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Central Hammond Historic Structures Survey Report
PROJECT SUMMARY

BACKGROUND
The Central Hammond Historic Structures Survey (Heretofore known as the “Central Hammond Survey”) began fieldwork in October 2017. The project was funded by the LA State Historic Preservation Office (LASHPO) Historic Preservation Grant 2017-18 and the Hammond Downtown Development District (HDDD). The City of Hammond via the Hammond Historic District Commission (HHDC) provided project support as well.

This undertaking was spurred on by recent losses in Hammond’s historic fabric. The city’s connection to a growing Southeastern Louisiana University pushes development forward and brings new economic success. This is evident as it is increasingly impacting the historic architectural landscape. There is an average of 30 demolitions per year of both commercial and residential structures1 (Figures 1 - 3). A few potentially significant buildings were demolished just over the course of this survey. While this observation is difficult to quantify, employees of the City of Hammond Building Department who issue permits for demolitions and new constructions confirm that they’ve noted this trend. In a smaller community like Hammond, changes like this make for a big impact.

OBJECTIVES
The goal of the survey was to document approximately 1,400 structures/parcels in order to construct an accurate visualization of Hammond’s built environment. A relatively small swath was surveyed previously. The Hammond Historic District Survey in 1981 documented less than 200 structures and the Adams-Lillie Neighborhood Survey in 2014 documented 89 structures.

The scope of this project will begin to document the dense residential surrounding those previous surveys.

The information in this survey will be used in two ways: for recognition and as a reference tool. Proliferating and expanding upon the documented information will ideally help redirect the community’s economic success toward restoration instead of demolition/new construction, either through tax incentives or a sense of community pride.

Some recognition is achieved directly through this project as the Central Hammond Survey will have one entry per structure in the Louisiana Historic Resources Inventory on the LASHPO’s website. The mapped feature on the website provides access for a larger demographic.

---

1 “Demolition Permit Records - (01/01/2015 - 12/31/2017).” City of Hammond Building Department. 23 May 2018.
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

THE CITY OF HAMMOND

Originally a part of Livingston Parish, Louisiana, Hammond is Tangipahoa Parish’s largest municipality. Situated close to the northwestern shore of Lake Pontchartrain, the city is named for Peter Hammond, a Swedish immigrant who was the first to settle the area c. 1820. Hammond at that time was a dense pine forest. Peter established a successful lumber products business out of this wealth of resources.

Not many joined Peter to settle this area until after 1854, when Peter successfully lobbied the Illinois Central Railroad to build their railway through Hammond. This established “Hammond Crossing” as a water stop on the way to New Orleans.

This is what drew Charles Emory “C.E.” Cate to the region in the 1860s. Cate’s shoe factory in New Orleans was suffering due to the Civil War’s economic climate. In search of an alternative location to grow his industry, he found potential in Hammond Crossing. Cate purchased a significant amount of land from Peter, who died in 1870. Cate had this property surveyed and platted, finally incorporating the Town of Hammond in 1889 as the railroad completed construction. Because of this, he essentially was the founder of Hammond’s economic development and city landscape.

Advertisements touting the local climate's positive effect on soil quality brought families down the Illinois Central RR to settle the area and expand the agricultural industry. Hammond was lauded “Queen City of the Ozone Belt” and this led to the “Strawberry Boom” – Hammond’s next major industry after the depletion of the pine forest. In the early twentieth century Hammond was known as the “Strawberry Capital of America.” Boxcar loads of the produce were shipped north, aided by the invention of the refrigerated railcar.

In the Great Depression, industry stagnated nationwide and Hammond was not immune. Strawberry production lessened accordingly and Hammond’s population took the only dip in its history to date.

Emerging from World War II, Hammond again followed the national trend and the population swelled. This time it was out of the connection to Southeastern Louisiana University (Southeastern). The G.I. Bill of 1944 encouraged WWII veterans to buy housing and go to college by offering affordable mortgage rates and stipends for tuition. Southeastern prospered with the financial aid available through this legislation.

Currently, Hammond still grows at a steady rate. The current population is 20,480 and the median age of 26.8 years old. National median age was 37.9 in 2016, which is over 39%

---

higher than Hammond. This discrepancy reflects the dominance Southeastern’s student population still has over the city’s demographic and economy.

