

FAIRHOPE HISTORIC DISTRICTS UPDATES, 2015
Fairhope, Baldwin County, Alabama

Historic Resource Assessment

Location: Fairhope, Baldwin County, Alabama
USGS: Daphne

Consultant: David B. Schneider
Historic Preservation Consultant
411 E. 6th Street
Anniston AL 36027
June 1, 2015

I. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the current condition of resources within the Fairhope Downtown, Fairhope Bayfront, White Avenue, and Montrose Historic Districts and to 1) identify changes that have occurred with the district since they were listed in the National Register of Historic Places; 2) record information regarding changes to individual resources; 3) to make recommendations regarding individual resources with respect to their status as contributing or noncontributing resources within the districts; and 4) to make any other recommendations regarding the district based on current conditions

II. Methodology

1) Literature and Records Review

Prior to undertaking survey fieldwork, SHP reviewed the following records: i. Properties listed in the National Register; ii. Properties formally determined eligible for listing by the Keeper of the National Register; iii. Properties that the SHPO/THPO certifies are in the process of being nominated to the National Register; iv. Properties previously determined eligible as part of a consensus determination of eligibility between the SHPO/THPO and a Federal Agency or local government representing the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); and v. Properties listed in the SHPO/THPO Inventory that the SHPO/THPO has previously evaluated and found to meet the National Register criteria, and that are identified accordingly in the SHPO/THPO Inventory.

2) Field Inventory

Reconnaissance level historic sites surveys were completed of the historic districts in order to update information about each individual resource. In addition, reconnaissance level historic sites survey work was completed in areas adjacent to the project study area in order to determine any possible boundary adjustments that might be recommended for each district. For each resource, a "Historic Survey Update Form" was completed and one or more high resolution digital photos were taken.

Information regarding each individual resource was recorded on a Historic Sites Survey Update Form that was completed for each resource.

Digital photographs have been provided for all resources within the historic district as well as representative streetscapes.

A new base map of the district was prepared based on information available from the Baldwin County Assessor's office.

III. Findings

Fairhope Downtown Historic District

Listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2006.

12% of resources lost or altered to the point where they would no longer be considered contributing resources to the district.

The boundaries of the historic district, as listed, included a number of noncontributing resources and a proposed revised boundary is included in the map for this report that deletes a number of noncontributing resources. In addition, a number of resources are located within the district boundaries that were not included in the inventory.

Category	No.	% All
Resources not Recorded, Noncontributing:	12	9.4%
Demolished, Replaced with Modern Building:	4	3.1%
Demolished, Site Vacant:	1	0.8%
Reclassify as Contributing:	5	3.9%
Reclassify as Noncontributing:	9	7.1%
Unchanged:	96	75.6%
	127	

1988: 111 Resources: Contributing: 61 (50.5%); Noncontributing: 39 (49.5%)
2015: 126 Resources: Contributing: 58 (46.0%); Noncontributing: 68 (54.0%);
1 Demolished, Site Vacant

Period of Significance: 1900-1952

Recommended Period of Significance: 1900-1955

Work Products Transmitted with This Report:

Downtown HD Survey 2015 (PDF file)
Downtown HD Map, 2015 (PDF file)
Downtown HD Map, 1988 (PDF file)
Downtown Photographs, 2015 (JPEG files)

Fairhope Bayfront Historic District

Listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1988.

Note: The inventory numbered contributing and noncontributing resources separately and a number of existing resources were not included in the inventory. The survey forms for this project are therefore numbered as follows: 1-118 are resources that were listed as contributing in 1988; NC01-NC39 are resources that were listed as noncontributing in 1988; and AD01-AD17 are resources that were not recorded in 1988.

22% of resources lost or altered to the point where they would no longer be considered contributing resources to the district.

Category	No.	% All
Demolished, Replaced with Modern Building:	21	12.1%
Demolished, Site Vacant:	5	2.9%
Reclassify as Contributing:	14	8.0%
Reclassify as Noncontributing:	12	6.9%
Unchanged:	105	60.3%
Added, Not Recorded in 1988, Contributing:	5	6.9%
Added, Not Recorded in 1988, Noncontributing:	12	6.9%
	174	100.0%

1988: 157 Resources: Contributing: 118 (75.2%); Noncontributing: 39 (24.8%)
2015: 169 Resources: Contributing: 124 (73.4%); Noncontributing: 45 (26.6%)

Period of Significance: 1894-1938

Recommended Period of Significance: 1900-1954

Work Products Transmitted with This Report:

Bayfront HD Survey 2015 (PDF file)
Bayfront HD Map, 2015 (PDF file)
Bayfront HD Map, As Listed 1988 (PDF file)
Bayfront Photographs, 2015 (JPEG files)

White Avenue Historic District

Listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1988.

50% of resources lost or altered to the point where they would no longer be considered contributing resources to the district.

Category	No.	% All
Demolished, Replaced with Modern Building:	2	25.0%
Reclassify as Noncontributing:	2	25.0%
Unchanged:	4	50.0%
	8	100.0%

1988: 8 Resources were classified as contributing
2015: 8 Resources: Contributing: 4 (50.0%); Noncontributing: 4 (50.0%)

Period of Significance: 1915-1935
Recommended Period of Significance: 1915-1935

Work Products Transmitted with This Report:

White Avenue HD Survey 2015 (PDF file)
White Avenue HD Map, 2015 (PDF file)
White Avenue Photographs, 2015 (JPEG files)

Montrose Historic District

Listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1976.

43% of resources lost or altered to the point where they would no longer be considered contributing resources to the district.

Category	No.	% All
Demolished, Replaced with Modern Building:	7	16.0%
Reclassify as Noncontributing:	4	8.0%
Unchanged:	16	32.0%
Added, Not Recorded in 1976, Contributing:	1	2.0%
Added, Not Recorded in 1976, Noncontributing:	21	42%
	49	

1976: 28 Resources were not classified as contributing or noncontributing
2015: 49 Resources: Contributing: 17 (34.7%); Noncontributing: 32 (65.3%)

Period of Significance: 1900-1952

Recommended Period of Significance: 1900-1955.

Work Products Transmitted with This Report:

Montrose HD Survey 2015 (PDF file)

Montrose HD Map, 2015 (PDF file)

Montrose Photographs, 2015 (JPEG files)

Qualification Statement

COMPLIANCE WITH 36 CFR 61

David B. Schneider

Mr. Schneider meets the requirements of Professional Qualifications A, History, and C, Architectural History:

A: Master of Arts Degree, History, Middle Tennessee State University, 1981; 34 years of professional experience in research, writing, and interpretation of local and regional history, including: 34 years as a full and part time historical consultant; 1 year as Director of the Berkeley County Historical Society Museum, a local history museum; 5 years as the Executive Director of the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County (PA); 4 years as Executive Director of the Historic Beaufort Foundation (SC); and 4 years as Executive Director and Senior Director of Preservation Services of the Alabama Trust for Historic Preservation.

C: Master of Arts Degree, History (primary emphasis in Historic Preservation), Middle Tennessee State University, 1981; 34 years of professional experience in historic preservation planning and administration including extensive experience with historic district surveys, registration, ordinances, and design review. Mr. Schneider has successfully completed a diverse range of projects for both private and public sector clients in fourteen states and one other country, specializing in community preservation planning, design review in historic districts, historic resource documentation, and the certification of projects for historic rehabilitation tax credits.

