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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Bexar County proposes to construct improvements to a 0.77-mile-long segment of Roland Avenue at Salado Creek in east San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas, as part of the Bexar County Flood Control Capital Improvement Program. The proposed roadway construction project would replace the two existing culverts as well as improve Roland Avenue’s horizontal and vertical alignments.

The proposed project would entail straightening and widening Roland Avenue. New ROW would be acquired between the crossings and at the eastern extent of the project area. No new ROW would be acquired south of Roland Avenue along the western extent of the project area. The Eastview Cemetery is located at the southwest corner of Roland Avenue and the west crossing of Salado Creek. The cemetery's easternmost property boundary includes the creek crossing and a portion of the eastern bank. A temporary construction easement would be required on a 0.0125-acre sliver of land located adjacent and east of the cemetery graveyard, on land that is currently owned by the Eastview Cemetery. The temporary construction easement would only be used to access an existing drainage structure for removal.

In April and September of 2009 Raba-Kistner archeologists conducted an intensive cultural survey of the project area, the result of which were published under separate cover. Although no NRHP-eligible sites were discovered, Raba-Kistner recommended a historic resources investigation be conducted due to the historic age of the multiple box culverts and cemetery. In October 2009 and February 2010 Ecological Communications Corporation (EComm) professional staff surveyed the project APE and documented seven properties containing historic-age resources. One property is recommended as eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion C for Architecture. The remaining sites are recommended as not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places; one property’s status is undetermined due to rights of entry issues and poor visibility. There is no basis for designation of a historic district or rural historic landscape within the project area. The proposed project would have no adverse effect on historic properties under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The County of Bexar (County) proposes to construct improvements to Roland Avenue on the east side of the city of San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas (see Figure 1 for project location). The project would provide new drainage structures at Salado Creek and modify the alignment to reduce the severity of the curves. The improvements would extend from a point approximately 0.27 miles east of the Amity Road intersection to a point approximately one mile west of Sinclair Road. Currently, the existing roadway has two twelve foot wide travel lanes and no shoulders within 60 feet of right-of-way (ROW), and crosses Salado Creek at two points via multiple box culverts. The project would reduce the severity of the curves on Roland Avenue, improve the vertical alignment, and replace the two culvert bridges over Salado Creek with multiple-span bridges. The proposed improvements would also add five foot wide bike lanes and six foot wide sidewalks separated by a one foot wide curb, with an expanded ROW averaging 135 feet. The total length of the proposed project is approximately 0.77 miles. Approximately 5.8 acres of new ROW would be required for the proposed improvements.

PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION
The project area is located within the city of San Antonio, in central Bexar County. The project area is suburban and semi-rural in character, with more recent development at the western terminus of the project area and larger, undeveloped parcels to the east. Land use is a mix of agricultural, residential, and recreational, with scattered commercial and one cemetery.

METHODOLOGY
Area of Potential Effects and Study Area
Although not a Texas Department of Transportation undertaking, project historians decided to use the standard Area of Potential Effect (APE) as it would be defined under Section IX.D(1)b of the December 2005, First Amended Programmatic Agreement for Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU) among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and TxDOT. The APE is therefore 150 feet beyond the proposed ROW boundaries due to an increase in proposed ROW and additional acreage required. The APE includes the full acreage of all parcels of land that partially or wholly fall within the APE. See Figure 2, Project Limits Map, for project limits.
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Figure 1: Project Location Map
(Source: Google Earth)
Field Investigations

With a proposed letting date of 2010, historians adopted a cut-off date for survey of historic-age resources of 1965, providing a five year buffer to accommodate any unexpected potential project delays. In October 2009 Ecological Communications Corporation (EComm) professional staff surveyed the project’s APE. The field survey consisted of:

- Identifying and photographing all pre-1966 buildings, structures, and objects located within the project’s APE.
- Examining associated groupings of buildings, structures, objects, and sites for potential historic districts or rural historic landscapes.
- Keying all identified resources to a survey field map taken from aerial photographs.
- Noting major relevant architectural or engineering features for each identified resource.

Work was performed to ensure compliance with the Antiquities Code of Texas and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended. NHPA compliance is anticipated due to the acquisition of the Nationwide 404 permits related to the Clean Water Act and the involvement of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) Ft. Worth District in accordance with 33 CFR Part 325, Appendix C (Processing Department of Army Permits: Procedures for the Protection of Historic Properties; Final Rule 1990; with current Interim Guidance Document dated June 24, 2002).

In February 2010, in response to Flood Control Capital Improvement Program Office comments, an EComm historian conducted a more thorough examination of one property (Map I.D. 5, the former Fulcher Residence). The second field visit focused on additional photographs of the two buildings on the property and closer examination of building materials, building foundations, and any evidence of historically significant events taking place on the property.

Research Methods

Prior to the field visit, EComm staff examined the Texas Historic Sites Atlas to identify any properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places, State Archeological Landmarks, or designated as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks within 1,300 feet of the APE. EComm staff examined entries in secondary sources to gain a general knowledge of the area’s historical background and various histories of Bexar County, and examined historic maps for additional information on development patterns. Finally, EComm historians contacted the Bexar County Historical Commission and the San
Antonio Historic Preservation Office for information on potential historic properties in the project area, including Eastview Cemetery and South Side Lions Park.

During the second field visit, project historians examined land records at the Bexar County Clerk's office and attempted to trace land ownership back to the time of the primary residence's construction. This research also yielded the names of previous owners, whom historians attempted to identify in the historic record through online searches using internet search engines such as Google and Bing, and online ancestry databases housed at ancestry.com and familysearch.org. Historic census records housed at the Texas State Library were also consulted in an attempt to confirm details unearthed through online research.

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED RESOURCES

National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)
There are no properties listed in or known to be under nomination to the NRHP within 1,300 feet of the APE.

State Archeological Landmarks (SAL)
There are no SAL within 1,300 feet of the APE.

Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL)
There are no RTHL within 1,300 feet of the APE.

Official Texas Historical Markers (OTHM)/Local Historical Markers
There are no OTHM or local historical markers within 1,300 feet of the project area.