MAJOR ERAS OF DEVELOPMENT
To summarize the industries that have most influenced Hammond’s development, below is a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUMBER PRODUCTS</td>
<td>1820s – 1870s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAILROAD DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>1880s – 1930s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE STRAWBERRY BOOM</td>
<td>1890s – 1940s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1950s – Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING
As previously mentioned, the Central Hammond Survey was financed by the Hammond Downtown Development District and matching funds from the Division of Historic Preservation’s Historic Preservation Fund Survey Grant executed through the LASHPO:

“Each year DHP distributes an allocation of federal funds for Survey and Planning projects through a competitive grants process. The grants are focused on ongoing state and federally mandated programs and initiatives that are outlined in the Louisiana Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan and include regional, parish, and local historic standing structure surveys of properties fifty years and older.”

The grant was awarded August 9th, 2017 and the contract was signed in September 20th, 2017. Project end date was June 30th, 2018. Per the grant application, there was “an established goal of approximately 1,400 structures [to] be surveyed, dependent on time and budget.” The “organization and analysis of survey data into a comprehensive report” was a second defined deliverable.

SURVEYORS
As necessitated by the grant structure, a Project Supervisor oversaw the distribution of grant funds. This role was fulfilled by the HHDC’s Administrative Director, Leah B. Solomon. Solomon also volunteered in-kind hours to contribute to survey work per the terms of the grant.

A Secretary of the Interior Qualified Lead Surveyor was hired to manage the survey process and delegate survey work – Kelly Calhoun, Calhoun Preservation, LLC. She began work on October 5th, 2017.

Amanda Coleman, a current candidate for the Tulane University Master of Preservation Studies degree, was brought as the Project Assistant in February 2018.

Volunteer Surveyors contributed in varying capacities throughout the project timeline. The volunteers were predominantly interested local citizens and alumni of the Master of Preservation Studies program at Tulane University.

RECORDING INFORMATION
Part of the grant funding requirements was that surveyors utilize the Louisiana Historic Resources Inventory form (LHRI form) as well as provide mapping files for LASHPO to include on the Louisiana Historic Resources Survey.

The Louisiana Historic Resources Survey:
“is an ongoing, statewide survey designed to uniformly collection information about buildings, sites, structures, and objects of historical, architectural, and cultural significance. This information is used to assess eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and for other statewide preservation activities.”

To standardize statewide survey information, the same LHRI form is used. The current form is below. Surveyors prioritized materials data as well as information on elements not visible in photos (such as outbuildings).

Surveyors were made aware of the above updated form from the LASHPO in April 2018. Prior to that time, the form below was used to survey the data.

---

SURVEY BOUNDARIES
The Central Hammond Survey was established with the approximate boundary illustrated in the map below. The area within this boundary has a roughly 1,400 structures.

These boundary lines were established via a “windshield survey”\textsuperscript{8} of the more densely populated portions of Hammond - aka “Central Hammond.”

The boundary of the Central Hammond Survey follows:

Begin corner of E. University Ave (LA Hwy 3234) & N. Oak St.
South on N. Oak St.
West on W. Dakota St.
North on N. General Pershing St.
West on W. University Ave. (LA Hwy 3234)
South on Pecan St.
West on W. Church St.
South on Carter St.
East on W. Morris Ave. (US Hwy 190)
South on Mooney Ave.
East on W. Coleman Ave.
South on N. Cypress St.
East on E. Park Ave.
South on S. Cherry St.
East on E. Iowa Ave.
North on Range Rd.
West on E. St. Thomas St. (US Hwy 190)
North on N. Chestnut St.
West on E. Church St.
North on N. Holly St.
East on E. Robinson St.
North on Martin Luther King Ave.
East on E. Dakota St.
North on N. Cherry St. (Hwy 1065)
West on E. University Ave. (Hwy 3234)

There are a couple of exclusions within the boundaries highlighted above. One exclusion is the Hammond Historic District and another is the Adams-Lillie neighborhood. They are not included in the survey data because these areas were surveyed previously.

Also excluded in the Central Hammond Survey is Southeastern Louisiana University’s campus. This is because the survey focused on historic neighborhoods. Also, Southeastern’s

\textsuperscript{8} A “windshield survey” is an observation of historic significance made by car. This is an informal survey done to prepare formal survey boundaries. Using a vehicle to traverse a large area in a relatively short amount of time, the surveyor can see where density of historic structures thins and places a boundary line accordingly.
administration would need to be involved in the process if their land was included, which could complicate the process. While this tract was not covered in this project, it is a goal of the HHDC to survey the area in the future.
HISTORIC HAMMOND NEIGHBORHOODS

Within the survey boundaries are five definable districts/neighborhoods. Changes in Hammond’s architectural trends and why certain neighborhoods formed assist in understanding the architecture of the surveyed inventory. The boundaries of these neighborhoods are roughly outlined below and summaries of each neighborhood’s development follows.

