown and other residential areas to the south (fig. 4-26). In the mid-1950s, the availability of more money for the construction of highways spurred more freeways, extensions, feeder roads, and interchanges in Fort Worth. In 1955, Tarrant County and Fort Worth approved a five-year street and highway improvement plan calling for over $21 million for right of way and construction in the city and county. A year later, the passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 made federal monies available for highway projects. One of the most significant highways constructed afterward was a roughly 35-mile loop around the city to connect existing and developing outlying suburbs to one another and to Fort Worth (see figs. 4-15 and 4-16). Championed by Congressman Jim Wright, who led the way in securing federal approval and funding, the project was completed in 1982 after 26 years of construction. Interstate Highway 820 comprises the east, north, and west portions of the loop, and IH 20 forms the southern section. Constructed largely in undeveloped areas, the loop spurred new development along its path (fig. 4-27).

Throughout the rest of the period, Fort Worth and TxDOT constructed more highways in the city. Among the other highways completed were US 287 (Southeast Freeway), SH 183, and SH 199. State Highway (SH) 121 East (the Airport Freeway), connecting downtown Fort Worth to Dallas Fort Worth International Airport, was built between 1964 and 1988.50 Constructed in predominantly undeveloped sections in the areas farther from downtown, SH 121 did cut through Riverside, a residential area comprised of both white and Black residents close to downtown (fig. 4-28). The alignment wiped out early and mid-twentieth-century houses.51

The impact of massive highway construction during this period was two-fold. The expanded transportation network enabled residential, commercial, and industrial development in areas far outside...
the city center. As a result of this suburban development, Fort Worth entered into a period of annexation, as it absorbed large amounts of newly developed land. In addition to spurring suburbanization, the road network also impacted the historic inner city. Roadway construction disrupted historic neighborhoods and downtown experienced a decline in activity as more and more people utilized new shopping centers in the suburbs. In response to this decline, the City and private entities employed various urban renewal and historic preservation projects in an effort to revitalize downtown.

RESIDENTIAL SUBURBANIZATION

Auto-Based Residential Growth
The postwar population boom, facilitated by highway expansion and advances in building technology, played out as rapid suburbanization across the county. The availability of low-cost mortgages to white families also aided the trend. The mortgages provided by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) since 1934 remained available, and the G.I. Bill home loan program backed millions of dollars to veterans for home purchases. These factors created the perfect opportunity for developers, who purchased large swaths of undeveloped land along and near new highways and established residential subdivisions for white families in the outlying areas of cities. The design of postwar suburbs generally incorporated many of the principles advocated by the FHA, such as curvilinear streets and standards for minimum lot sizes, setbacks, and street widths. Lots were typically uniform and included both a front and back yard. Builders embraced popular architectural trends and filled subdivisions with a cohesive collection of like-sized and styled houses. Among the popular styles from the period include Minimal Traditional, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, and the ubiquitous Ranch house. Refer to the Suburbanization section on page 160 in Chapter 3 for more information on FHA loans.

This trend toward suburbanization was no different in Fort Worth, where the city’s population more than doubled between the end of the war and 1970. During this period of outward expansion, Fort Worth grew in every direction, and new residential developments filled in many of the areas annexed by the city (see fig. 2-1 in Chapter 2 and fig. 4-29). Between 1946 and 1955, the City added nearly 45,000 new houses.52 Some new construction infilled existing neighborhoods, including the Morningside Historic District, where Minimal Traditional houses went up on undeveloped lots, though most of the construction occurred in the suburbs (fig. 4-30).
The City annexed subdivisions as they developed, adding over 1,400 subdivisions between 1946 and 1958 and another 126 between 1959 and 1975 (see fig. 2-1). Early in the period, new subdivisions filled in undeveloped areas just outside city limits. Hi-Crest (1948) developed in North Fort Worth, Glen Crest West (1946) developed in southeast Fort Worth, Meadowbrook Terrace Addition opened to the east in the 1950s, and near Texas Christian University (TCU) in the southwest, J. E. Foster and Son developed Westcliff, South Hills, Kellis Park, and the Wilshire additions in the late 1940s and 1950s (fig. 4-31).53 Near TCU, these new additions sprung up around one of the few remaining agricultural properties in Fort Worth: the nineteenth-century Edwards Ranch, described by the *Fort Worth Star-Telegram* as “a rural island surrounded by suburban development.”54 Cass Edwards II, whose grandfather settled the land in the 1840s, owned the 4,020-acre ranch on which cattle still grazed. In 1955, Edwards formed Cassco Land Company to develop the ranch into “exclusive residential” neighborhoods.55 From the ranch, Edwards carved Tanglewood, Overton Park, Overton Crest, and Overton Woods. Cassco Land Company, like most developers of the period, advertised the beauty, seclusion, and modern homes of his subdivision in the local newspaper (fig. 4-32).
Through the 1960s and 1970s, despite a slowing of the frenzied development that took place in the 1950s, developers continued building new communities farther from the central business district. In the 1960s, Ridgmar, on the city’s west side, filled in with a variety of Ranch houses, and in the 1970s, Ranch houses filled Camelot and Foster Village, while Tudor Revival style houses characterized Cooke’s Meadow in far east Fort Worth (fig. 4-33).
Though single-family houses represented the majority of residential development in the suburbs, developers also built apartment complexes there (fig. 4-34). In fact, in 1977, Fort Worth added 9,500 apartment units, the most of any major American city.56 Unlike single-family neighborhoods which were usually located away from main commercial corridors, apartments typically opened on and near major commercial highway corridors. Early in the period, FHA loans aided the construction on apartments, but by the 1960s and 1970s developers relied less heavily on the FHA program, allowing for a diversification in style and design of apartment complexes (figs. 4-35, 4-36).57 Developers also built club-like apartments geared for singles, with amenities including pools, clubhouses, and staff for social activities.58 One example of this type of apartment in Fort Worth is Ridgmar Manor at 2200 Taxco Road. Opened in 1969 for single adults between 21 and 39 years old, it advertised itself as “a swinging new singles-only apartment community” that offered social and recreational amenities (fig. 4-37).59 Advertisements from the 1960s and 1970s highlight the vast number and variety of apartments available in the suburbs (fig. 4-38).

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Suburbanization, subtheme: Auto-Based Residential Growth.
### Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Post-World War II Suburbanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Continued Highway Development, Residential Suburbanization, Suburban Commercial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement of Significance:</td>
<td>Resources associated with this theme include residential properties and subdivisions and commercial resources. Neighborhoods and clusters of these resources may be eligible as historic districts if they have features such as curvilinear streets, and amenities like schools and parks (individual houses, unless architect-designed or associated with a significant person, are rarely eligible). Various factors including population growth contributed to suburbanization, but the proliferation of modern highways in the city was a primary cause. Therefore, resources associated with road construction during this period are also associated with this theme. Resources are likely to be eligible under Criteria A and C in the areas of Community Planning and Development, Commerce, Ethnic Heritage, and Transportation. Resources significant under this theme must retain integrity to convey significance and association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance:</td>
<td>Roughly between 1946 and 1980.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance Justification:</td>
<td>Covers the postwar period of suburbanization when new suburbs and commercial shopping centers developed along the expanded highway network away from the city center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location:</td>
<td>Primarily located outside of the original city limits. Commercial properties are most likely located along major transportation corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area(s) of Significance:</td>
<td>Community Planning and Development, Commerce, Ethnic Heritage, Transportation, and Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria:</td>
<td>National Register: A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Property Types:</td>
<td>Many resources associated with this theme include: Residential – single-family and multi-family residences (Minimal Traditional and Ranch style houses were common). Commercial – shopping centers and malls, offices, motels, restaurants, gas stations (Modern styles were popular). Transportation: bridges, interchanges, roadway segment. Clusters of resources may be considered historic districts. See the NPS National Register Bulletin <em>Historic Residential Suburbs</em> for more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td><em>Mid-Century Modern Ranch house at 6840 Brants Lane</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Mid-Century Modern Ranch house** in Ridglea Hills is an architect-designed 1950s Ranch house. Its low mass, flat roof, emphasized eaves, and horizontality keep with the popular architectural influences of the day. Built in 1956, the house is an intact example of a Mid-century Modern single-family house in Fort Worth. Local architect J. B. Johnson, who studied under Harwell Hamilton Harris at the UT Austin, designed the house. The house may be eligible as a local landmark and is potentially eligible for the National Register under Criterion C in the area of Architecture. It may also be eligible under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development for its association with residential suburbanization in the postwar period. It would also contribute to a postwar residential historic district that may be eligible under Architecture and Community Planning and Development.

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*

Figure 4-37. Advertisement for Ridgmar Manor at 2200 Taxco Road (extant), a singles-only apartment complex for those aged 21–39. Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram, August 15, 1969, 39.

Figure 4-38. Page in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram full of advertisements for a variety of apartments in 1970. Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram, March 22, 1970, 49.
Impact on Black and Latino Fort Worthians

Despite the Supreme Court’s ruling in 1948 against the racial covenants commonly attached to prewar suburbs, the majority of residents in Fort Worth’s new outlying suburbs were white middle-class and professional families. Despite the court ruling, racial covenants were not made illegal until 1968, and prewar racist practices of the FHA loan program continued into the postwar period. Not only did the FHA program continue to favor single-family suburban development over home improvements for extant houses, it also continued to overwhelmingly extend loans to white families over non-white families; less than two percent of FHA loans issued between 1947 and 1959 went to African Americans.60

In Fort Worth, as the population of African Americans and Latinos grew, these communities experienced severe housing shortages in the face of discriminatory housing practices. Historically African American neighborhoods, including the Near East Side, Near Southside, and Como, had little room to grow and offered few options for new residents. Additionally, areas within these neighborhoods became subject to “slum clearance” after the passage of the 1949 Housing Act aimed at eliminating substandard housing. The City demolished at least 380 “dilapidated” buildings in the Near East- and Near Southsides in the early 1950s.61 This was particularly devastating as sections of these neighborhoods had already been impacted by the construction of highways. To relieve the housing shortage and relocate displaced low-income families, the City authorized the construction of an all-Black public housing complex. J. A. Cavile Place, located off the 4900 block of East Rosedale, opened in late 1953 with 300 units (fig. 4-39, demolished in 2019).62