TxDOT Bridge Inventories
A search of the TxDOT and FHWA websites revealed that none of the historically significant sections of the Interstate system are within the project APE. Neither of the bridge-class culverts in the project APE have previously been determined eligible by TxDOT.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES EVALUATION CRITERIA
In order to be considered for listing in the NRHP, buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts must meet standards of historic significance defined by the Keeper of the National Register (36 CFR
60). Each property must be evaluated within the framework of its historic context and it must retain characteristics that make it a good representative of properties associated with that aspect of the past. The NRHP Criteria for Evaluation state that:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. Have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

**Criterion A**

A resource that is representative of an important trend or event may be eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A. This broad definition provides flexibility when determining the kinds of significant historical associations. However, a property is not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP simply because it was built during an important era in history or if it fulfilled its historic role. In order for a property to be eligible for Criterion A, it must be significant under one or more defined historic context(s), convey a sense of the past, and remain recognizable to the period in which it was first constructed or achieved significance.

**Criterion B**

Criterion B applies to properties associated with individuals whose specific contributions to history can be identified and documented. However, it is important to determine not only what contributions are associated with the individual and how they compare with those of other persons, but also how the property represents or is linked to that individual and his or her accomplishments. The extent and
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duration of that association is particularly important for determining NRHP eligibility. Moreover, the significance of that person must be associated with the contextual themes defined in this report. Properties significant under NRHP Criterion B should be those most closely associated with a person who has made important contributions to the past, be associated with the person during the time he or she achieved significance, and convey a strong sense of the past and remain recognizable to the period in which the person achieved significance.

Criterion C
Properties eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C derive significance from the physical qualities of their design, construction, and/or craftsmanship, including such elements as architecture, landscape architecture, engineering, and art. To be eligible under Criterion C, a property must embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represent the work of a master; possess high artistic value; or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (a historic district). A property significant under Criterion C is one that clearly represents a noteworthy example of a defined property type, dates from the period of significance of one or more historic context(s), and exhibits the character-defining features of its property type. Therefore, a property must retain a high degree of physical integrity, as well as having a relation to the historic context.

Criterion D
Criterion D deals with the significance of resources that have the potential to yield important information about the past. It is applied most often to archeological resources, but it also may be used to evaluate the significance of extant buildings and structures. Properties significant under this Criterion are those that have the ability to yield important historic information, such as a rare type of construction. In order for these types of properties to be eligible under Criterion D, they must themselves be, or must have been, the principal source of the important information, such as how construction expertise affected the evolution of local building development. Evaluation under Criterion D has been excluded from this report due to the previous archeological survey work conducted by Raba Kistner under separate cover.

Criteria Considerations
On occasion, certain types of resources are also evaluated that are not normally considered eligible for the NRHP. These resources include religious properties, structures moved from original locations,
birthplaces and graves, cemeteries, reconstructed buildings, commemorative properties, and properties achieving significance within the last fifty years. These properties can qualify for inclusion in the NRHP if they meet specific Criteria Considerations, in addition to meeting the regular requirements.

A. A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or

B. A building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most important associated with a historic person or event; or

C. A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life; or

D. A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or

E. A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or

F. A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or

G. A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.²

Seven Aspects of Integrity

In addition to being significant under one or more of the Criteria listed above, a NRHP site must also retain historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance (U.S. Department of the Interior 1998:3). The Keeper of the National Register has identified and defined seven aspects of integrity by which potential candidates for the NRHP must be measured (U.S. Department of the Interior 1998:44-45):

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.

- *Design* is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- *Setting* is the physical environment of a historic property.
- *Materials* are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
- *Workmanship* is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture of people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- *Feeling* is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- *Association* is the direct link between an important historic event, person, or period and a historic property.\(^3\)

Determining which of these aspects of integrity are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where and when the property is significant (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1998:48). For Criteria A or B eligibility, the aspects of location, feeling, setting, and association take on greater importance in determining a property’s integrity. To be eligible under these criteria, a property must be able to clearly convey its significant associations with the historic context. This often requires that a property’s overall environment remain relatively unaltered from its period of significance. Properties eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C must retain a high degree of physical integrity, as well as retain some relation to the historic context. The most important aspects of integrity for Criterion C eligibility are location, design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

At a minimum, a property eligible under Criteria A or B must retain its basic original form that identifies its property type and must be generally recognizable to its period of significance. However, the significance of properties under Criteria A or B is not derived mainly from their design or construction value. Therefore, a greater amount of alteration to a building’s historic physical features is allowable when compared to the more stringent standards set for Criterion C eligibility. Some minor alterations to the physical fabric of the building do not necessarily preclude Criterion C eligibility, although they may result in some loss of integrity. Such acceptable alterations could include replacement of roof materials or replacement of a minority of exterior doors and windows within the original fenestration pattern of the building. In some cases, non-historic outbuildings or

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 44.
landscape features could also be considered acceptable modifications to the property, if they are visually unobtrusive and compatible in design and scale with the original building and its setting. Major changes to a building’s roofline, form, or overall massing are generally considered unacceptable, and would render a building not eligible under NRHP Criteria A, B, and C.

**Rural Historic Landscapes**

The Department of the Interior defines a rural historic landscape as “a geographical area that historically has been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention, and that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features.” They commonly reflect the lives of those engaged in agricultural pursuits such as farming, ranching, or fishing, but not necessarily so. Rural historic landscapes are defined by eleven characteristics:⁴

- **Land use and activities** are the major human forces that shape and organize rural communities.
- **Patterns of spatial organization** define the relationships among major physical components, predominant landforms, and natural features.
- **Responses to the natural environment** are reflected in the siting of buildings, construction materials, and the location of clusters of buildings and structures, as well as traditions in land use, construction methods, and social customs.
- **Cultural traditions** in the form of religious beliefs, social customs, ethnic identity, and trades and skills may be evident today in both physical features and uses of the land.
- **Circulation networks** are systems for transporting people, goods, and raw materials from one point to another, varying in size from footpaths to railroad lines.
- **Boundary demarcations** delineate areas of ownership and land use through the use of fences, walls, tree lines, hedge rows, drainage or irrigation ditches, roadways, creeks, and rivers.
- **Vegetation related to land use** includes not only crops, trees, or shrubs planted for agricultural and ornamental purposes, but also trees that have grown up incidentally along fence lines, beside roads, or in abandoned fields.
- **Buildings, structures, and objects** are the various types of buildings, structures, and objects serve human needs related to the occupation and use of the land.

- *Clusters* are groupings of like features resulting from function, social tradition, climate, or other influences, cultural or natural.

- *Archeological sites* may provide valuable information about the ways the land has been used, patterns of social history, or the methods and extent of activities such as shipping, milling, lumbering, or quarrying.