Revealed in the Central Hammond Survey data is the makeup of three of Hammond’s key historic neighborhoods - Hyer-Cate, the Iowa Addition, and College Park/University Place. To further understand the development of these areas, also included here are short histories of the two other previously documented historic districts - the Hammond Historic District and the Adams-Lillie neighborhood.

Base map courtesy of Google Maps
HAMMOND HISTORIC DISTRICT (DOWNTOWN)
PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE:
c. 1880 - c. 1940
PREDOMINANT ARCHITECTURAL STYLES:
Decorative Brick, Commercial Row, Classical Revival, Art Deco

This section of the city is a largely commercial district with some historic residential properties at the west end. When the railroad was completed in the 1890s, the historic downtown “grew up around [it as] characterized by architecture dating from the period of 1890-1920.” The population grew by an average of 81.4% each decade during those 30 years.

Seventeen square blocks of downtown compromise the Hammond Historic District, which was designated in 1978. The historic commercial core became vacant and blighted with the construction of two major highways around Hammond (I-55 and I-12). Large shopping centers were built closer to these freeways, which drew local and regional shoppers away from interacting with the downtown because of the convenience and variety of retail offered in a new automobile-centered era. In reaction to this, the city prioritized needs inherent to automobile traffic in the suddenly outmoded downtown to make it more appealing to the population (i.e. demolition, modernized storefronts, street-widening/sidewalk thinning, etc.). However, this led to the loss of a notable amount of architectural integrity without any economic benefit.

Fortunately, as these issues were peaking, historic district designation led to community reinvestment. In the first two years after designation (by 1980), five full renovations, sixteen modest renovations, and over 100 minor improvements were already in motion. Presently, as the historic district reaches its fortieth year of preserving and maintaining the city’s historic center, the central business district is almost completely restored and enjoys high volume pedestrian traffic. This has been done with the assistance of the Hammond Downtown Development District, designated in 1987.

The aforementioned historic district’s architectural survey was conducted by Laurie Moon Chauvin in 1981. The resulting data set will not be referenced in this report as the focus was to gather a data set of undocumented structures. It is still important to note the pioneering nature of Chauvin’s work in preparing for the Central Hammond Survey as well as the history behind this central area.

---

10 U.S. Decennial Census. 1890-1900 population increase of 118.4%; 1900-1910 population increase of 94.7%; 1910-1920 population increase of 31.0%
12 Ibid.
ADAMS-LILLIE
PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE:
c. 1870 - c. 1930
PREDOMINANT ARCHITECTURAL STYLES:
Eclectic, Craftsman, Queen Anne

This neighborhood is immediately east of the Hammond Historic District. It is where the original settlers of Hammond constructed their homes, including Peter Hammond. Peter Hammond’s original house is no longer standing, but he is buried in the neighborhood under the “Hammond Oak” (504 East Charles Street).

Adams-Lillie was named for the Adams and Lillie families, who built their houses at either end of the original neighborhood area (301 East Church, c. 1905, and 712 East Charles Streets, c. 1895). These founders were connected with the Hammond State Bank - Mr. Lillie was the President and Mr. J.Q. Adams was on the board - and were the rumored originators of “Bankers Row,” which is the name of the last few blocks of East Charles Street before the street dead ends.

The homes along the oak-lined streets of Bankers Row are some of the most unique from the first years of Hammond. For example, the “Preston House” (706 E. Charles, c.1907) sits on one quarter of a city block and is one of the more eclectic in the neighborhood, with Mission and Italianate influences.

As the first residences in Hammond, 65% of the Adams-Lillie surveyed structures (89 total) were built prior to 1930. The neighborhood has significant historic integrity with 80% of the structures in the survey area overall aged 50 years or older.

The Adams-Lillie architectural survey was conducted by Laura Blokker of Southeast Preservation, LLC in 2013. The resulting data set may be referred to in the recommendations section, but was not part of the Central Hammond Survey.