The city’s barrios also suffered during this period. The flood of 1949 wiped out the north side barrio, La Corte, while the construction of IH 30 and the Vickery-Rosedale connection in the 1950s and 1960s displaced hundreds in the city’s Southside barrios, including El TP Barrio. The expansion of the medical district on Pennsylvania Avenue in the 1950s also contributed to the displacement of working-class Latino families and the clearing of Southside barrios (it also contributed to the disintegration of Quality Hill as a residential neighborhood).63 As a result of the loss of the barrios, the Latin American population dispersed throughout the city.
Housing options for the racial minority middle class were equally limited. One developer, though, Howard Patterson, saw the opportunity for an African American residential development. Modeled after white neighborhoods, with single-family houses, schools, and churches, Carver Heights was the first private residential housing development in Fort Worth for African Americans. Located in East Fort Worth on land recently annexed by the City, Carver Heights opened in 1952. The subdivision’s nearly 900 Ranch-style residences housed a state representative, city council members, teachers, lawyers, and businessmen (fig. 4-40). Several years later, another African American subdivision, the Jean Capers Addition, developed southeast of Carver Heights with modest brick and frame Ranch-style houses (fig. 4-41).
As was happening across the country, Black Americans and Latinos in Fort Worth also began moving into historically all-white neighborhoods in search of housing. This shifting demographic played out in neighborhoods including Morningside, Van Zandt, Terrell Heights, and Riverside, where Black families moved, as well as in Diamond Hill, where Latino families relocated. The integration prompted some white families to leave these neighborhoods and move to new outlying, predominantly white suburbs. Other white families remained, and in some cases the integration resulted in racial tensions and violence. In Van Zandt and Morningside, white residents staged demonstrations, and at least one dynamite bomb was placed on the porch of a Black-owned house. The worst case of racial violence, though, occurred in Riverside, where protests, house burnings, and bombings occurred for several years in the late 1950s (fig. 4-42). Though tensions persisted, much of the violence ended in the 1960s as the Civil Rights Movement and desegregation efforts grew (see Civil Rights and Integration beginning on page 241).
## Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Post-World War II Suburbanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Continued Highway Development, Residential Suburbanization, Suburban Commercial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement of Significance:</td>
<td>Resources associated with this theme include residential properties and subdivisions and commercial resources. Neighborhoods and clusters of these resources may be eligible as historic districts if they have features such as curvilinear streets and amenities like schools and parks (individual houses, unless architect-designed or associated with a significant person, are rarely eligible). Various factors including population growth contributed to suburbanization, but the proliferation of modern highways in the city was a primary cause. Therefore, resources associated with road construction during this period are also associated with this theme. Resources are likely to be eligible under Criteria A and C, in the areas of Community Planning and Development, Commerce, Ethnic Heritage, and Transportation. Resources significant under this theme must retain integrity to convey significance and association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Period of Significance: | Roughly between 1946 and 1980 |
| Period of Significance Justification: | Covers the postwar period of suburbanization when new suburbs and commercial shopping centers developed along the expanded highway network away from the city center. |
| Geographic Location: | Primarily located outside of the original city limits. Commercial properties are most likely located along major transportation corridors. |
| Area(s) of Significance: | Community Planning and Development, Commerce, Ethnic Heritage, Transportation, and Architecture |
| Criteria: | National Register: A, C | Local: 1, 2, 3, 5 |

| Associated Property Types: | Many resources associated with this theme include: Residential: single-family and multi-family residences; Minimal Traditional and Ranch style houses were common. Commercial: shopping centers and malls, offices, motels, restaurants, gas stations; Modern styles were popular. Transportation: bridges, interchanges, roadway segment. Clusters of resources may be considered historic districts. See the NPS National Register Bulletin *Historic Residential Suburbs* for more information. |

| Example: | Carver Heights Neighborhood |

The Carver Heights Neighborhood in East Fort Worth is associated with the theme Postwar Suburbanization and subtheme Residential Suburbanization. While many of the new suburbs were predominantly white, Carver Heights is a rare example of an auto-oriented suburb built exclusively for African Americans. While the neighborhood is unique for its racial makeup, its built environment—house forms, styles, and layout—is representative of residential neighborhoods of the period. Opened in 1952, Carver Heights contains a collection of Minimal Traditional, Ranch style, and Contemporary houses, a school, and has curvilinear streets. The neighborhood is a local historic district and is potentially eligible for the National Register under Criterion A in the areas of Community Planning and Development and Ethnic History and Criterion C in the area of Architecture.

*Street view in Carver Heights in the 1950s. Source: Southwestern Builder Magazine, vol. 6, December 1953, 6.*

---

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.
SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Early in the postwar period, the expansive residential construction also spurred commercial development on the city’s major commercial arterials near new subdivisions. Oftentimes developed at the same time as adjacent residential neighborhoods, the late 1940s and 1950s suburban commercial nodes of the period typically included shopping centers, restaurants, banks, and other businesses that catered largely to the new residents. Commonly anchored by a grocery store, these neighborhood shopping centers had a linear plan and provided ample parking. The early 1950s 40 Oaks Shopping Center on East Lancaster Street in the growing Meadowbrook neighborhood and the 1950s Berry Street Center (demolished) near TCU in the rapidly developing southwest part of the city reflect this trend (figs. 4-43, 4-44). Upon its opening in 1953, Fair East Shopping Center, also on East Lancaster Street, boasted 17 stores and the city’s largest suburban department store, The Fair (fig. 4-45). President of the development corporation behind the shopping center said Fair East was designed to:

... meet the modern trend in retailing to make it more convenient and easier for the shopper to buy, and to keep pace with the “rush to the suburbs” where residents may practice an easy shopping habit while dressed informally, satisfying all of their needs with one stop.

By the 1960s and 1970s, as highways and freeways connected Fort Worth to outlying areas, new commercial developments opened farther from downtown to serve a growing regional population. Dwarfing the shopping centers of the 1940s and 1950s, large shopping malls went up along IH 20, IH 30, IH 820, and IH 35W in the 1960s and 1970s. Homart Development Company, a subsidiary of Sears, Roebuck and Company, opened Fort Worth’s first mall, Seminary South Shopping Center, in 1962 (remodeled and rebranded over the years, now named La Gran Plaza de Fort Worth). Built on the...
recently completed South Freeway (IH 35W), the mall occupied over 80 acres on the former site of Katy Lake, a storage lake built by the Katy Railroad in the early twentieth century (fig. 4-46). In the 1970s, Fort Worth’s suburbs added four more shopping malls: Northeast Mall (1971) on IH 820, Ridgmar Mall (1976) on IH 30, Hulen Mall (1977) on IH 20, and North Hills Mall (1979, demolished 2007) on IH 820.

In addition to shopping centers and malls, the new highways promoted construction of other commercial enterprises. Many of these businesses catered to the growing number of travelers passing through Fort Worth on the improved highway system. Several new “motor inns” opened near Seminary South Shopping Center in the 1960s, including a Ramada Roadside Motel and the current Days Inn at 4213 South Freeway (figs. 4-47, 4-48). Far different from earlier lodging styles such as downtown vertical-block hotels, this period’s freestanding motels typically included a row of rooms in a one- or two-story building. The rooms often overlooked a swimming pool and restaurant and motel office buildings. Developers also built drive-through restaurants and gas stations along the highways and frontage roads.
Figure 4-47. Newspaper article on the opening of the new Ramada Inn at 4201 South Freeway (IH 35W) near Seminary South Shopping Center in 1961 (extant). Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram, October 1, 1961, 34.

Figure 4-48. A typical motel that opened along the city’s new freeways in the 1960s and 1970s. This extant motel opened in the 1960s at 4213 South Freeway (IH 35W). Source: HHM, 2015.

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Suburbanization, subtheme: Suburban Commercial Development.
Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Post-World War II Suburbanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Continued Highway Development, Residential Suburbanization, Suburban Commercial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement of Significance:</td>
<td>Resources associated with this theme include residential properties and subdivisions and commercial resources. Neighborhoods and clusters of these resources may be eligible as historic districts if they have features such as curvilinear streets, and amenities like schools and parks (individual houses, unless architect-designed or associated with a significant person, are rarely eligible). Various factors including population growth contributed to suburbanization, but the proliferation of modern highways in the city was a primary cause. Therefore, resources associated with road construction during this period are also associated with this theme. Resources are likely to be eligible under Criteria A and C in the areas of Community Planning and Development, Commerce, Ethnic Heritage, and Transportation. Resources significant under this theme must retain integrity to convey significance and association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance:</td>
<td>Roughly between 1946 and 1980.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance Justification:</td>
<td>Covers the postwar period of suburbanization when new suburbs and commercial shopping centers developed along the expanded highway network away from the city center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location:</td>
<td>Primarily located outside of the original city limits. Commercial properties are most likely located along major transportation corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area(s) of Significance:</td>
<td>Community Planning and Development, Commerce, Ethnic Heritage, Transportation, and Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria:</td>
<td>National Register: A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Property Types:</td>
<td>Many resources associated with this theme include: Residential – single-family and multi-family residences (Minimal Traditional and Ranch style houses were common). Commercial: shopping centers and malls, offices, motels, restaurants, gas stations (Modern styles were popular). Transportation: bridges, interchanges, roadway segment. Clusters of resources may be considered historic districts. See the NPS National Register Bulletin Historic Residential Suburbs for more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td>Ridgmar Mall, 1888 Green Oaks Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ridgmar Mall** is located in west Fort Worth, just off IH 30. Built in 1976, the enclosed mall is associated with postwar suburban commercial development spawned by the period’s expansion of interstate and freeway construction. Ridgmar was one of several large regional shopping centers built along new roadways in Fort Worth in the 1960s and 1970s. A new property type, the shopping mall evolved from the linear shopping centers of the early postwar period. Unlike shopping centers, though, malls catered to a larger regional population and were anchored by national department stores and chains. These malls and commercial suburbanization in general contributed to the decline of commercial activity in downtown Fort Worth. Ridgmar, like some other shopping malls in Fort Worth, has not yet reached the 50-year threshold set by the National Park Service. Currently, it is not eligible for listing in the National Register based on evaluation precedent of shopping malls to date. Once it reaches the 50-year mark, however, its National Register eligibility should be reexamined in the areas of Commerce and Community Planning and Development under Criterion A.

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*
HISTORIC CONTEXT OF FORT WORTH

4 | Postwar Suburbanization and Development, 1946–1980

DOWNTOWN DECLINE AND REVITALIZATION EFFORTS

Fort Worth’s urban core suffered the impact of suburbanization as shopping centers and malls drew businesses and customers away from downtown. Though people continued working downtown in the upper-level office spaces of buildings, many first-floor commercial spaces sat empty as businesses closed or moved to the suburbs. Retail institutions, including Cox’s, Stripling’s, Everybody’s, Meacham’s, Wally Williams, and Monning’s opened branch stores or completely left downtown for the suburbs.72 While some buildings remained vacant, others received new occupants. The Downtown Rescue Mission, a food pantry, which moved into the old Liberty Theater at 1100 Main Street in the 1950s, reflects the changing demographics of downtown (fig. 4-49). Businesses that remained downtown often sought to attract and retain customers by modernizing their stores. Owners updated storefronts and applied slipcovers over older buildings in an effort to present a modern appearance. Monning’s Department Store, which opened several suburban branches throughout the period, added two stories and modernized its downtown store on 500 Houston Street (demolished) in the 1950s (fig. 4-50). Leonard’s Department Store at 112 Throckmorton Street (demolished) also made improvements and also tackled the parking issue that many downtown businesses faced. In the early 1960s, Leonard’s opened an underground subway, the M & O, to move shoppers from its 5,000-car parking lot at Henderson Street by the Trinity River to the store’s basement (only remnants of the subway remain) (fig. 4-51). However, limited parking remained an issue for many downtown businesses.

Figure 4-49. The former Liberty Theater at 1100 Main Street. In the 1950s the theater vacated the building and the Downtown Rescue Mission moved in (building demolished during convention center construction). Source: “Fort Worth downtown Rescue Mission in old Liberty Theater building, 1100 Main Street, Fort Worth, Texas,” Jack White Photograph Collection, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries Digital Gallery, 1960, accessed June 15, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/img/10006372.