- *Small-scale elements* such as foot bridges, sign posts, or hay bales add to the historic setting of a rural landscape, and may be characteristic of a region.

Rural historic landscapes follow the same general guidelines for evaluation as other properties under the Criteria, although due to their complex nature they are commonly significant under more than one of the Criteria and may have to meet one or more of the Criteria Considerations depending on the composition of contributing elements. Rural historic landscapes must also retain sufficient integrity to convey their significance. While no landscape will appear exactly as it did during the historic period due to their variable and mutable nature, the landscape must retain the general character and feeling of the historic period. Which aspects of integrity must be retained will vary depending on the reasons behind the landscape's significance, but in general the aspects of *setting, feeling,* and *association* are particularly important.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT AREA

San Antonio and the Eastern Triangle: 1880-1965

Although San Antonio is a very old community with a rich settlement history by various ethnic groups, certain areas on the fringes were sparsely populated ranch land for decades after Texas (and later the United States) took control of the city from Mexico. This began changing in the late nineteenth century, as a second wave of immigrants from Europe – particularly Germans – continued to arrive and settle in communities around the city. Research conducted by project historians points to two primary contexts affecting the historic built environment of the project area: Ranching and Agricultural Development (1880-1965) and Community Planning and Development (1891-1965).

Ranching and Agricultural Development (1880-1960)

The area of San Antonio occupied by the project area rests within a greater geographic region known as the Eastern Triangle, an area primarily devoted to ranching and grazing during the Spanish and Mexican periods prior to Texas independence. In the decades following the United States's annexation of Texas, the area remained lightly populated ranch and grazing land. After the Civil War, however, recent European immigrants from Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Belgium, and Italy began moving in and establishing farmsteads and small community centers such as Boldtville.⁵

Early farms prior to the advent of mechanization were generally small, with field sizes no larger than what a man and mule team could plow in one day. Common crops included grains and vegetables, but on most Texas farms cotton was the preferred crop from the late nineteenth century up through the 1920s. Lucrative and easy to grow in the Texas climate, cotton proved both a blessing and a curse to area farmers. The lure of the cash crop brought thousands of acres under cultivation, but the glut of cotton combined with the threat of the boll weevil contributed to a crash in prices.⁶

With the advent of mechanization starting in the 1920s, field sizes began to grow and a new variety of crops appeared. Burned by cotton, some farmers moved to truck farming, fruit, and vegetables, given the built-in market of San Antonio immediately west. Others picked up dairy farming, and the dairy industry thrived in the area for several decades until pasteurization pushed many smaller dairy farms
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⁵ Residents of the Eastern Triangle, 2008: 21
⁶ Britton, et. al., 2009.
out.\textsuperscript{7} By the mid-twentieth century, however, the housing boom of the 1950s saw much of the local farmland sold to developers for subdivisions. San Antonio annexed large swaths of the Eastern Triangle through the 1950s. Houses soon populated the landscape and only scattered pockets of agricultural land, primarily on the fringes, remained.

\textbf{Community Planning and Development (1891-1965)}

The Eastern Triangle remained outside of the San Antonio city limits for decades after the first European immigrants arrived in the late nineteenth century, but small communities nonetheless developed among the fields and pastures. Sulphur Springs Road (the original name for Roland Avenue) was built sometime in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, stretching from San Antonio to the agricultural areas southeast of the city. Boldtville was one of the first communities to appear, settled in 1891 at the intersection of Sulphur Springs Road and Foster Road. With a general store, school, and churches, it was the primary community center in the area outside of San Antonio itself.\textsuperscript{8} As late as the 1920s, the area immediately west of the project area was still outside of the city limits according to Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps.

In 1923, the Eastview Cemetery Association purchased the land on which some early African-Americans graves existed and turned it into an official cemetery.\textsuperscript{9} South of Sulphur Springs Road, the city of San Antonio began purchasing land from the Brackenridge Estate for use as a landfill in the early 1940s. However, the local Lions Club successfully petitioned the city to relocate the landfill to the north and instead use the purchase as a municipal park.\textsuperscript{10} Once the city began annexing the western edge of the Eastern Triangle in the early 1950s, they began building improvements in the new park along Salado Creek. Sulphur Springs Road became New Sulphur Springs Road, and later was renamed Roland Avenue up to Foster Road as subdivisions appeared in newly annexed agricultural land. By the late 1960s, South Side Lions Park had adopted most of its present configuration and the city limits extended east all the way to what would become Interstate 410.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{7} Residents of the Eastern Triangle, 2008: 22
\textsuperscript{8} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{9} Held, 2009: 18
\textsuperscript{10} http://www.sanantonio.gov/sapar/southsidelionshs.asp
\textsuperscript{11} Residents of the Eastern Triangle, 2008: p. 25-26
SURVEY FINDINGS

Overall Observations/Eligibility Recommendations

The field surveys inventoried a total of 17 resources on seven historic-age properties within the project’s APE. A tabular inventory of all surveyed resources can be found in Appendix A and each identified resource has been keyed to a Resource Location Map, found in Appendix B. Photographs of the surveyed resources, arranged by Map I.D. number, are located in Appendix C. EComm historians use a variety of sources to date and determine the style of surveyed resources, including McAlester & McAlester, Jakle, et. al., Longstreth, National Park Service bulletins, TxDOT publications and guidance, county appraisal records, impromptu interviews with property owners, and professional experience and judgment. When county appraisal district records or other information sources do not provide a construction date for a historic resource, EComm historians use visible evidence and professional judgment to approximate a construction date; all estimated dates are prefixed by “circa” or “ca.”

Residential Resources

Residential properties are often the most common building type encountered during a survey. Most are single-family houses, but residential resources also include multi-family dwellings such as duplexes, townhomes, condos, and apartment buildings. Style and form vary greatly depending on time period and region. Prior to the advent of the railroad, regional differences were far more pronounced, but as transportation and communication methods improved into the twentieth century, national style trends such as Queen Anne and bungalows appeared. The years following World War II saw some of the greatest homogenization of suburban housing stock, as developers undertook building projects en masse to counteract a housing shortage and fuel the “American Dream” of home ownership.

A domestic building can be eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion C if it was constructed prior to 1965 and it retains a significant amount of its architectural integrity; i.e., it should appear almost exactly as it did at the time of construction or when it was sympathetically altered prior to 1965. Significant additions and unsympathetic alterations, such as the application of synthetic siding, replacement of original wooden porch supports with metal ones, and the replacement of wood-sash windows with aluminum sash units, diminish the building’s architectural integrity and make it ineligible for NRHP listing. In addition, a domestic building should be clearly associated with one of
the significant historic themes listed above. Buildings eligible under Criteria A or B should have strong historical associations, but can be altered, and do not even have to be particularly noteworthy examples of an architectural style, form, or type. Four sites identified in the APE contain historic-age residential resources.