HYER-CATE
PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE:
c. 1890 - c. 1970
PREDOMINANT ARCHITECTURAL STYLES:
Craftsman, Queen Anne, New Formalism

West of downtown is the neighborhood where Hammond’s secondary founder, C.E. Cate, commissioned homes for his children and where he and his wife built the oldest remaining structure in Hammond’s city center - the Grace Memorial Episcopal Church (c. 1876). Notably,

---

C.E. Cate’s house once stood where Cate Square is now.16 While Cate Square is technically in the Hammond Historic District, it is on the border of the Hyer-Cate neighborhood. Nearby is former Louisiana Senator James Morrison’s childhood home as well.17

This area was part of the original Hammond land survey in the 1860s - the Hyer Survey - for which it was named. Commissioned by C.E. Cate, the Hyer Survey established the layout of Hammond based on the diagonal railroad tracks. New streets were rotated on that axis to match the railroad.

This neighborhood grew most when the railroad was completed in the 1890s. Tracts of land were advertised to Midwesterners and Northerners who came down for the local soil and climate conditions. Therefore the identity of this neighborhood and the majority of historic architecture in Hammond is more closely tied to popular features of those regions rather than what’s considered traditional for Louisiana. For instance, architectural styles are expressed more conservatively and there aren’t as many wrap-around porches because northern citizens did not use them as a climate solution.

On the north end of this neighborhood is a section known as the “Cate Addition.” Found there is some of the city’s foremost examples of Modern residential architecture - colloquially known as “Acadian Modernism.” Southeastern University, north of the Hyer-Cate neighborhood, grew from a two-year junior college (est. 1925) to a four-year university that experienced great popularity post-WWII18. Because the Cate Addition is near campus, it experienced mid-century development.

IOWA ADDITION
PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE:
c. 1890 - c. 1940
PREDOMINANT ARCHITECTURAL STYLES:
Craftsman, Vernacular Queen Anne

C. E. Cate and Midwestern business partners bought the Iowa Addition land in 1906 through their company, the Iowa and Louisiana Land and Lot Company. The sole intention of this company to advertise the availability of these residential lots to Midwesterners, bringing new citizens down to Hammond via the convenience of the Illinois Central Railroad.19

The residences in this neighborhood are vernacular iterations of national trends. The majority presently have a high degree of historic integrity.

---

17 Ibid. P. 104
19 Ibid. P. 95
Hammond Junior College was established in 1925 as a two-year college. It was operated by the Tangipahoa Parish School Board and had with forty students taught by five teachers. Soon after, in 1928, the State Board of Education integrated the fledgling facility into their system and it was then known as Southeastern Louisiana College. The campus grew from fifteen acres to seventy-five.20

Most buildings from the original campus were built throughout the 1930s by the Works Progress Administration (WPA) when funding was available. Some of these original buildings remain as notable examples of Art Deco architecture in Hammond.

After World War II, Southeastern was formally accepted as a full four-year institution and young families migrated to Hammond to utilize the educational benefits of the GI Bill.

As previously mentioned, the Cate Addition served some of the housing needs for an increasing population at this time, but with more students came more teachers who needed permanent residences. Therefore the College Park neighborhood was initially surveyed in August 1953 and University Place was initially surveyed in February 1964.21

The College Park & University Place neighborhoods maintain a high degree of historic integrity for mid-century architecture representative of development prompted by Southeastern Louisiana University’s enrollment. These areas retain their appearances as a mid-20th-century suburb with many Ranch homes set further back on the lot for automobile accessibility.

---

With an eye toward Hammond nominations for the National Register of Historic Places, below are the 12 individual sites/structures currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places:

- Cate House      111 N. Magnolia
- Carter House   1.5 miles SW of Hammond
- Grace Memorial Episcopal Church   100 W. Church
- Hammond High School    500 E. Thomas
- McGehee Hall    Southeastern Louisiana University
- McGehee House     1106 S. Holly
- Stevenson House     113 S. Pine
- Wascom House     303 E. Michigan
- Randal House      301 E. Michigan
- Miller Memorial Library    108 S. Pine
- First Christian Church     305 E. Charles
- Greater St. James AME     311 E. Michigan

One local district is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Hammond Historic District    Multiple (Central Business District)

One National Register designated property in Hammond was delisted in 2016. It was demolished and new homes were then built on the property c. 1995 (Figure 2).