Figure 4-50. Like other stores with downtown locations, Monning’s modernized their building (now demolished) and also opened stores in suburban shopping centers and malls. In addition to their downtown location, Monning’s had stores in four suburban shopping centers. Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram, June 30, 1963, 59.
In addition to the vacancies, the central business district also suffered from demolitions during this period. Among the buildings lost were several nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century landmarks: the 1928 Worth Theatre, the 1889 Metropolitan Hotel, and the 1910 Westbrook Hotel (figs. 4-52, 4-53). Just east of the central downtown corridor, the Jim Hotel, a 1920s jazz and blues venue on East 5th Street, gave way to an IH 35 W ramp. As buildings came down, few new buildings went up, and vacant lots and parking lots remained. The central business district only added about 20 new buildings between 1951 and 1971, a far cry from the building boom in downtown Dallas and in the Fort Worth suburbs. Among the new buildings constructed in this 20-year period were several government offices: the 1958 Civil Courts building (demolished in 2013), the 1962 Criminal Courts building north of the courthouse, and the 1971 Edward Durrell Stone–designed Fort Worth City Hall on Throckmorton Street (fig. 4-54). A new motel also opened downtown during this period. Unlike the vertical block hotels of previous periods, the Downtowner Motor Inn at 1010 Houston Street (renovated in 2017 and reopened as a Fairfield Inn) was modeled after a suburban motel (fig. 4-55). Another notable building constructed downtown was the Continental National Bank building at 200 West 7th Street (demolished 2006). Upon its completion in 1956, it was Fort Worth’s tallest building at 31 stories (fig. 4-56).
Figure 4-53. Article on the demolition of the 1910 Westbrook Hotel at 416 Main Street in 1978. The Westbrook Hotel was just one of the handful of landmark buildings downtown lost in the postwar period. Source: Fort Worth Star-Telegram, January 30, 1978, 27.

Figure 4-54. The grand opening of the new Fort Worth City Hall at 1000 Throckmorton Street in 1971 (extant). The building, the city’s third city hall, was designed by Edward Durell Stone (NYC) with influences of the Brutalist and International styles. Source: “Overlooking the grand opening and formal dedication of Fort Worth City Hall at 1000 Throckmorton Street,” Fort Worth Star-Telegram Collection, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries Digital Gallery, 1971, accessed May 28, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/img/10010733.
Figure 4-55. The Downtowner Motor Inn at 1010 Houston Street (now a Fairfield Inn) was one of few motels constructed downtown in the postwar period. Opened in the mid-1960s, the Downtowner mimicked the design of suburban and highway motels. Source: "Downtowner Motor Inn Hotel at Throckmorton Street and 9th Street, Fort Worth, Texas" Fort Worth Star-Telegram Collection, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries Digital Gallery, 1964, accessed June 16, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/img/10009043.

Figure 4-56. Designed by Preston M. Geren and Associates, the Continental Bank Building on West 7th Street was the city’s tallest building upon completion in 1956. It also was the city’s first building to use an aluminum curtain wall in its construction. The building was struck by a tornado in 2000 and suffered significant damage and was eventually demolished in 2005. Source: "Continental National Bank building, Fort Worth, Texas," W. D. Smith Commercial Photography, Inc. Collection, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries Digital Gallery, 1961, accessed May 28, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/img/10011334.
In response to the city’s housing shortage, the first multi-family residential development was built downtown.74 In an effort to provide rental units to single men and women in “critical defense areas,” the FHA program financed the construction of the Fortune Arms Apartments at 601 West 1st Street (fig. 4-57).1 Completed in 1951, the new 10-story building provided commercial and office space on the ground floor, a pool and parking, and modern amenities including air conditioners and electric kitchens in its 234 units.75 Despite its offerings, the building only reached 50 to 60 percent occupancy throughout the 1950s and 1960.76 The Fort Worth Housing Authority, who assumed management of the building after a series of previous property owners, reopened the building as apartments for the elderly in 1973.

**URBAN RENEWAL AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION EFFORTS**

Despite this construction activity, downtown Fort Worth remained underutilized and desolate. One of the first attempts to address this issue occurred in 1953, when J. B. Thomas, president of the Texas Electric Service Company, commissioned architect Victor Gruen.77 Gruen, who, ironically, also pioneered the suburban shopping mall, created an ambitious urban renewal plan that sought to banish virtually all cars from downtown and proposed converting streets into outdoor pedestrian malls, parks, and plazas (fig. 4-58). Motorists would park at one of six large garages located along a new beltway constructed around downtown and walk no more than two and a half minutes to businesses and parks.78 Gruen submitted his plan, “A Great Fort Worth Tomorrow,” to City Council in 1956. Ultimately considered too radical, the Gruen Plan failed to garner funding and support from the City and was not implemented. In the early 1960s, a City Council–appointed municipal planning committee attempted to rework the Gruen Plan, but like the previous plan, it was never realized.79

In 1963, through a series of town halls held at Will Rogers Auditorium, the City sought the public’s input on how best to reinvigorate downtown.80 Citizens proposed a variety of options including implementing the Gruen Plan, building more libraries, and hosting more cultural activities, but overwhelmingly the public supported building a downtown convention center.81 In 1964, Tarrant County voters easily approved the bond issue for funding the project.82 The City chose a 14-block site in the south end of downtown in the area historically known as Hell’s Half Acre for the new convention center. Through eminent domain, the City and County cleared the land of shops, warehouses, hotels, and theaters (fig. 4-59). A consortium of five Fort Worth architects, including Preston M. Geren, collaborated on the Modern design of the complex, which included a theater (demolished 2000), arena, exhibits hall, and meeting rooms (fig. 4-60). The Fort Worth Convention Center (originally named the Tarrant County Convention Center).1 Fort Worth was considered a “critical defense area” due to the number of defense-related firms established in the city.
Center) opened in 1968 and successfully brought conventions to Fort Worth, as well as some of music’s top performers from the 1970s, including Elvis Presley, Paul McCartney, the Rolling Stones, Pink Floyd, Bob Marley, and Led Zeppelin.
Downtown was not immediately reinvigorated by the opening of the convention center. Despite the thousands of visitors the conventions and events brought to downtown, many of them stayed in hotels and ate in restaurants in the suburbs. As the convention center did little for downtown’s nightlife, businesses continued to shutter.83 Efforts to revitalize downtown continued throughout the 1970s, largely spearheaded by private investors including some of the city’s most prominent names: Carter, Tandy, and Bass.

In 1974, the Amon G. Carter Foundation, established in 1945 by Amon G. and Nenetta Burton Carter (see Cultural and Social Context), gifted the City the four-and-a-half-acre Modern Water Garden at 1502 Commerce Street in what was then a blighted section of the city (fig. 4-61). Inspiration for the park stemmed from First Lady “Lady Bird” Johnson’s civic beautification movement and the hope that it would transform that section of town. Designed by architect Philip Johnson and John Burgee, the site features a series of pools, terraces, and walkways in sunken and raised spaces (fig. 4-62). At the garden’s opening ceremony, J. C. Pace Jr., former president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, said the park would be “a big boost for downtown development.”84
In 1975, businessman Charles Tandy was the next to invest in downtown Fort Worth. Tandy purchased four blocks in the north end of downtown and demolished the existing buildings on site, including Leonard’s Department Store. In their place, Tandy Center, a mixed-used two-tower 20-story building, opened between 1976 and 1978 (fig. 4-63). Designed by Growald Architects of Fort Worth, the complex, meant to mimic a suburban shopping center, included a mall and indoor skating rink and served as corporate headquarters for Radio Shack.85

At the end of this period, Sundance Square, a 35-square-block area downtown transformed by Bass Brothers Enterprises in the 1980s and 1990s, began to take form. The Basses began plans for a larger redevelopment project following their involvement with the opening of the Americana Hotel (now the Worthington Hotel) on the former site of Stripling’s Department Store at 200 Main Street in 1979 (fig. 4-64). In 1979, Bass Brothers began acquiring property in what began as a two-block area downtown. Their plans included a pair of Paul Rudolph–designed high-rises at 201 Main Street (City Center (completed between 1982 and 1984) and a rehabilitated Plaza Hotel at 301 Main Street (fig. 4-65).86
Their restoration of the Plaza Hotel was “the first of a series of such efforts Bass Brothers has planned for Main Street.” As part of the redevelopment plan, the City would spend $3 million using Urban Development Action Grant money for a nine-block improvement program downtown. The Sundance Square project came to fruition over the subsequent decades, helping return vibrancy to downtown Fort Worth. Throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s, the project rehabilitated 12 commercial buildings, including the Burk Burnett Building (500 Main Street) and Fire Station No. 1 (214 Commerce Street). For the project, Bass Brother Enterprises, Inc. earned the Ruth Lester Award for Historic Preservation, the state’s highest honor in preservation, from the Texas Historical Commission in 1982. To date, the project remains one of the largest private-sector preservation efforts undertaken in Fort Worth and serves as a national model.

See the next page for a sample statement of significance for resources associated with the theme: Downtown Decline and Revitalization Efforts, subtheme: Urban Renewal and Historic Preservation Efforts.
**Statement of Significance***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme: Downtown Decline and Revitalization Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes: Urban Renewal and Historic Preservation Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement of Significance: Resources associated with this theme represent a variety of projects undertaken in the post-war period to combat the commercial decline of downtown that resulted from massive suburban development. The municipal government and private individuals were both involved in the various urban renewal and historic preservation efforts. Resources are likely to be eligible under the areas of Community Planning and Development, but they must retain integrity to convey significance and association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance: Roughly between 1950 and 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance Justification: Covers the beginning of the decline of downtown due to suburbanization and subsequent revitalization efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location: Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area(s) of Significance: Community Planning and Development, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria: National Register: A and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Property Types: Resources associated with this theme include hotels, motels, convention centers, parks, and mixed-use high-rise buildings and complexes. Building modifications from this period may also be significant as they reflect downtown businesses’ attempts at modernizing to maintain and attract customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Fort Worth Convention Center, 1201 Houston Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fort Worth Convention Center (originally the Tarrant County Convention Center) was a collaborative project between Tarrant County and the City of Fort Worth aimed to reinvigorate downtown. Approved by the city’s voters, the convention center opened in 1968. The urban renewal project used eminent domain to clear the 14-block site of warehouses and one-and two-part commercial block buildings historically associated with Hell’s Half Acre for the new complex. The convention center successfully brought in conventions to Fort Worth, as well as many musical performers, though it did not immediately reinvigorate downtown. Following its completion, other revitalization efforts—including the Water Garden, Tandy Center, and the Sundance Square project—attracted more people to downtown. Dependent on integrity (current renovation plans for the convention center call for the demolition of the arena), the Fort Worth Convention Center may be eligible as a local landmark and for listing in the National Register under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development. The Modern style building, designed by a consortium of five Fort Worth architects, including Preston M. Geren, may also be eligible under Criterion C for Architecture.

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.