Bungalows
A bungalow is a one- or one-and-one-half story house that had its roots in the Indian province of Bengal and achieved great popularity in America during the first three decades of the 20th century. The style was inspired by the work of Charles Sumner Greene and Henry Mather Greene, who practiced in Pasadena, California from 1893 to 1914, and was popularized by furniture maker Gustav Stickley, the leading spokesman of the American Arts and Crafts movement. Stickley worked with architect Harvey Ellis to develop house plans that exemplified his ideas about organic domestic architecture, which he published in his magazine, *The Craftsman*, from 1901 to 1916. Individuals could purchase plans for bungalows from local lumberyards, or they could buy pre-cut kits from Sears Roebuck, Montgomery Ward, Aladdin, and other mail-order catalog companies. Bungalows built after 1930 are typically more modest than those that preceded them as a result of the economic impact of the Great Depression and the influence of the Minimal Traditional style. While they retain the bungalow massing and form, they lack the character-defining decorative features of the style.

Character-defining features of *Craftsman*-influenced bungalows (whether designed or kit built) are a low pitched front-, side- or cross-gabled roof with deep eaves and exposed rafter tails; decorative false beam ends or knee braces under gables; a full- or partial-width porch, supported by battered square columns resting on square masonry piers that extend to ground level; and double-hung windows, typically in groups of two or more. More modest examples lack much of the distinctive ornamentation but commonly retain the exposed rafter tails, overhanging eaves, and simple knee braces. The so-called Southern bungalow is almost exclusively front-gabled with a full width inset or projecting porch. Although most bungalows are front or side-gabled, a few have irregular massing creating unique floor plans. In plan, bungalows are typically divided into two zones by a central load-bearing wall running from front to rear. On one side of the house are the public spaces: the
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17 Weissman, 1988, “Introduction to the Dover Edition,” *Craftsman Bungalows*
parlor, dining room, and kitchen, while on the opposite side are the private spaces: the bedrooms and bath(s). An important characteristic of bungalow-plan houses is that the public spaces open directly into one another and onto the porch, which is treated as an outdoor room.

Survey efforts identified one Craftsman-influenced bungalow in the project area, Map I.D. 6. This 1930 single-story, wood-frame building features horizontal wood siding, replacement metal frame windows, and a replacement standing seam metal on a clipped gable roof (photos 43-47). The house has a small inset porch supported by replacement column faced with stone and topped with decorative iron work. The house has a large rear addition which has been badly damaged by fire. The chain link entry gate is supported by two large stone gate posts with short curving walls. The property is presently vacant. It has no known association with significant historic events, trends, or persons under Criteria A and B. Although a decent example of bungalow architecture in the area and thus marginally significant under Criterion C, the addition, window and porch changes, and substantial fire damage impact integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling to a degree that it is unable to convey its significance. As such, the property is recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Ranch Style Houses
The primary new house type introduced after World War II is the ubiquitous Ranch. The Ranch Style (American Ranch, Western Ranch, or California Rambler) originated in the early-1930s in California loosely following the Spanish Colonial precedents in California filtered through Craftsman bungalow and Prairie house styles that had been widely popular earlier in the 20th century. The style remained largely confined to California until after World War II. A combination of factors led to the popularity of the Ranch Style in its heyday of the 1950s and 1960s: the demand for single-family housing by World War II veterans starting families; the GI Bill; which provided many different types of loans for returning veterans to buy homes; an increase in automobile ownership, which freed workers from the need to live close to public transportation routes; and the strict FHA-VA guidelines under which developers operated in order to be able to market the houses to buyers using FHA and VA government-subsidized mortgages.

Ranch Style houses share these character-defining features:
- Orientation parallel to the street

\[16\] Date of fire damage undetermined, but likely within the past five years based on physical evidence.
\[17\] Ibid., p. 479.
• Asymmetrical facades
• Low pitched gabled or hipped roof
• Large roof overhangs
• Horizontal, rambling layout: long, narrow, and low to the ground
• Rectangular, L-shaped, or U-shaped design
• Large windows: double-hung, sliding, and picture
• Sliding glass doors leading out to patio
• Attached garage
• Simple floor plans
• Emphasis on openness (few interior walls) and efficient use of space
• Wood and/or brick exterior
• Minimal decorative detailing, aside from decorative shutters and ornamental porch supports

Survey efforts identified one Ranch-style residence in the project APE. As part of Map I.D. 3, Granieri Farm, it is discussed below under Agricultural Resources.

Other: Mixed and No Style Cottages
A cottage is a general house type used to describe a variety of basic housing forms. Sometimes referred to as National Folk, cottages may be single or double-pile, one or two story, and square, rectangular, or mass-planned. Stylistic detailing is simple, but sometimes mimics known architectural styles to varying degrees.

Two individual cottages or buildings with mixed architectural styling were identified in the project APE, both at Map I.D. 5. Map I.D. 5A is a large, one-and-one-half-story dwelling built in 1903 of cast-in-place concrete with stucco siding, a mix of four-over-four-light wood-sash and modern aluminum frame windows, and replacement standing seam metal on a hipped gable roof. Two large additions (essentially sunrooms or enclosed patios) are on the east and west sides of the building, respectively (photos 33 and 34). The west addition hides prominent arches on the old exterior west wall of the house (photo 35). Part of the east side of the original building (the main body of the house) appears to have once been a separate detached building (likely a kitchen), but is now connected to the
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18 http://architecture.about.com/od/periodstyles/ig/House-Styles/Ranch-Style.htm
19 Bexar County Tax Appraisal District records
main house via an angular addition (photo 36). The building has four stucco chimneys: three on the
main body of the house, and one on the angular addition.

Map I.D. 5B is a circa 1925 two-story wood-frame and masonry garage or carriage house converted
into living space (photos 37-39). Like the primary building, it features stucco siding, a mix of wood-
sash and aluminum frame windows, and a standing-seam metal hipped gable roof. It has a full-length
one story shed addition made with concrete masonry units (CMU) on the south side, the roof of which
is partially collapsed due to tree fall. Next to the building is a metal tower, likely the remnant of a
windmill (Map I.D. 5C, photo 40), and a concrete slab. Entry to the property is provided by a simple
chain link gate supported by stone masonry gate posts with attached curved walls, one of which has
been partially demolished (Map I.D. 5D, photos 41-42).

