

To: Historic Resources Management Commission

From: College Park Historic District Survey Update Subcommittee (Herbert, Lowry, Sosnick)

With regard to the College Park question:

1. College Park was twice recognized as an historic district by city surveys accepted by the HRMC and City Councils. Those councils wisely viewed College Park as a “key” that locks the City to the Campus the University Farm, without which the City would be a Dixon;
2. Through confusion, focus on other issues, or inattention, it was dropped from the last City survey as a district;
3. No affirmative action was taken by the HRMC or City Council to remove the College Park district as a city historic resource.

Therefore, the Commission considered it unnecessary to have a formal survey done to determine if College Park is an historic district – previous commissions and councils have already determined that it is. Therefore the HRMC formed a subcommittee of three members to review the previous documentation and complete a status check to determine whether the existing district has retained sufficient integrity to retain its status, the City having already invested in inventory and evaluation efforts sufficient for the district’s original evaluation and determination of eligibility, and subsequent recognition as a district by earlier HRMCs and City Councils.

Your subcommittee undertook an investigation of the current condition of the contributors to the College Park Historic District as described in our 1996 survey. Commissioners Herbert and Lowry walked the district and compared the current condition of buildings listed within the district to the descriptions provided in 1996.

There are 43 buildings / parcels inventoried in the 1996 survey. At that time only two were called out as currently under alteration or heavily altered. The following table summarizes the current situation:

Address	Comparative Status to 1996	Notes
10	Heavily altered	Large addition to south (on Russell) replacement windows
16	Replacement	Chancellor’s Residence new since 1996; appropriate in scale and massing
17	Unchanged	Park
18	Altered	Replacement porch shelter, metal siding, large garage addition
20	Heavily altered	Heavily altered garage doors, large addition, changes to dormers
21	Unchanged	
24	Unchanged	
25	Slightly altered	Windows modernized using false muntins

26	Heavily altered	Large additions, new bay windows, etc.
27	Unchanged	
28	Altered	Replacement porch shelter (gable to hip); raised metal seam roofing over porch and bay
29	Unchanged	
30	Unchanged	
31	Unchanged	
32	Unchanged	
33	Unchanged	
34	Heavily altered	Altered windows and surrounds, Commission Lowry believes contributes no less than the original despite the changes.
35	Unchanged	
36	Unchanged	
38	Unchanged	
40	Heavily altered	Altered siding, windows, etc.
42	Unchanged	
44	Unchanged	
46	Appears slightly altered	Replacement windows?
47	Unchanged	
48	Replacement bldg.	New building, appropriate in scale and massing
49	Unchanged	
50	Unchanged	Probably should not be a contributor owing to alterations prior to 1996
51	Unchanged	
52	Altered	Principal window modernized, but appropriately
53	Unchanged	
54	Unchanged	
55	Altered	Major addition on north side; original main residence essential intact.
56	Unchanged	
58	Unchanged	
59	Unchanged	
60	Unchanged	
61	Unchanged	
62	Heavily altered	Undergoing current heavily alterations; other alterations since 1996
63	Unchanged	
64	Unchanged	
65	Unchanged	
66	Unchanged	
68	Replacement	New building since 1996; appropriate in scale and massing.
70	Unchanged	

In addition, there is a continuity of the District's landscape, including the many of the original trees, parking strip, and a number of gravel driveways that add so much to the sense of time and place, overall setting and feeling of the District. This is also true of the little park that remains at the south end of the main loop, although it may have had more features in it originally.

Seven of the 43 are replacements or heavily altered, and thus would not be considered contributors to the district, although even the heavily altered structures have retained at least some of their original features and keep, for the most part, their massing and scale. Therefore, the ratio of contributors to non-contributors is 7:43, or 16% non-contributors and 84% contributors. The ratio is quite favorable for districts such as College Park, therefore we do not consider the level of alterations to be sufficient to change the status of the district. Furthermore, a number of the houses should be considered as Landmarks or Merit Resources based on their architectural value; further research would determine if individual buildings had significance under other City criteria (association with events, or persons).