---

See the “Heritage and Cultural Preservation Movement” discussion on page 256 for more information on Fort Worth’s historic preservation movement.
CULTURAL AND SOCIAL CONTEXT

CIVIL RIGHTS AND INTEGRATION

Segregation and racial discrimination in Fort Worth persisted in the public and private realms into the 1960s. Racial minorities, restricted in where they could shop, go to school, swim, find lodging, see a movie, and dine, continued to frequent Black- and Latino-owned businesses. The Fort Worth listings in the *Green Book*—the traveler’s guide for African Americans that was established in 1936—from the 1940s through the 1950s list a number of the city’s Black-owned business, including restaurants, hotels, and service stations (fig. 4-66). Reflective of the segregated nature of the city, most of the businesses were clustered together east of downtown, on East 5th, East Terrell, and East Rosedale Streets, in the city’s predominantly African American section. Most of these businesses suffered the same fate as the Jim Hotel on East 5th Street and were demolished in the 1960s and 1970s for the convention center and freeway construction. At least one “tourist home” from the *Green Book* remains. From her house at 1213 East Terrell Avenue, Mary Lou Evans provided lodging for African Americans (fig. 4-67).
To combat the perpetuation of Jim Crow-era policies and inequality, various individuals, activists, and groups advocated for the city’s racial minorities. The Fort Worth Urban League, founded in 1944, was among the groups working on behalf of the city’s Black population. The group, which met at various churches including the 1904 St. Andrew’s Methodist Church at 522 Missouri Avenue, worked to increase Black employment in the defense industry, provide education for Black women, and help Black families build and repair homes in historically Black neighborhoods, including Stop Six. In the 1950s, activist Lenora Rolla (see Preservation Movement beginning on page 256), opened Hattie Street Haven, a community center in a former fire station on East Hattie Street (demolished) (fig. 4-68). There, Rolla organized boycotts of segregated businesses and encouraged voting among Black Fort Worthians.

Activist and physician Dr. Marion J. Brooks also had a profound impact on advancing civil rights in Fort Worth. In addition to serving on the Urban League board, Dr. Brooks, who co-founded the Tarrant County Precinct Workers Council in 1953, fought to eliminate the poll tax and encouraged Black voter participation and candidacy. As a medical provider, Dr. Brooks also fought for and achieved admitting privileges at all of the city’s major hospitals by the mid-1960s, having previously only had privileges at City-County Hospital (now John Peter Smith Hospital) and the “Negro Ward” at St. Joseph’s. At his own clinic, Brooks Clinic at 2200 Evans Avenue, which he opened with his brother Donald A. Brooks and dentist Clyde R. Broadus in 1958, Dr. Brooks sought to provide medical care for all in need, regardless of ability to pay (fig. 4-69). Dr. Brooks also helped organize protests in the 1960s against the Safeway Grocery at 2100 Evans Avenue over the store’s employment policy, as well as one against segregated shopping policies at Leonard’s Department Store; both ultimately resulting in changed policies. Among the other activists enacting change during this period include women’s rights and political and farmworker advocate Pauline Gasca Valenciano, who was jailed for her role in organizing United Farm Workers’ Organizing Committee-led boycotts and pickets of grocery stores in the 1970s (fig. 4-70, 4-71).
Figure 4-68. In the 1950s, activist Lenora Rolla opened Hattie Street Haven, a community center on East Hattie Street (demolished). Taken in the 1950s, this photo shows children helping paint the inside of the community center. “We do it together,” is written on the back of the photo. Source: “Children Painting Hattie Street Haven,” [photograph], 1955–1978, University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting Tarrant County Black Historical and Genealogical Society, accessed June 16, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth1227342/m1/1/?q=%22hattie%20street%20haven%22.

Figure 4-69. The extant Brooks Clinic at 2200 Evans Avenue. Activist and doctor Marion J. Brooks opened the clinic with his brother Donald A. Brooks and dentist Clyde R. Broadus in 1958 in a predominantly African American neighborhood. Source: Loopnet, accessed August 24, 2021, https://www.loopnet.com/Listing/2200-Evans-Ave-Fort-Worth-TX/15306011/.

Figure 4-71. American labor leader and civil rights activist Cesar Chavez in 1969, leading a picket against a local grocery store. During his trip to Fort Worth, Chavez also gave a speech at St. Patrick Cathedral where he spoke on behalf of farm workers. Source: “Cesar Chavez with other strikers,” United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, Fort Worth Boycott Records, University of Texas at Arlington Libraries Digital Gallery, 1969, accessed June 16, 2021, https://library.uta.edu/digitalgallery/img/10004463.
The work of activists and local and national organizations, including the NAACP, helped raise awareness and initiate integration and other racial justice changes in Fort Worth. Following petitions and lawsuits brought against the City by various individuals and groups, early civil rights gains included the integration of the City’s three all-white public golf courses in the mid-1950s, the desegregation of buses in 1956, and the hiring of Fort Worth’s first Black policeman in 1958 (fig. 4-72). Despite those achievements, the City perpetuated segregation in other areas including its public pools and schools; pools remained largely segregated until the mid-1960s, and Fort Worth was among the last major cities in Texas to implement an integration plan. Following a lawsuit brought against Fort Worth by the NAACP, in 1961 a US district judge ruled the city’s dual school system unconstitutional, forcing the city to begin integration.

While city schools integrated in the 1960s, so too did the rest of the city. A 1963 report by the Mayor’s Commission on Human Relations stated that most of the city’s restaurants, hotels, stores, theaters, and churches had already been integrated. The city’s largest university, TCU, was integrated in 1964, and the Fort Worth Bar admitted its first Black attorneys that same year. By the end of the decade, the City passed an ordinance making racial discrimination unlawful in public places including hotels, restaurants, bars, theaters, bowling alleys, washtaterias, and skating rinks. Fort Worth’s first African American City Council member, Dr. Edward Guinn, proclaimed it the “latest of many steps to overturn serious problems affecting Fort Worth.” Throughout the rest of the period, racial minorities gained more representation in municipal affairs. Prompted by advocates, including Valenciano, calling for a larger voice for racial minorities in local affairs, City Council representation changed in the 1970s to single-member districts from the at-large system that had historically kept local government white. Following the restructuring, Louis Zapata became the city’s first Mexican American City Council member in 1977, 43 years after his birth in El Pozo Barrio along the Trinity River.
Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme: Twentieth-Century Cultural and Social Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes: Religious Institutions, Parkland &amp; Recreation, Women’s Clubs, Civil Rights &amp; Integration, Emerging LGBTQ Scene and Community, Arts &amp; The Cultural District, Heritage &amp; Cultural Preservation Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement of Significance: Resources associated with this theme and its many subthemes highlight the development of the city’s rich cultural and social fabric in the twentieth century. The theme covers the welfare and cultural development of the city and its people, and the institutions involved in this work. Progressive issues, civil rights advocacy, parks, and the arts are among the areas associated with this theme. Resources may be eligible under a variety of areas of significance, but they must retain sufficient integrity to convey significance and association with this theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance: From 1900 to 1980.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance Justification: Covers the twentieth century period of cultural and social development. Some resources may have periods of significance that begin earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location: Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area(s) of Significance: Art, Community Planning and Development, Entertainment/Recreation, Ethnic Heritage, Health/Medicine, Landscape Architecture, Performing Arts, Social History, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria: National Register: A, C, Criteria Consideration A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Property Types: Resources include churches, synagogues, parks, club houses, medical clinics, residences, bars, theaters, and museums.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:** Brooks Clinic, 2200 Evans Avenue

The Brooks Clinic is an example of a resource associated with the subtheme of Civil Rights and Integration under the Twentieth-Century Cultural and Social Context. Black advocate and physician, Dr. Marion J. Brooks, established the clinic to serve all in need, regardless of their race or ability to pay. Brooks opened the clinic in a predominantly Black neighborhood in 1958, approximately six years before hospitals across the nation began integrating and during a period when racial minorities had less access to medical care compared to white citizens in Fort Worth. The clinic reflects how the African American community filled in gaps left by the government. The building may be eligible as a local landmark and for the National Register under Criterion A in the areas of Ethnic Heritage and Health/Medicine.


*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*
EMERGING LGBTQ SCENE AND COMMUNITY

Texas’s harsh stance on and the social stigma attached to homosexuality led to the State of Texas passing and retaining nineteenth century laws. The State of Texas even passed a law in 1973 making homosexuality a misdemeanor. Fort Worth was no more tolerant and had an anti-cross-dressing ordinance into the late 1970s. Despite an overwhelming disapproval of the community, this period witnessed the opening of the city’s first gay bars and saw the establishment of gay advocacy and support groups. While the city’s LGBTQ community and establishments proliferated after 1980, the seeds for such growth were sown in this period.

In the 1950s, many city bar owners prohibited LGBTQ members from patronizing their establishments. There were some establishments, though, that allowed the community into their businesses. Several of these bars were located on the Jacksboro Highway, and they included one of Fort Worth’s largest clubs, the famed Skyliner Ballroom (not extant). Another bar, the Longhorn Bar and Grill, downtown at 1510 Houston Street (not extant), was included in the “Lady Jai Recommended List,” a gay traveler’s guide, though not as an exclusive gay bar. The 1960s and 1970s saw the opening of the city’s first gay bars and the early origins of several small LGBTQ districts. Jacksboro Highway was one area with several LGBTQ establishments, including El Toga (not extant), Lil Elvira’s (not extant), and Little Lou Lou’s at 5420 Jacksboro Highway (building extant but business no longer in operation). The Hemphill and Magnolia neighborhoods also had several LGBTQ establishments, including the 500 Club at 506 West Magnolia Avenue (extant), the Banjo Lounge at 1408 West Magnolia Avenue (extant), and Aub’s Steakhouse, one of the first gay-owned restaurants in Fort Worth, at 1308 St. Louis Avenue (not extant). However, it was South Jennings Avenue, particularly the 400–600 blocks, that emerged as the closest thing to an LGBTQ district in Fort Worth. The city’s longest running gay bar, the 651 Club, opened in 1969, only months before the Stonewall Inn police raid and clash in New York City. The club remained in operation (renamed the Rainbow Lounge) at 651 South Jennings Avenue until 2017, when the building was destroyed by fire. The Come Along Inn was another addition to the strip. Opened in the 1970s at 515 South Jennings Avenue, the business changed names over the years, but remained in operation into 2020. The establishments at 651 and 515 South Jennings Avenue were considered by many as the heart of the city’s LGBTQ scene. With so few places where members of the community could openly meet and socialize during the period, these establishments were significant in fostering the LGBTQ community in Fort Worth.

The city’s LGBTQ community also benefited from the support provided by new advocacy groups and LGBTQ-friendly religious institutions. In 1973, several individuals founded the city’s first gay organization, Awareness, Unity, and Research Association (AURA). The group published a gay newspaper, Community News, and advocated for LGBTQ civil rights (fig 4-73). One of their primary goals, the establishment of a gay community center, was achieved in 1983, when Center for the Community opened at 2412 Lipscomb Street (not extant). The group, in conjunction with the Fort Worth/Dallas Metroplex Gay Council, also hosted the inaugural Texas Gay Conference in 1974. Held at St. Stephen Church College Community Services building at 4301 Miller Avenue (extant), the event was plagued by conflict with the police over their recording of license plate numbers of attendees. In 1978, the LGBTQ community won a legal victory when a judge ordered the Fort Worth Police Department to destroy the names and license plate numbers collected at the event.
The Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches (UFMCC), a nationwide religious organization for LGBTQ members of faith, also established itself in Fort Worth in the 1970s. After meeting privately in the early 1970s, several locals met with representatives of the UFMCC and chartered Agape Metropolitan Community Church in 1973, one of 45 affiliated churches in the country. The congregation, which consisted of 40 men and women in 1973, leased space throughout the 1970s before moving to its current location in southeast Fort Worth in the early 1980s. Among the spaces used by the congregation during the period include: the First Unitarian Universalist Church at 2800 Purington Avenue (extant), the former Handley Masonic Lodge at 3024 Forest Avenue (extant), and a commercial building at 5404 East Lancaster Avenue (believed to be extant, though the address has changed).