Research indicates the previous owners of the property were retired USAF Colonel Stanley A. Fulcher
and his wife, Christina Theis Fulcher. Colonel Fulcher passed in 1997, with Christina passing in 2002.
Deed records on file with the Bexar County Clerk indicate the Fulchers purchased the property in 1970
from AH and Rosie Albrecht, whom acquired the property in 1933 from Groos National Bank. Prior
to this, the property’s land history is not entirely certain, traced to ownership by one “Commercial
Company” which acquired the property sometime in or prior to 1932 from an unknown party.
Additional information provided by the City of San Antonio Historic Preservation Office indicates the
owners prior to the “Commercial Company” were John V. Spring, Jr., and AJ Drake, both of whom
acquired their parts of the land from John V. Spring, Sr., and wife Mary W. Spring in 1922 and 1921,
respectively. The Springs bought the land from one JN Groesbeck in 1904. The acreage and parcel
descriptions mentioned in the deed records prior to 1932 do not entirely match that provided by later
records, but are similar enough such that the information is likely correct. Although the house has a
reported construction date of 1903, it was likely built by the Springs, as Groesbeck did not live on the
property (see below).

Research into the Fulchers indicates they were long-time residents of San Antonio, dating back to the
end of World War II. Colonel Fulcher was involved in Operation Phoenix (a.k.a Phoenix Program)
during the Vietnam War, but was not part of the decision-making process of the controversial
program. Christina Fulcher was a descendent of the Theis family, a large German family with deep
roots in the Eastern Triangle area. Research uncovered no pertinent information on AH Albrecht.
Little information was available on the Springs; John Spring was a physician with an office in San
Antonio, according to 1914-1918 San Antonio City Directories, although only his son was listed in the 1926 city directory (and living at a separate address). Dr. Spring’s residence was listed as “Fieldstone Farm,” although online searches did not reveal any references to such a property, nor is it mentioned in the history of the Eastern Triangle.\textsuperscript{20} JN Groesbeeck was most likely John Norton Groesbeeck, son of noted San Antonio resident John D. Groesbeeck. John Norton was an accomplished businessman himself, involved in the Houston and Texas Central railroad, and helped survey the towns of Thornton, Palmer, Ennis, and part of Corsicana; the town of Groesbeeck was named in his honor. He also reportedly had extensive land holdings across the state.\textsuperscript{21} Upon his return to San Antonio in 1884, he occupied the family home on Dwyer Street in downtown San Antonio until his death in 1916.\textsuperscript{22}

The property does not appear to have any clear association with important historic events or trends under Criterion A. While it may have once been used for ranching or farming, no concrete evidence remains of agricultural activity; city directories referred to the property as Fieldstone Farm at one point, but this name did not come up in any other references, including deed records, online searches, or histories of the area. Historians uncovered no other information on the property that would suggest it once played a significant role in local historic events. Information is available on the Fulchers and the Theis family in general, but none of it suggests Colonel Fulcher or Christina Fulcher rose to the level of historic significance required under Criterion B. Little information is available on the Springs, other than John Spring, Sr., had a medical practice in the city proper. Assuming Spring had any significance in the local medical field, his city office would be the appropriate location for consideration under Criterion B per NRHP guidelines, not his place of residence. John Norton Groesbeeck was arguably significant in the history of San Antonio and the state of Texas, but the property in question was only one of many landholdings, and he did not live on the property; as such, it is not significant for association with Groesbeeck under Criterion B. The house and secondary residence feature some distinctive architectural elements, such as the arches on the original west wall and the tall hipped roof of the main house; however, the property’s primary significance is the concrete construction of the main dwelling. According to City of San Antonio Historic Preservation Officer Kay Hindes\textsuperscript{23}, this type of construction is rare for dwellings of any age in San Antonio but particularly for those built in the first decade of the 20th century and in this part of the city.

\textsuperscript{20} Residents of the Eastern Triangle, 2008

\textsuperscript{21} Johnson, 1914: p. 1157.

\textsuperscript{22} San Antonio Express, 1928.

\textsuperscript{23} Hindes 2010.
Consequently, this property is recommended as eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion C at the local level of significance for Architecture for method of construction. Although the property has undergone numerous changes, sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association remain to convey significance. The contributing resources include the main dwelling, the secondary dwelling, and the stone gateposts. The NRHP boundary coincides with the existing fence defining the yard surrounding the primary and secondary dwelling.

**Agricultural Resources**

Agricultural resources include a variety of buildings, objects, and structures with varying roles in the production of crops and livestock. The form of individual elements, as well as the arrangement of the buildings, fields, fence lines, and vehicular access, often reflects the type of farming or ranching originally practiced. Agricultural resources may also include irrigation facilities. Agricultural resources may be eligible under Criterion A if they have known associations with a historic event, trend, or ethnic group, or under Criterion B for association with a significant person or family. To be considered eligible in the area of Agriculture, they must show a clear association with historic agricultural methods and retain sufficient integrity to convey how such methods were used. Agricultural resources are usually evaluated under Criterion C for the architecture of the primary residence or building for farms and ranches, or for their engineering significance when dealing with irrigation systems. One agricultural site was identified in the APE.

**Subtype: Farmsteads**

The farming industry is widespread in Texas. A farmstead’s structures include the main residence along with outbuildings such as barns, sheds, chicken coops, cribs, outhouses, water tanks, windmills, corral areas, and fields. The type of outbuildings present is generally reflective of the type and method of farming practiced at the farmstead, as well as its general age. Pre-mechanized farming properties will have small fields generally between 10-25 acres and a mule barn, while mechanized farms will have large fields, tractor barns, and a machine shop. Farms without a significant livestock presence will generally not have corrals, water tanks, or other animal support structures such as chicken coops. The architectural style of farmhouses varies but common styles include I-houses, bungalows, double-pile and L-plan cottages, and the Ranch style. Outbuildings, as functional structures, rarely adhere to any particular style; those closest to the farmhouse may mimic or share stylistic elements.
Survey efforts identified one farmstead in the project APE, Map I.D. 3. Known as Granieri Farms, it is a complex consisting of a Ranch style main house (Map I.D. 3F), two secondary houses of indeterminate styling (Map I.D. 3D, 3E), a large gabled barn (Map I.D. 3A), corrals, and several smaller outbuildings that sits approximately 2,000 feet north of the Roland Avenue ROW (see Figure 3 and photos 14-24, Appendix C).

![Figure 3. Granieri Farms. (Source: Google Earth)](image)

The fields surrounding the farmstead are actively cultivated. According to information provided by the City of San Antonio Historic Preservation Office, Granieri Farms has existed in some form since 1925 with the family immigrating to the United States from Italy in the early twentieth century. Once supporting dairy cows, the farm now grows vegetable and other truck farming crops. Conversations with the owners via telephone confirmed the main house and the barn were of historic age, but the owners denied rights of entry to the property for historians to photograph the buildings or make any kind of analysis of their condition and appearance. Due to the distance from the roadway and lack of rights-of-entry, project historians were unable to get a close-up view of the farmstead or its component buildings. Available aerial photography and photographs taken from public right-of-way suggest the
buildings are relatively simple in architectural styling and detailing, with alterations including rear additions and possible replacement windows.

Granieri Farms has strong ties to the agricultural heritage of the project area and is significant under Criterion A at the local level in the area of Agriculture as an example of a working farmstead within the San Antonio city limits. Although the Granieri family has ties to farming, they do not appear to have made a significant contribution to the history of San Antonio beyond what the farmstead itself represents, and are thus not significant under Criterion B. Project historians were unable to examine the buildings and components of the farmstead up close to determine significance under Criterion C due to a denial of rights-of-entry and limited visibility from public right-of-way. For the same reason, a comprehensive assessment of integrity of the property is not possible. Consequently, its NRHP status is undetermined.

**Transportation Resources**

A transportation resource is any building, structure, or object directly related to the movement of people, animals, or goods from one location to another. Most commonly they take the form of roads (vehicular, rail, or pedestrian), bridges, and docks, but may also include specialized buildings or structures such as toll booths, maintenance yards, and depots. According to TxDOT historians, TxDOT does not consider roadways themselves to be NRHP-eligible resources except in specific circumstances, where the roadway is demonstrably significant at the state or national level. Examples of such significant roadways in Texas include the Bankhead Highway and Route 66 (old US Highway 66). As Roland Avenue is not of the level of either example, project historians did not evaluate it for NRHP eligibility.

**Bridges**

Bridges are transportation structures built to support a road (vehicular, rail, and/or pedestrian) over another feature, commonly other roads or bodies of water. They vary greatly in length, composition, design, and appearance. Reinforced concrete and steel are the most common materials used in bridge construction of the past 100 years, but earlier bridges may be iron, steel, or even wood. A bridge or bridge-class culvert can be eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion C if it was determined to be significant by one of the TxDOT-sponsored bridge inventories; or if it is at least 50 years of age and of a rare type, or if it is unusual from an engineering perspective, and retains sufficient integrity to convey its significance.
Survey efforts identified two multiple box culverts in the project APE, Map I.D. 2 and 4 (photos 10-13 and 25-28, respectively). Both are composed of board-formed concrete box culverts, with low scuppered concrete curbing on the south side and a simple metal guard rail on the north side. Concrete wing walls help protect the stream embankments on the upstream (north) side (photo 27). Neither bridge has any kind of identifying marks, numbers, or plaques indicating construction date or the builder/engineer, but given the construction methods and plan, project historians estimate the date of construction around 1950. Neither bridge has any known association with significant historic events, trends, or people under Criteria A and B, and both are simple utilitarian structures with no engineering significance under Criterion C. As such, they are both recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Cemeteries
Cemeteries are collections of graves or burials, commonly marked by stones or other features. They are often delineated from surrounding land through the use of fencing, vegetation, or landscape features such as a hill top. They may be associated with a neighboring religious building, such as a church, or they may be stand-alone features. Markers may include a wide variety of materials, including stone, concrete, metal, wood, or vegetation, and range from simple stones to elaborate works of art. Decoration of graves varies from none or simple such as shells or mounding to large crypts or above-ground mausoleums. Cemeteries with unmarked graves may be recognizable through other features, such as fencing or depressions. Although cemeteries are primarily a means of private or family recognition, they may also embody broader ethnic or community identity that extends beyond the personal sphere.

A cemetery may be considered eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A, B, or C if it meets the significance requirements of the relevant Criteria, retains integrity, and meets the requirements of Criteria Consideration D. Under Criteria Consideration D, the cemetery may be eligible if it garners its chief significance from relative great age, association with historic events, graves of persons of transcendent importance, distinctive design features or potential to yield important information. A cemetery may also be eligible if it is the last vestige of a vanished community, or as a contributing element to a historic district. Cemeteries eligible for listing under Criterion D do not need to meet the requirements of Criteria Consideration D.
Survey efforts identified one cemetery in the project APE: Map I.D. #1, the Eastview Cemetery. The first unmarked burials reportedly date back to the late nineteenth century, although the earliest marked graves date to 1920. The cemetery first existed on land owned by Robinson and Farb families, who later sold it to the Eastview Cemetery Association in 1923. The 15-acre cemetery is laid out in a triangular shape with a rough grid pattern accentuated by a small loop at the east tip. The entrance is off Roland Avenue, flanked by two large square concrete columns topped by squared concrete domes supporting a decorated black steel gate (photo 8). The bulk of the property is surrounded by a simple chain link fence, overgrown in many places with vegetation. Grave markers are primarily concrete and stone and are a mix of commercial and handmade (photos 4-7). Imagery on some handmade markers includes simple drawings, curved lines, and geometric designs. Graves generally face east or west, and some are edged with concrete curbing or covered with concrete slabs (photo 3). Grass grows around and on all graves not covered with concrete, with no evidence of mounding or scraping. Within the cemetery is a mid-twentieth century mausoleum with stone siding and a flat roof (photo 9).

The cemetery has a high number of African-American burials, although it does not appear to be exclusive. African-American cemeteries differ from Anglo cemeteries in several regards, primarily in what cemeteries represent for African-American communities. As opposed to permanent monuments to death or even statements in defiance of it, African-American graveyards tend to be more simply places to bury loved ones or kin. Notions of permanence or limited space are foreign beliefs; “There is always room for one more person,” in the words of one South Carolinian.\(^{24}\) Also, grave markers tend to be more temporary, with less emphasis on where a particular grave may be and more simply on the overall location of the cemetery. They are not maintained to the degree that Anglo cemeteries are, and landscaping tends to be natural. As a result, such cemeteries tend to contain many unmarked graves and may appear abandoned or unkempt to the casual, outside observer.