The work of the LGBTQ members during this period laid the foundation for continued civil rights advancements in the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s. The community would also achieve greater visibility in the following decades, through various events including the city’s first pride picnic and pride-week celebrations in the 1980s.
### Statement of Significance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Twentieth-Century Cultural and Social Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Religious Institutions, Parkland &amp; Recreation, Women’s Clubs, Civil Rights &amp; Integration, Emerging LGBTQ Scene and Community, Arts &amp; The Cultural District, Heritage &amp; Cultural Preservation Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement of Significance:</td>
<td>Resources associated with this theme and its many subthemes highlight the development of the city’s rich cultural and social fabric in the early twentieth century through the postwar period. The theme covers the welfare and cultural development of the city and its people, and the institutions involved in this work. Progressive issues, civil rights advocacy, parks, and the arts are among the areas associated with this theme. Resources may be eligible under a variety of areas of significance, but they must retain sufficient integrity to convey significance and association with this theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance:</td>
<td>From 1900 to 1980.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance Justification:</td>
<td>Covers the twentieth-century period of cultural and social development. Some resources may have periods of significance that begin earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location:</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area(s) of Significance:</td>
<td>Art, Community Planning and Development, Entertainment/Recreation, Ethnic Heritage, Health/Medicine, Landscape Architecture, Performing Arts, Social History, Architecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria:</td>
<td>National Register: A, C, Criteria Consideration A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Property Types:</td>
<td>Resources include churches, synagogues, parks, club houses, medical clinics, residences, bars, theaters, and museums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td>The 500 Club, 506 West Magnolia Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 500 Club on West Magnolia Avenue was one of Fort Worth’s early gay bars and is associated with the subtheme Emerging LGBTQ Scene and Community. Newspaper advertisements indicate a bar, Velma’s 500 Club, located in the ca. 1930 building as early as 1961, but it presumably became a gay bar in the early 1970s. The bar was one of several in Fort Worth that provided the LGBTQ community a safe space for socializing and meeting during a period of discrimination. The development of the bar scene coincided with a growing LGBTQ advocacy movement and visibility for the community that continued into the 1980s. The former 500 Club is one of the few extant resources known to be associated with this movement; unfortunately, many other sites have been lost. The building at 506 W. Magnolia Avenue suffers from integrity issues, but it may be eligible as a local landmark and for the National Register under Criterion A under Social History if it is rehabilitated according to the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and non-historic age alterations are reversed. The building may be an ideal candidate for the federal and state preservation tax incentive and credit programs for rehabilitation.

![View of the building at 506 West Magnolia Avenue. Source: HHM, 2015.](image)

*This sample provides a framework for the identification of resources associated with significant themes in Fort Worth’s history. Resources significant under one theme/subtheme may also be significant under one, or several other themes. Period of Significance dates are also just a guide, and resources may have periods of significance that start earlier or end later. Each resource needs to be evaluated individually for historical significance.*
ARTS AND THE CULTURAL DISTRICT

The postwar period in Fort Worth saw the city’s already rich cultural fabric grow richer. The music scene benefitted from the founding of the Fort Worth Opera in 1946, as well as the inaugural Van Cliburn International Piano Competition, one of the world’s most prestigious, held at TCU in 1962. “Major Bill” Smith founded several record labels in Fort Worth after his discharge from Carswell Air Force Base in the 1950s, recording several national hits from a recording studio at the old Clifford Herring Sound Equipment Company building on West 7th Street (demolished).118 Songs recorded at the studio were often played on KXOL, said to be the city’s first independent radio station (all buildings demolished).119 Musical acts played clubs like the Jim Hotel downtown and those on Jacksboro Highway including the 50/50 Club, the Chateau Club, Skyliner Ballroom, and the Rocket Club (fig. 4-74). Fans of the big band and jazz musicians who played these clubs shopped at one of the city’s first record stores, Record Town, which opened in 1957 and was located at 3025 South University Drive.120

Figure 4-74. The former Rocket Club at 2130 Jacksboro Highway in North Fort Worth (extant). Built in the late 1940s, the Rocket Club was just one of the many clubs on Jacksboro Highway in the period. Source: Google Street View, 2018, captured June 15, 2021.

A combination of the city’s commitment to the arts and the philanthropy of wealthy Fort Worth individuals and families manifested in the cultural district’s extraordinary expansion in the postwar period. Early in the period, City Council and voters approved over half a million dollars for construction of new museums and theaters, while families who had made millions in the oil, grain, and cattle industries earlier in the twentieth century bequeathed the City some of the state’s and nation’s finest museums.121 As a result of this investment, between 1946 and 1980, five new institutions opened in the city’s cultural district. Designed by some of the period’s most renowned architects, the collection of museums is one of the most architecturally significant in the nation.

Taxpayers helped fund some of the earliest additions to the Cultural District: the Children’s Museum, the Fort Worth Art Center, and Casa Mañana Theater. Both the Children’s Museum (demolished, a new Fort Worth Museum of Science and History opened in 2006) and the Fort Worth Art Center (1300 Gendy Street) opened in 1954, spurring the development of a museum district on the former Camp Bowie and 1936 Frontier Centennial site (fig. 4-75). The Children’s Museum, founded in 1939, moved into its permanent home just west of Will Rogers Memorial Center after bouncing from schools to residences on Summit Avenue in the 1940s. The museum opened the Charlie Mary Noble Planetarium, the first public planetarium in the region, in 1955 (fig. 4-76).122 Next to the Children’s Museum, the Fort Worth Art Center opened at 1300 Gendy Street (fig. 4-77). Designed by Bauhaus-trained graphic designer and architect Herbert Bayer, the museum housed the City’s art collection, previously displayed at the public...
Additions to the building during the period included the W. E. Scott Theater in 1966 and a 1974 addition designed by O’Neil Ford and Associates. The last building added in the 1950s was Casa Mañana Theater (fig. 4-78). Built as a permanent replacement for the open-air amphitheater used during the Frontier Centennial, the theater opened in 1958 with a focus on bringing Broadway musicals to the city. Designed by A. George King, the theater’s main feature was its aluminum geodesic dome designed by Henry Kaiser and Richard Buckminster Fuller.


The two other museums built in this period stemmed from the philanthropy of two Fort Worth families. The Amon Carter Museum of American Art (3501 Camp Bowie Boulevard), opened in 1961, was a gift
from the Amon G. Carter Foundation (fig. 4-79). The museum, north of the Fort Worth Arts Center across West Lancaster Avenue, replaced a used auto lot. During his lifetime (1879–1955), businessman, media mogul, oil man, and civic leader Amon G. Carter amassed a collection of art containing more than 400 works.127 Envisioning his collection on display in a museum accessible to the public, Carter provided for such a place in his 1955 will:

I desire and direct that the museum be operated as a nonprofit artistic enterprise for the benefit of the public and to aid in the promotion of cultural spirit in the city of Fort Worth and vicinity, to stimulate the artistic imagination among young people residing there.128


Kay Kimbell, who amassed his wealth from his flour, feed, and oil mills and chain of grocery stores, formed the Kimbell Art Foundation in 1936 with his wife Velma and his sister and brother-in-law. Over Kimbell’s lifetime (1886–1964), the foundation acquired over 300 pieces of art. Upon his death, Kimbell bequeathed his estate to the foundation, charging it with creating a first-class art museum.129 Designed by architect Louis Kahn, the Kimbell Art Museum opened in 1972 at 3333 Camp Bowie Boulevard (fig. 4-80). Mayor R. M. “Sharkey” Stovall declared the museum “the greatest thing that has happened to Fort Worth in the field of culture for many years.”130 The opening of the Kimbell Art Museum within the cluster of museums, the Will Rogers Memorial Complex, and the Fort Worth Botanic Garden further cemented the area’s transformation into an arts district (fig. 4-81). Not only did the district’s development contribute to the city’s cultural sphere, but it also supported new and existing independent restaurants and other galleries nearby.

Figure 4-81. Part of the Cultural District sometime after the completion of the Kimbell Art Museum in 1972. The Kimbell Art Museum is located in the bottom left, and the Amon Carter Museum of American Art is to its right, at the intersection of Camp Bowie Boulevard and West Lancaster Avenue. Will Rogers Memorial Center and Coliseum is in the top left. The Children’s Museum is in the top right corner, and below it is the Fort Worth Art Center. Casa Mañana Theater is left of Will Rogers Coliseum outside the frame. Source: “Aerial view of the Fort Worth arts district,” [photograph], n.d., University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, crediting UNT Libraries Special Collections, accessed June 16, 2021, https://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc850136/.
PARKS AND CIVIC IMPROVEMENTS

Throughout the postwar period, Fort Worth added around 80 new parks to its system. Many of the parks development in this period generally followed recommendations presented in landscape architects Hare and Hare’s 1930 and updated 1957 park master plan, while some of the later parks reflect the City’s urban renewal efforts and its renewed interest in the Trinity River as a source of recreation.

Following Hare and Hare’s park master plan, a large number of the city’s new parks included playgrounds near schools, playfields, and small community and neighborhood parks in new residential areas. Bonnie Brae Park, opened in 1957 at 3212 Wesley Street near Bonnie Brae Elementary School, is an example of the postwar effort to create parks near schools, while Riverside Park, established in 1974, opened in an area called out in the 1957 plan for its inadequate park facilities. Among the neighborhood suburban parks established in this period, Foster Park opened in 1952 in the new Westcliff subdivision in southeast Fort Worth, a gift to the City from the developer J. E. Foster. Like many of the neighborhood parks from this period, Foster Park was less than 20 acres.

Though neighborhood and community parks accounted for the bulk of new parks, Fort Worth also added several special-use parks to its inventory. In addition to the Water Garden downtown and Log Cabin Village (see Downtown Decline and Revitalization Efforts on page 231 and Heritage and Cultural Preservation Movement on page 256), the Japanese Gardens became part of the City’s Parks Department (fig. 4-82). The City, in collaboration with local gardening clubs, transformed a former gravel pit south of the Botanic Garden into the new seven-and-a-half-acre Japanese Gardens. The Fort Worth Star-Telegram proclaimed about the garden, which opened in 1973,

> When you add the garden and the airport to our museums, the Botanic Garden, the Water Garden which will open probably within a year, and all the entertainment in the Mid-Cities area, we live in excitement city.

When you add the garden and the airport to our museums, the Botanic Garden, the Water Garden which will open probably within a year, and all the entertainment in the Mid-Cities area, we live in excitement city.

By the end of this period, the City added one more significant park to its inventory: Heritage Park, which was created in an effort to incorporate the Trinity River into the downtown experience. Reassessing its relationship with the river, the City made the Trinity the center of its park plans. Following the devastating flood of 1949, which inundated 10 square miles of the city, killed 11 people, displaced 13,000, and caused an estimated $25 million in damage, the City began a massive flood-control project. Throughout the 1950s, the US Army Corps of Engineers built new reservoirs (Lake Benbrook and Grapevine), channeled the West and Clear Forks, and strengthened and supplemented the existing levee system. Completed in the mid-1950s, the Fort Worth Floodway project straightened the Trinity River and protected 1,710 acres of land, including the area near downtown at the confluence of the Clear and West Forks. In 1969, the City’s Streams and Valleys Committee hired landscape architect Lawrence Halprin to develop a plan for the Trinity River corridor. Among the recommendations in Halprin’s plan was the creation of a 112-acre urban park that incorporated the bluffs on the south side of the river in downtown. Backed by the City and privately funded, Halprin’s Heritage Park and Heritage Park Plaza, a half-acre portion of the park, opened in 1980 (Heritage Park Plaza is listed in the National Register, see fig. 4-83).

Figure 4-83. Water channel near live oaks in Heritage Park Plaza (looking east), designed by Lawrence Halprin and opened in 1980. The park is listed in the National Register. Source: W. Dwayne Jones and Michal G. Tincup, “Heritage Park Plaza,” National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form, Texas Historical Commission, March 26, 201, 71, from the THC, https://atlas.thc.texas.gov/NR/pdfs/10000253/10000253.pdf.

**HERITAGE AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION MOVEMENT**

Fort Worth’s historic preservation movement gained momentum during this period. In addition to the Sundance Square preservation efforts, historical societies and grassroots activists also contributed to the growth of heritage and cultural preservation in Fort Worth. Early efforts during this period focused on the 1949 City Centennial. The Tarrant County Historical Society, founded one year prior in 1948, coordinated celebration efforts in its aim to preserve the city’s history and raise awareness about its
disappearing nineteenth-century architecture. The group hosted an exhibition at the public library with dioramas, a reproduction of a pioneer kitchen, and exhibits showing the development of schools, churches, social life, and industry in the city. Following these efforts, the Tarrant County Historical Society helped establish Log Cabin Village, a museum with relocated nineteenth-century buildings, including the Isaac Parker cabin, in 1958. The City Parks and Recreation Department acquired the property, located at 2100 Log Cabin Village Lane in southeast Fort Worth, in 1966 and opened it to the public. That same year, the Tarrant County Historical Society led the first effort in the county to inventory its architectural landmarks. The results, published in “A Guide to Historical Sites in Fort Worth and Tarrant County,” identified a dozen buildings in Fort Worth deemed worthy of preservation (fig. 4-84).

Several years after the publication, Historic Fort Worth, Inc., formed in 1969 to promote and preserve the city’s landmarks. The group established a list of priority buildings to preserve, including the Knights of Pythias Castle Hall, the Land Title Block, the Santa Fe Depot, St. Ignatius Academy, and the Tarrant County Courthouse.

With a focus on the city’s and county’s African American heritage, civil rights activist Lenora Rolla founded the Tarrant County Black Historical and Genealogical Society in 1974 (see Civil Rights and Integration on page 241 and fig. 4-85). While helping plan the City’s centennial celebration, Rolla realized that not only could the public not easily access Black historical documents, but that these records were often lost over time. The society therefore aimed to collect, organize, and preserve the city’s Black historical documents. The society first met at Rolla’s home at 4751 Ramey Street before moving into its current home at the A. L. Boone house at 1020 E. Humbolt Street in the early 1980s.
Grassroots efforts also helped save and designate historic buildings during this period. Following a series of demolitions that included the loss of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century residences in Quality Hill and Arlington Heights, residents of Elizabeth Boulevard in south Fort Worth nominated the Elizabeth Boulevard Historic District to the National Register in 1979. Meanwhile, the demolition of the old Niles City Town Hall in North Fort Worth in 1975 spurred another group into action. The North Fort Worth Historical Society organized following the demolition with the goal of preserving the architectural heritage of the Stockyards and surrounding area. A year later, the group helped nominate the Stockyards to the National Register. Along with several US Economic Development Administration Public Works Impact Program grants awarded to the City in the 1970s for the restoration of the Northside Coliseum, beautification of Marine Creek, and general redevelopment and restoration planning, the designation brought recognition to the Stockyards and North Fort Worth during a time of decline and helped spur activity and tourism in the area.

The work of these groups and individuals and the momentum gained during this period culminated in the establishment of the City of Fort Worth’s Preservation Program in 1981. One year prior, the City enacted its first municipal preservation ordinance. In 1986 the city became a Certified Local Government, a joint designation of the National Park Service and the Texas Historical Commission.
opening doors to preservation funding and assistance. The City’s Preservation Office and its new authority added to Fort Worth’s arsenal of historic preservation tools and enabled stronger partnerships and collaboration amongst the various preservation interests in the city. As a result, the strengthened preservation community has helped designate and preserve hundreds of historic resources in Fort Worth.
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Survey Plan Addendum

INTRODUCTION

HHM has been commissioned to develop a historic resources survey plan for the City of Fort Worth as part of the City’s Historic Context of Fort Worth. The survey plan presents a list of prioritized recommendations guided by the principles of efficiency, urgency, and feasibility for conducting a historic resources survey within the current city limits of Fort Worth, Tarrant County, Texas. The survey plan recommends a phased approach that can be completed over a multi-year period, as funding becomes available.

Maps listed throughout this Survey Plan Addendum text (figures 1–9) are included as oversized pages at the end of this chapter.

SURVEY PLAN METHODOLOGY

Defining the geographic limits of potential survey areas and establishing a process in which to conduct the survey is a critical step for ensuring success. The following methodology explains the background and rationale behind the recommendations for and prioritization of survey areas.

IDENTIFICATION OF SURVEY AREAS

The core principles of both efficiency and urgency guide all recommendations set forth in this survey plan. To maximize the efficiency of survey efforts across Fort Worth, the plan divides the city into discrete geographic survey zones. Each zone feasibly may be surveyed relying on funding from the Certified Local Government (CLG) and on its annual grant cycle as well as the City’s annual budget, external fundraising, and partnerships with other governmental entities. Cost estimates to complete a historic resources survey of each zone are intentionally consistent with typical CLG grant awards from the Texas Historical Commission (THC).¹

Dividing the city into manageable zones, or survey areas, is the first key step in determining priorities for future survey. HHM worked closely with the City of Fort Worth’s Historic Preservation Program to understand the city’s preservation needs and identify areas where the evaluation of historic resources proves the most urgent and critical. The recommended survey areas and their priority order is based on the following parameters, as defined by the City:

- Previously designated City of Fort Worth Local Historic Districts
- Concentrations of historic resources within Fort Worth’s city limits based on oldest annexation areas

Additionally, HHM and the City of Fort Worth worked together to determine the type of survey recommended for each survey zone—windshield or reconnaissance—based on the level of evaluation needed for each area. See “Defining Levels of Survey” below for a breakdown of these survey types.

¹ Although there is a wide range in CLG awards, in a typical year, the THC’s CLG program provides matching grants up to $40,000 for a total project cost of up to $80,000. The THC publishes listings of recent CLG grant awards online at https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/certified-local-government/grant-information/fy20-grant-round.
Defining Levels of Survey

Windshield Versus Reconnaissance


These levels of survey are further refined by Texas Department of Transportation’s Documentation Standard: Historic Resource Survey Reports, available at https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/421-06-ds.pdf. The standard definitions of each level of survey are summarized below.

Windshield-Level Survey
- Typically focuses on district scale rather than individual buildings, noted by the NPS as the “streetscapes, the general character of its housing stock or commercial buildings, representative buildings and structures, the layout of its spaces in general.”
- Photography includes streetscape photographs rather than photographs of individual buildings.
- Maps and inventories record areas at the subdivision scale (or larger) rather than resource-by-resource.
- No historical research or analysis is included.
- The most common goal of the windshield-level survey is to recommend whether or not the area should be surveyed at the reconnaissance level in the future.

Reconnaissance-Level Survey
- Typically documents individual buildings, including two photographs of each building, a map of the building location, and a survey form noting the building’s address, date of construction, use type, architectural style, physical integrity, and eligibility for local historic designation and/or National Register listing.
- Broad contextual research is conducted to guide eligibility determinations.
- For the City of Fort Worth, contextual research has been conducted during this phase of the project, so that the narrative historic context can be reused for all future phases of reconnaissance-level survey.

CONCENTRATIONS OF HISTORIC RESOURCES BY AGE

The City of Fort Worth’s Historic Preservation Program determined age as the best indicator to identify the order in which the unsurveyed parts of the city should be evaluated, with the oldest sections taking priority over newer sections. Using the historic maps listed below, HHM utilized GIS mapping and analysis tools to trace Fort Worth’s annexation boundaries over time, thereby delineating survey areas according to annexation periods. Table 1 and figure 1 present these results, showing Fort Worth’s annexation periods as survey areas with their corresponding parcel counts. The recommended survey type for each survey area is also included in the table.

Historic Maps Used
- Successive Stages of Fort Worth’s Growth from Four Square Miles in 1873 to Approximately 100 Square Miles, 1949 (see fig. 2)
- Road map of Tarrant County Texas, 1958 (see fig. 3)
- Geological Survey map of Dallas, 1975 (see fig. 4)

Table 1. Annexation periods as survey areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annexation Period</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Number of Subdivisions</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1873–1889</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Reconnaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890–1891</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892–1908</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909–1921</td>
<td>14,355</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922–1927</td>
<td>38,318</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928–1945</td>
<td>9,872</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946–1958</td>
<td>75,476</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959–1975</td>
<td>18,001</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey plan makes the following recommendations as a roadmap for a citywide survey effort of Fort Worth. All future surveys should use the consolidated GIS-compatible database template developed for the City under this contract. A Survey Implementation Matrix (table 8), presented at the end of this section, details the phases, parcel and subdivision counts, and projected timeframes and costs associated with all phases of survey.²

GIS-compatible Citywide Database Template

HHM has developed a custom historic resources database template for the City of Fort Worth using the ArcGIS Online Collector App. This tool allows for the survey team to utilize handheld devices, such as mobile phones and tablets, to document historic resources remotely in the field. As the survey team captures information, the data will be stored in the City’s ESRI cloud-based ArcGIS Online platform. HHM designed the structure of the database template to comply with Texas Historical Commission and National Park Service standards for documenting historic resources. The ArcGIS Online Collector App allows for the integration of previous survey data, Appraisal District data, previous designation files, and other relevant datasets. The database template allows for data editing, querying, map analysis, and the export of inventories and forms. The City of Fort Worth can control permissions within their ArcGIS Online account to determine who on the survey team may access, edit, or delete data in the survey tool.

RECOMMENDATION 1. IDENTIFY AND APPLY FOR PRESERVATION GRANTS

To fund a citywide comprehensive survey, the City of Fort Worth should seek funding sources and prepare applications for available grants. Funding for future survey efforts is available from a variety of public and non-profit sources, including:

- THC’s CLG program
- THC’s Texas Preservation Trust Fund (TPTF) program
- City Hotel Occupancy Tax (HOT) funds dedicated to cultural and heritage tourism
- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds
- FEMA mitigation funds
- NPS mitigation funds
- National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) grants

While various funding sources exist, this survey plan encourages the City of Fort Worth to pursue THC CLG grant funding first, as the program aims to assist participating city and county governments engaging in a variety of preservation planning-related efforts. Priority for CLG funding is given to projects involving architectural surveys, preparation of National Register nominations, and writing or amending preservation ordinances, among other projects. CLG grants require a local match on a one-to-one (dollar for dollar) basis equal to a 50-50 ratio for the total cost of the project. City Hotel Occupancy Tax funds may be used to match CLG grant funding. Although there is a wide range in CLG awards, in a typical year the THC’s CLG program may provide matching grants up to $40,000, and a single project total cost of up to $80,000.