Hand-made markers represent “the last significant survival of the southern folk tombstone tradition in Texas today,” according to cultural geographer Terry Jordan.\(^{25}\) The unmarked graves and lack of decoration are typical of folk African-American cemeteries. However, most graves are well marked, and modern commercial stones appear to outnumber the hand-made markers. The cemetery remains in use and is actively maintained by the cemetery association. Two prominent residents of the

cemetery include Reverend Alexander Carver Sutton (1919-2002) and Charles Bellinger (1875-1937). Rev. Sutton was a godson of Dr. George Washington Carver, and an active member of San Antonio’s African-American population. He served on the board of the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, operated the city’s first African-American-owned toy shop, and a major investor in Inner City Broadcasting Corporation. Bellinger was a prominent early entrepreneur in the city, running numerous saloons and gambling houses, and was an accomplished gambler himself. He was convicted of tax fraud and evasion, but was later pardoned by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.  

Although Eastview Cemetery has associations with the local African-American community under Criterion A, and nominal association with important historic persons under Criterion B, in order to be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP it must meet the requirements of Criterion Consideration D, as noted above. The cemetery is not of any great age, especially compared to the age of San Antonio itself, nor is it associated with specific important historic events. It is not noteworthy for its design, and its information potential appears to be no greater than any other cemetery. It does contain graves of known local persons, but Criteria Consideration D requires such graves to be of persons of transcendent importance. While both Rev. Sutton and Bellinger made their marks on San Antonio history, they did not rise to the level of significance required under the Criteria Consideration. As such, Eastview Cemetery does not meet the requirements of Criteria Consideration D and is therefore recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Recreational Resources

Recreational resources are buildings, structures, objects, or districts designed for recreational use and amusement, or for the advancement and pursuit of cultural endeavors. Theaters, concert halls, fairgrounds, city parks, man-made lakes, and art objects are all examples of recreational or cultural resources. The types of buildings, structures, and objects present in a particular location will vary with its use as will the size and boundaries of the resource.

Survey efforts identified one recreational resource, the South Side Lions Park East (Map I.D. 7). The City of San Antonio park was established in honor of the South Side Lions Club which successfully petitioned the city to use nearly 350 acres of land it had newly acquired in 1944 from the Brackenridge

26 Held, 2009: 18
estate for a community park rather than a landfill. In 1953, 22 acres were given over to the San Antonio Independent School District for construction of a new high school, and in 1956 a picnic area was established along Salado Creek. The city bought the remainder of the Brackenridge estate in 1964 to add to the park and bringing it up to its present size, with improvements mainly built through the remainder of the 1960s.\(^\text{27}\) The park contains recreational, playground, and picnic facilities along with a small artificial lake (photos 48-50). South Side Lions Park has no known association with significant historic events, trends, or people under Criteria A or B, and is not a particularly noteworthy example of landscape or park design under Criterion C. As such, it is recommended **not eligible** for listing in the NRHP.

**RURAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPE EVALUATION**

According to the “National Register Bulletin: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes (#30),” a rural historic landscape is a “geographical area that historically has been used by people or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention and that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features.”\(^\text{28}\). The land now traversed by the project area was outside of the San Antonio city limits prior to World War II. Since annexation, it has undergone significant change in areas, from establishment of a park and several private residences. Portions of it remain rural, but they are pockets contained within a larger suburban area. The establishment of the park and added elements of housing and associated infrastructure diminish the rural landscape to a degree that it no longer serves as an example of a rural historic landscape.

**POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO NRHP-LISTED OR ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES**

There is one NRHP-eligible resource within the APE of the proposed undertaking: Map I.D. #5. As shown in Figure 4, the proposed roadway would increase in width by 10 feet due to the addition of bicycle lanes, and have curb-and-gutter edge instead of the current drainage ditches. No new ROW would be taken from the property. Figure 5 shows the relationship of the property to the existing (blue) and proposed (red) ROW. The proposed undertaking will not diminish the qualities that make

\(^{27}\) [http://www.sanantonio.gov/sapar/southsidelionshis.asp](http://www.sanantonio.gov/sapar/southsidelionshis.asp)

the property eligible for NRHP listing; specifically, the concrete construction of the primary dwelling. Consequently, the project will have no adverse effect on this resource.