Assumption: Annual Budget Planning

Note that all recommendations below assume that the City of Fort Worth will plan for an average of approximately $65,000 for survey implementation per year (with 50 percent from grant funding, plus a 50 percent match from City budget allocations – possibly taking advantage of HOT tax funds).

² The cost estimates proposed in this section are provided for budget planning purposes only. The actual cost may vary based on the actual scope of work developed for the proposed work and other unknown variables.
The deadline for CLG grant applications is usually in the fall. The THC requires that grant applications include such detailed information as a summary of local preservation-related activities and threats to historic properties, how the project will be undertaken, how much the project will cost, and how the grant applicant will provide matching funds. For more information about the THC’s CLG program, please visit https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/certified-local-government/grant-information.

Table 2 presents the timeframe, cost, and duration associated with Recommendation 1, Securing Preservation-Related Grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>No. Years</th>
<th>Price per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing (Years 1–17)</td>
<td>N/A (Staff Time Only)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>N/A (Staff Time Only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION 2. PHASED CITYWIDE HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEY

The City of Fort Worth should create and maintain an up-to-date, accurate inventory of historic resources within the city limits to facilitate the identification of properties and districts considered eligible for possible listing to the National Register and/or local landmark designation. The inventory will also assist the local government in preservation planning and heritage tourism endeavors. The historic resources survey may be conducted in phases that are confined to separate and distinct “survey zones,” due to the costs and logistics of such an ambitious citywide effort. The following recommended survey phases are based on the methodology outlined above.

Phase 1: Integrate Previously Identified Resources into a GIS-Compatible Database Template (Year 1)

During the first phase, the City of Fort Worth should analyze and consolidate data from previous surveys and documentation. Potential sources include the results of earlier historic resources surveys of Fort Worth, National Register nominations, local landmark designation files, as well as documentation of historic resources prepared by various government agencies and/or held in various archival repositories. Data gathered during this stage should be integrated into a single database used for the Historic Preservation Program’s management of historic resources. Data also could be linked to GIS to produce maps showing concentrations of known historic resources to help determine priorities for future historic resources surveys.

Previous historic resources surveys that should be integrated into the database include:

- “Historic Resources Survey Update for White Settlement Road Bridge, Fort Worth, Texas,” prepared by Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc., 2012
- “Supplement to Historic Resources Survey for N. Main Street Bridge, Fort Worth, Texas,” prepared by Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc., 2012
- “A Survey of Five Urban Villages: Carver Heights, Mistletoe Heights, Morningside, Berry-Riverside, and Garden of Eden within the City of Fort Worth, Tarrant County, Texas,” prepared by LopezGarcia Group, Inc., 2008
• “Polytechnic/Wesleyan Village Potential Historic District Inventory,” prepared by LopezGarcia Group, Inc., 2008
• “Reconnaissance-Level Survey for Historic Bridges over Trinity River in Fort Worth,” prepared by Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc., 2006
• “Arlington Survey Update,” prepared by HHM (previously Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc.), 2005
• “Historic Context, Inventory, and Assessment of the Central City Segment of the Trinity River Vision Plan, Fort Worth, Texas [Draft],” prepared by Prior, Marsha, Duane Peter, and Joseph Murphey, 2005
• “Historic Schools Survey,” prepared by City of Fort Worth Planning and Development Program, 2003
• “Historic Resources Survey of the Near Southeast Neighborhood,” prepared by Historic Fort Worth, Inc., 2001

Phase 2. Reconnaissance-Level Resurvey of Previously Designated Historic Districts (Years 2–6)
The City of Fort Worth’s Historic Preservation Program identified historic resources comprising existing local historic districts as a top priority for future survey efforts. City preservation professionals ranked the priority of the local historic districts in terms of the urgency for resurvey. Based on this feedback, the previously designated local historic districts will be surveyed in the following order:

1. Terrell Heights (1,316 parcels)
2. Morningside Neighborhood (974 parcels)
3. Historic Carver Heights (866 parcels)
4. Fairmount (1,539 parcels)
5. Elizabeth Boulevard (45 parcels)
6. Stockyards (86 parcels)
7. Garden of Eden (16 parcels)
8. Central Handley (12 parcels)
9. Linden Avenue (19 parcels)
10. Chase Place (11 parcels)
11. Historic Hillcrest (37 parcels)
12. Kenwood Court (31 parcels)
13. W. A. Powers Co. (3 parcels)
14. Mistletoe Heights (395 parcels)

All City of Fort Worth Local Historic Districts will be surveyed during one phase (Phase 2). Figure 5 depicts a map of the Phase 2 survey area, comprised of the previously designated local historic districts in Fort Worth. Table 3 below presents the number of parcels, survey type, timeframe, and estimated cost associated with Phase 2, Reconnaissance-Level Resurvey of Previously Designated Historic Districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Parcels</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,351</td>
<td>Reconnaissance Level</td>
<td>Years 2–6</td>
<td>$75,000 per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 3. Reconnaissance-Level Survey of 1873–1889 Annexation Area (Years 7–8)
The Phase 3 survey area, depicted in figure 6, encompasses the parts of Fort Worth annexed to the City between 1873 and 1889. Table 4 presents the number of parcels, survey type, timeframe, and estimated cost associated with Phase 3, Reconnaissance-Level Survey of 1873–1889 Annexation Area.

Table 4. Phase 3 planning matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Parcels</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>Reconnaissance Level</td>
<td>Years 7–8</td>
<td>$70,000 per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 4. Windshield-Level Survey of 1890–1921 Annexation Areas (Year 9)
The Phase 4 survey area, depicted in figure 7, encompasses the areas of Fort Worth annexed to the City between 1890 and 1921. Table 5 presents the number of parcels and subdivisions, survey type, timeframe, and estimated cost associated with Phase 4, Windshield-Level Survey of 1890–1921 Annexation Areas.

Table 5. Phase 4 planning matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Parcels</th>
<th>No. Subdivisions</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17,469</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>Windshield Level</td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 5. Windshield-Level Survey of 1922–1945 Annexation Areas (Years 10–11)
The Phase 5 survey area, depicted in figure 8, encompasses the parts of Fort Worth annexed to the City between 1922 and 1945. Table 6 presents the number of parcels and subdivisions, survey type, timeframe, and estimated cost associated with Phase 5, Windshield-Level Survey of 1922–1945 Annexation Areas.

Table 6. Phase 5 planning matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Parcels</th>
<th>No. Subdivisions</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48,190</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>Windshield Level</td>
<td>Years 10–11</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Phase 6 survey area, depicted in figure 9, encompasses the parts of Fort Worth annexed to the City between 1946 and 1975. Table 7 presents the number of parcels and subdivisions, survey type, timeframe, and estimated cost associated with Phase 6, Windshield-Level Survey of 1946–1975 Annexation Areas.

Table 7. Phase 6 planning matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Parcels</th>
<th>No. Subdivisions</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93,477</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>Windshield Level</td>
<td>Years 12–17</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SURVEY PLANNING MATRIX

Table 8 below shows the Survey Planning Matrix, which details the phases, parcel and subdivision counts, and projected timeframes and costs associated with each phase of the survey.
### Table 8. Survey planning matrix for citywide survey effort of Fort Worth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Timeframe per Phase</th>
<th>Survey Area</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Subdivisions</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Price per Phase</th>
<th>Price per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>N/A (data integration)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Years 2–6</td>
<td>Previous LHDs</td>
<td>5,351</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Recon</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Years 7–8</td>
<td>1873–1889</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Recon</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>1890–1921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) 1890–1891</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) 1892–1908</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) 1909–1921</td>
<td>14,355</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17,469</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Years 10–11</td>
<td>1922–1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) 1922–1927</td>
<td>38,318</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) 1928–1945</td>
<td>9,872</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48,190</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>Years 12–17</td>
<td>1946–1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$990,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) 1946–1958</td>
<td>75,476</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) 1959–1975</td>
<td>18,001</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Windshield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>93,477</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>166,890</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,757,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is recommended that once Phase 6 is completed, resurvey efforts begin, starting with the Local Historic Districts (per Phase 2) and then proceeding with resurveying each subsequent zone.*
Figure 1. Map showing recommended survey areas based on Fort Worth’s successive stages of development. Map by HHM, 2021.
Figure 2. Successive Stages of Fort Worth’s Growth from Four Square Miles in 1873 to Approximately 100 Square Miles, 1949. Map courtesy of The Portal to Texas History, University of North Texas Libraries.
Figure 3. Road map of Tarrant County Texas, 1958. Map courtesy of The Portal to Texas History, University of North Texas Libraries.
Figure 4. US Geological Survey map of Dallas, 1975. Map courtesy of The Portal to Texas History, University of North Texas Libraries.
Figure 5. Phase 2 Survey Area which includes previously designated City of Fort Worth Local Historic Districts. Map by HHM, 2021.
Figure 6. This map depicts the Phase 3 survey area, comprised of the areas annexed to Fort Worth between 1873 and 1889. A reconnaissance-level survey is recommended for Phase 3 of the survey. Map by HHM, 2021.
Figure 7. This map depicts the Phase 4 survey area, comprised of the areas annexed to Fort Worth between 1890 and 1921. A windshield-level survey is recommended for Phase 4 of the survey. Map by HHM, 2021.
Figure 8. This map depicts the Phase 5 survey area, comprised of the areas annexed to Fort Worth between 1922 and 1945. A windshield-level survey is recommended for Phase 5 of the survey. Map by HHM, 2021.
Figure 9. This map depicts the Phase 6 survey area, comprised of the areas annexed to Fort Worth between 1946 and 1975. A windshield-level survey is recommended for Phase 6 of the survey. Map by HHM, 2021.
Appendix A

*Statewide Historic Context of the Navy in Texas*

The following is an excerpt from the “Statewide Historic Context of the Navy in Texas in the 20th Century” by Emily Payne and David W. Moore [Hardy-Heck-Moore, Inc.], prepared for the US Navy, NAVFAC Southeast, 2012.
In May 1940, the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce approached several different aircraft companies about the possibility of building a plant in Tarrant County. With the war in Europe escalating and the possibility of American intervention becoming more likely, President Roosevelt determined that American industry needed to concentrate on production for the Armed Forces. Roosevelt located numerous potential military manufacturing sites situated within a proposed “safety zone” 200 miles inland from the any U.S. border. Fort Worth lay well within this safety zone, and was also considered as a site for an Army Air Corps training base. Tarrant County was a good location for a transportation facility because Fort Worth had access to nine railroad lines, eight bus companies, and several municipal airports.

In January 1941, the Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation agreed to construct a plant for the manufacture of B-24 “Liberator” bombers in Fort Worth. The Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce agreed to convey 1,450-acres of land adjacent to Lake Worth, which would provide landing for seaplanes. The City of Fort Worth was willing to clear the land for the Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation and make improvements to the proposed site, such as constructing roads and providing utilities.
By February 1942, less than one year later, operations at the plant were underway and the airfield had been completed. Wartime employment opportunities at the plant and on the base brought thousands of workers and their families to the Fort Worth area. The 1940 Fort Worth census reports that 177,662 people lived in the area; however, by 1943 the local population had increased to 251,176.1 The completion of the plant and air dome also spawned more suburban development in the White Settlement region. To accommodate the influx of civilian workers, Consolidated built temporary, low-cost apartment buildings, which it named “Liberator Village.”