Figure 4. Existing and Proposed Typical Sections.
The Granieri Farm (Map I.D. #3) was unable to be fully evaluated due to rights-of-entry issues. Assuming for the purposes of determining effects under Section 106 that the property is eligible with all seven Aspects of Integrity intact, no buildings would be impacted by the proposed project and the required right-of-way from the farm’s fields would be minimal. The proposed action would not sufficiently impact any of the Aspects of Integrity, and the property would still retain its ability to convey its significance. As such, project historians recommend that if the Granieri Farm were eligible, the proposed action would have **no adverse effect** on the property.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>PROPERTY TYPE/ SUBTYPE</th>
<th>FORM/PLAN</th>
<th>STYLISTIC INFLUENCE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ALTERATIONS/ COMMENTS</th>
<th>NRHP ELIGIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | 3530 Roland Ave  
UTM 555613E 3251562N | FUNERARY/ cemetery | Informal | No Style | c. 1890/1923 | Eastview Cemetery, historically African-American and still in active use. Mix of modern and historic graves and headstones. | Not Eligible |
| 2      | Salado Creek branch west at Roland Ave  
UTM 555961E 3251403N | TRANSPORTATION/ culvert | Linear/ NA | No Style | c. 1950 | NBI data for structure not available | Not Eligible |
| 3      | 3851 Roland Ave  
UTM 555263E 3251389N | AGRICULTURE/ farmstead |       |       | Known as Granieri Farms. Visibility limited from public right-of-way. | Undetermined |
| 3A     | Barn | Side gabled roof/ open plan | No Style | c. 1945 |
| 3B     | Shed | Flat roof/ rectangular plan | No Style | c. 1950 |
| 3C     | Single dwelling | Side gabled roof/ rectangular massed plan | No style | c. 1935 |
| 3D     | Secondary dwelling | Side gabled roof/ rectangular massed plan | No style | c. 1935 |
| 3E     | Secondary dwelling | Side gabled roof/ rectangular massed plan | No style | c. 1935 |
| 3F     | Secondary dwelling | Side gabled roof/ rectangular massed plan | Ranch | c. 1945 |
| 3G     | Shed | Flat roof/ rectangular plan | No Style | c. 1950 |
| 3H     | Shed | Front gabled roof/ open plan | No Style | c. 1950 |
| 4      | Salado Creek branch east at Roland Ave  
UTM 556527E 3251354N | TRANSPORTATION/ culvert | Linear/ NA | No Style | c. 1950 | NBI data for structure not available | Not Eligible |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP ID</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>PROPERTY TYPE/ SUBTYPE</th>
<th>FORM/PLAN</th>
<th>STYLISTIC INFLUENCE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ALTERATIONS/ COMMENTS</th>
<th>NRHP ELIGIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5A     | 4102 Roland Avenue  
UTM 556788E 3251232N | DOMESTIC/ vacant | Irregular roof/ irregular massed plan | Mixed | 1903 | Multiple side and rear additions, some replacement windows, replacement roof. | Eligible (C) |
| 5B     |          | Secondary dwelling | Hipped roof/ rectangular massed plan | Mixed | c. 1925 | Boarded and/or missing windows, some replacement; CMU shed addition on rear. | |
| 5C     |          | Tower | Truss/ square base | No Style | c. 1925 | Missing top component, likely windmill remains | |
| 5D     |          | Wall | Linear/ NA | Rustic | c. 1925 | Damage east of main gate | |
| 6A     | 4131 Roland Ave  
UTM 556873E 3251231N | DOMESTIC/ vacant | Irregular roof/ bungalow plan | Craftsman-influenced | 1930 | Metal roof, replacement windows and porch posts; rear of house damaged by fire. | Not Eligible |
| 6B     |          | Wall | Linear/ NA | Rustic | c. 1930 | | |
| 7      | Pecan Valley Drive  
UTM 555424E 3250921N | RECREATION/ park | Informal | No Style | 1944/ 1953/ 1964 | East Side Lions Park; most of the park amenities date to 1960 or later. | Not Eligible |
Map I.D. #: 1
Site Location: 3530 Roland Ave
UTM Coordinates: 14 555613, 3251562
Function/use: FUNERARY/ cemetery
Date: c. 1890/ 1923
Style/form: No Style/ NA
NRHP eligibility: Not eligible
Comments: Eastview Cemetery, historically African-American and still in active use. Contains a mix of modern and historic graves and headstones.

Photo 1: Aerial view of Eastview Cemetery facing west.
Photo 2: General view of cemetery facing southeast.

Photo 3: General view of cemetery facing southwest.
Map I.D. #1 (continued)

Photo 4: View of grave stone in cemetery facing southeast.

Photo 5: View of grave stone in cemetery facing southwest.
Map I.D. #1 (continued)

Photo 6: View of grave stone in cemetery facing southwest.

Photo 7: View of grave stone in cemetery facing northwest.
Photo 8: View of cemetery gates facing west.

Photo 9: View of mausoleum facing northwest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map I.D. #</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location:</td>
<td>Salado Creek branch west at Roland Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM Coordinates:</td>
<td>14 555961, 3251403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/use:</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION/ culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style/form:</td>
<td>No Style/ linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP eligibility:</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>No NBI data available for site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo 10: Culvert approach facing southeast.
Map I.D. #2 (continued)

Photo 11: View facing southeast.

Photo 12: View facing northwest.
Map I.D. #2 (continued)

Photo 13: Culvert approach facing northwest.
Map I.D. #: 3
Site Location: 3851 Roland Avenue
UTM Coordinates: 14 556263, 3251389
Function/use: AGRICULTURE/ farmstead
Date: c. 1925/1945
Style/form: No Style/ Various
NRHP eligibility: Not eligible
Comments: Known as "Granieri Farms". Visibility limited from public right-of-way. Rights of entry denied by owners.

Photo 14: Aerial view facing north.
Photo 15: View facing north.

Photo 16: Aerial view facing north.
Map I.D. #3B

Photo 17: Aerial view facing north.
Map I.D. #3C, D, E

Photo 18: View facing north.

Photo 19: Aerial view facing north.
Photo 20: View facing north.

Photo 21: Aerial view facing north.
Photo 22: Aerial view facing north.
Photo 23: View facing north.

Photo 24: Aerial view facing north.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map I.D. #:</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Location:</td>
<td>Salado Creek branch east at Roland Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM Coordinates:</td>
<td>14 556527, 3251354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/use:</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION/ culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style/form:</td>
<td>No Style/ linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP eligibility:</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>No NBI data available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo 25: Culvert approach facing southeast.
Photo 26: View facing northwest.

Photo 27: View facing southeast.
Photo 28: Culvert approach facing northwest.
Map I.D. #: 5
Site Location: No address
UTM Coordinates: 14 556778, 3251232
Function/use: DOMESTIC/ vacant
Date: 1903/ c. 1925
Style/form: Mixed/ Irregular hipped roof
NRHP eligibility: Eligible, C
Comments: Multiple side and rear additions, some replacement windows, replacement roof. Property eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture for its rare method of construction.

Photo 29: Aerial view facing south.
Map I.D. #5A

Photo 30: View facing southwest.

Photo 31: View facing southeast.
Photo 32: View facing northwest.

Photo 33: View facing west.
Photo 34: View facing northeast.

Photo 35: View inside of west addition, facing east.
Photo 36: View facing north.
Photo 37: View facing southwest.

Photo 38: View facing southeast.
Photo 39: View facing north
Photo 40: View facing south.
Map I.D. #5D

Photo 41: View facing southwest.

Photo 42: View facing southeast.
Map I.D. #: 6
Site Location: 4131 Roland Ave
UTM Coordinates: 14 556873, 3251231
Function/use: DOMESTIC/ vacant
Date: c. 1930
Style/form: Craftsman-influenced/ gabled roof
NRHP eligibility: Not eligible
Comments: Replacement windows, porch posts, and roofing; severe fire damage to rear of building.

Photo 43: Aerial view facing north.
Photo 44: View facing northwest.

Photo 45: View facing northeast.
Photo 46: View facing northeast.

Photo 47: View facing northwest.
Map I.D. #: 7
Site Location: Pecan Valley Drive
UTM Coordinates: 14 555424, 3250921
Function/use: RECREATION/ park
Date: 1944/ 1953/ 1964
Style/form: No Style/ NA
NRHP eligibility: Not eligible
Comments: East Side Lions Park. Most amenities built in the 1960s and later.

Photo 49: View facing west.

Photo 50: View facing southeast.