At the same time, the Army proceeded with plans to establish an air base in the Fort Worth area. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941 spurred the Army to action, and plans for an all-purpose air base were finalized by January 1942. The Army used standardized plans originally drawn up by the Army Corps of Engineers. Called the Tarrant Airfield, the facility was under the control of the Second Air Force, United States. Operations began in July 1942, with construction still underway. Beginning in October 1942, Tarrant Airfield provided officer training for B-24 Combat crews and B-17 operation. During the war, the installation was known as “Army Air Force Pilot School (Specialized 4-Engine), Fort Worth Army Airfield.”2

Near the end of the war, the Air Corps began to replace the B-24 with the B-32, but Tarrant Field continued to provide pilots with “continuing flying” instruction and refresher courses on the B-24. Between 1942 and 1944, Tarrant Field trained and instructed over 4,000 pilots to fly the B-24 heavy bomber.

As peace came to Europe and Japan, the Air Corps closed numerous airfields constructed as part of the war effort; however, the Army decided not to decommission Tarrant Field, but rather to make it one of the larger permanent stations—the Fort Worth Army Airfield (FWAAF). All flight training was adapted to the B-32 on 16 April 1945, and all squadrons were either reorganized or deactivated. Although the Federal government severely limited military spending during the immediate post-war period, Tarrant Field experienced growth as thousands of trainees from all over the country came to FWAAF.

During the immediate postwar period, the Air Force began to plan new construction at the Fort Worth Army Airfield to accommodate the newly-formed Strategic Air Command (SAC). After World War II, U.S. air combat forces were restructured, and the Strategic Air Command (SAC) was established in March 1946. The SAC was one of three major combat commands of the U.S. Army Air Forces. Its mission was to provide a long-range offensive combat capability of overwhelming strength and instant response.3 In 1947, not long after SAC was formed, the air combat forces were transferred from the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army to a separate independent Department of the Air Force.

In the subsequent months, command of the installation shifted a number of times. By late 1947, the installation fell under the command of the Air Force’s Seventh Bombardment Wing.4 To accompany this change of command, the former Fort Worth Army Airfield was renamed Griffiss Air Force Base on 13 January 1948. Two weeks later, the base was renamed Carswell Air Force Base to honor Fort Worth Native Major Horace S. Carswell, Jr., who received the Congressional
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Medal of Honor for actions performed during a bombing run on a Japanese convoy during World War II.

Under the Seventh Bombardment Wing, the mission of Carswell Air Force Base was to support warfare and operations “utilizing the latest technical knowledge and advanced weapons (including the atomic bomb).” This included training flying B-29 and B-36 aircraft. These bombers were the only aircraft in the fleet capable of carrying an atomic bomb. The Seventh Bombardment Wing and Carwell Air Force Base played a role in providing a deterrent to Soviet aggression through the build up of arms and their aggressive display.

In 1951, the Air Force chain of command was restructured. The 19th Air Division took command at Carswell AFB. This division included the Seventh Bombardment Wing, the 11th Bombardment Wing, and the 824th Air Base Group. All of these units remained under the general command of the Strategic Air Command, and Carswell AFB became one of the primary SAC stations.

These structural and strategic changes within the military establishment were a direct response to continued State Department fears of a growing Soviet threat and the policy of containment. The United States built up its weapons and military force to prove to the Soviets, and the world, that it could make good on its threat of military retaliation. As part of America’s nuclear arsenal, SAC needed to demonstrate a flawless ability to deliver American military strength when called upon. The aircraft at Carswell, as head of the 7th Bombardment Wing, were called upon to be a constant reminder of that preparedness.

As part of this “readiness training,” now the primary mission of Carswell, pilots flew B-36s on a daily basis. Instead of administering flight, radio, or navigation instruction, readiness training focused on the fine-tuning of SAC’s delivery capability. Crews from Fort Worth began long distance training flights all across the country. They also trained internationally, flying to Mexico, the Arctic Circle, and Africa. In all of their missions, Carswell AFB personnel never fired a shot or dropped a bomb in aggression. They won safety awards and crew of the month honors. However, during the Korean Conflict, the 19th Air Division did not enter into combat.

By the end of the 1950s, the Air Force had produced several new bombers, including the B-52 Stratofortress and the KC-135A, the first jet plane in the air force designed specifically for refueling. At the end of 1959, Carswell AFB had made the transition to B-52s, and retired the old B-36 bombers. The 7th Bombardment Wing became an all-jet, combat-ready air division. In 1960, the Air Force built a readiness crew training building at Carswell for combat crews manning the B-52s. Personnel who occupied the building had immediate access to aircraft in case of an emergency.

By the late 1950s, the Soviets were making great strides in intercontinental ballistic missiles. The possibility of a Soviet missile attack greatly threatened the unsteady peace that had been in place since the end of World War II. In keeping with its mission of immediate retaliation and sure-fire delivery of nuclear weapons, SAC developed a 24-hour airborne alert response force. Airborne alert called for one-third of all of SAC’s bombers to be on 15 minute ground alert, and many in the air 24 hours a day. Weapons were loaded and crews were standing by on shifts as if the Soviet Union had already fired the first nuclear shot. Training flights no longer simply fine-tuned SAC’s ability to deliver nuclear bombs to their target. The airborne alert concept helped to bring change to Carswell AFB. The program brought a host of new facilities built specifically to deal with a
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nuclear attack. Small shelters, named “moleholes,” were designed to protect pilots and crews while on 15-minute ground alert. The shelters were located adjacent to small cells of bombers and refueling tankers parked on the alert apron of the runway. The moleholes provided shelter for 70 men, including sleeping rooms, cafeteria facilities, and briefing rooms.

Continued escalation of the Cold War, represented in actions such as SAC’s decision to maintain airborne alert, was countered by a myriad of Soviet responses, one of which was the deployment of Soviet missiles to Cuba. During President Kennedy’s response to the crisis, the bombers of the 7th Bombardment Wing went to an advanced state of readiness. All of SAC’s aircraft not already on alert in the air, including the B-52s at Carswell, were placed on ground alert as SAC undertook an accelerated airborne alert operation.

In 1965, pilots in the 7th Bombardment Wing became involved in active combat for the first time since World War II. Augmenting other SAC forces in Southeast Asia, the 7th became part of America’s first major bombing campaign that tested the mettle of the relatively new B-52s. “Arc Light One,” as the plan was known, began in 1965 with a mission to destroy Viet Cong strongholds in the South.

In 1970, crews from the 7th Bombardment Wing participated in what they thought would be their last bombing mission in Southeast Asia. They returned home to Fort Worth to once again take up the banner of SAC’s airborne alert teams, operating in an attempt to deter major nuclear attacks on the United States. Following their return home, the 7th became equipped with another new bomber, the F-111. This two-seat, variable swept wing aircraft was added to the Air Force arsenal to augment the forces of the Strategic Air Command rather than replace its mainstay, the B-52. The F-111 had a complicated but ultimately successful terrain following radar system that allowed the plane to fly extremely low at very high speeds. In addition, the bomber could deliver pinpoint accuracy with newly developed SMART bomb technology and laser guided ordnance. The F-111s at Carswell, however, never got to Vietnam. When introduced in Vietnam in March 1968, the F-111s were largely untested and were susceptible to technological failures. By the end of the third month after their employment in Vietnam, aircraft had been downed due to technical difficulties, not enemy fire. After the end of hostilities in Vietnam, however, F-111s proved to be a more than capable bomber.

By 1972, the Air Force was introducing yet another new B-52 variation, as technology continued to improve the aircraft. Carswell AFB became the home of B-52D training. Almost every single crew that operated in the Pacific Theater during the next two years trained at Carswell AFB.

In the latter part of December 1972, B-52 crews from Carswell AFB again left for Southeast Asia to participate in what would be the most powerful strategic air campaign of the Vietnam Conflict—Operation Linebacker II. The first Linebacker, a series of strategic bombing raids on the North, began a year earlier in an attempt to bring a recalcitrant North Vietnam to the bargaining table. The campaign lasted almost six months and was powerful enough to get the North to talk. But further demands from both the northern politburo representative Le Duc Tho, and the southern Prime Minister Nguyen Van Thieu made for a series of stalled negotiations that looked less and less promising as fall 1972 approached.

Increased pressure from Congress and threats to cut off all funds forced Nixon to accelerate efforts to make peace yet leave the South Vietnamese government intact after American withdrawal. Talks seemed to move forward but eventually came to a complete halt, and Nixon again decided to bring air power to bear on the North and approved the start of Linebacker II. From 18 to 29 December 1972, B-52s from the U.S. Air Force flew 729 bombing missions.
against 34 targets in the North. Sixteen B-52s were lost and six were damaged. The bombers dropped over 15,000 tons of ordnance in 11 days. Bombers from Carswell’s 7th Bombardment Wing flew 150 of these missions. Peace negotiations resumed once again in early January 1973 and eventually the U.S. agreed to withdraw from Vietnam.

Following the conclusion of United States involvement in Vietnam, all U.S. military personnel were reassigned. At Carswell, the returning pilots resumed training for the airborne alert operations. From 1973 through 1992, although the B-52Ds were replaced by the new B-52H, the mission and operation of Carswell AFB remained unchanged. On 29 January 1990, Carswell AFB was designated for closure as part of Federal BRAC recommendations. In 1992, the men and aircraft of the 7th Bombardment Wing were reassigned to Barksdale AFB, Louisiana, and after more than 50 years of training and operations, the 7th itself was decommissioned.

After it ceased operation as an Air Force facility in 1992, the Air Force began to consolidate its operations at Carswell AFB. Most of former Carswell AFB was transferred to the Department of the Navy in a ceremony on 1 October 1994, and renamed Naval Air Station (NAS) Fort Worth Joint Reserve Base (JRB). When the Navy took command of the base that autumn, only two Marine Corps squadrons and one contingent of Navy personnel had arrived there. Additional personnel were prevented from moving to the base until construction of new buildings and renovation of old ones was completed in early 1996. When NAS Fort Worth JRB opened for operation in 1996, the base also had as part of its complement personnel from NAS Glenview and NAS Memphis. When NAS Fort Worth JRB was transferred to the Navy in 1992, the Navy planned to maintain the station with 3,500 active duty and civilian personnel, 7,800 Reservists, and about 100 aircraft. NAS Fort Worth JRB presently functions as a Reserve training station for the Naval Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Texas Air National Guard. During the 2004 BRAC process, a number of new tenants were assigned to NAS Fort Worth JRB, including Naval Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Texas Army National Guard, Marine Corps Reserve, and Marine Corps commands.
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Figure 2. Illustration depicts the B-36, which comprised the principal bomber at Carswell AFB during the late 1940s and early 1950s. Source: Hardy, Heck, Moore, Inc., Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth, TX.
Figure 3. 136th Operations Group Building, NAS Fort Worth JRB, 2011. Source: HHM.

Figure 4. Control Tower, NAS Fort Worth JRB, 2011. Source: HHM.