June House     408 E. Coleman
SURVEY CHALLENGES/KEY LEARNINGS

Below are the notable challenges that arose during the planning and execution stages of the Central Hammond Survey.

Potential preventative measures for these challenges in future survey work is included as well.

LACK OF ON-SITE GIS
At the project outset there was an expectation that surveyors could utilize GIS handsets during fieldwork surveys to automatically digitize the information. Information collected through a GIS application on a mobile tablet was to include property address, GPS coordinates, and a series of dropdown menus to identify the LHRI form information – style, number of stories, raised or foundation, windows, siding, materials, etc.

This technology was partially accessible to the surveyors, but could not be efficiently integrated into the process. It was outdated and the original LHRI form was incompatible, requiring too much time to complete in the field.

WEATHER
Working during inclement weather can affect fieldwork in multiple ways.

During rainy weather: rain droplets may land on the camera lens to give an unclear picture; cars passing by may splashing water on the surveyor; the ground may be too muddy to move around for the best perspective of a building; and rain may get on the the surveyor’s note sheets, making them difficult to read or write on.

Potential preventative measures for rainy weather: surveyor can wear a hat to keep rain out of her eyes as well as to protect the camera view; surveyor can have a terry cloth on hand to wipe clean the camera lens if rain droplets get on it; and a weather-proof notepad can be used in the field instead of regular paper.

During hot and sunny weather: sweat and sunburn may make the surveyor very uncomfortable; there might be no shade along that day’s route, which means no escape from hot conditions; and sunny days can make photographing buildings difficult because of light obscuring the features of the building.

Potential preventative measures for the heat and sun: surveyor could opt for breezy clothing, wearing sunscreen, a proper hat, eye protection and thick-soled shoes; supplies such as sunscreen, extra water, photography equipment, etc. can be kept in a nearby location instead of on surveyor’s person; photos can be taken under a shaded area; or surveyor can carry an extra sheet of paper to shield the overhead sun in the camera view where no shade is available.

A way to combat weather intrusions for future surveys is also to maintain a backlog of flexible project tasks. For instance, each field day can have a corresponding data entry day in case of a
surprise rain. In times of high heat, fieldwork can be done in the early morning or evening with data entry in the afternoon. Check the weather each week before executing a schedule and choose which tasks to complete based on what the surveyor can most easily accomplish that day.

TOPOGRAPHY
Foliage during photography sessions creates shade over houses, which obscures photographic details and can lead to visual obstructions. Plant life and trees enhance our landscape, but offer an obstacle when taking architectural survey photographs. Because photography for this survey was relegated to the sidewalk, street, and other public service-ways, taking photographs at a good vantage point was at times problematic.

A possible way to combat topographical obstructions is to plan photographic work in Louisiana for the winter months. This way foliage has not had the chance to bloom. Legal restrictions prevent maneuvering around different points on the property to get a workable angle, so conducting work in the fall and winter seasons is the best counterbalancing option.

DATA COLLECTION/RECORDATION
The majority of issues over the course of this work were related to data collection/recordation methods. The process was not straightforward or standardized and that led to delays. Also, towards the end of the period of fieldwork, there was an overhaul to the LHRI form, which affected project efficiency.

The system developed for conducting the Central Hammond Survey was as follows:

1. Plan daily route for fieldwork  
2. Go to beginning of route  
3. Photograph structure from at least 3 angles - the front and a 45-degree on either side  
4. Take shorthand notes on buildings materials and other details not evident in photographs  
5. Repeat for each structure along route  
6. Return to office  
7. Upload photos to computer  
8. Sort photos into appropriate folders, divided by street (i.e. “W. Coleman” or “S. Cherry”)  
9. Mark online progress map which properties were surveyed  
10. Add survey explanation and one photo per online map entry  
11. Create a line in Excel with the address  
12. Find assessment number and property information per address for Excel line  
13. Translate field notes into Excel  
14. Copy/paste Excel fields into corresponding LASHPO’s LHRI form fields  
15. Download the two best photos per property  
16. Place photos into LHRI forms

This 16-step process was more elaborate than necessary.
The Excel form was complex to match a comprehensive original LHRI form. Both these factors made for a lengthy practice. Surveyors would often only assist with the first 12 steps of the process because of the time it took to enter the field data into Excel. They already spent 7-10 minutes per property in the field and data entry doubled that time. Subsequently there was an unexpected amount of unentered field data towards the end of the project.

The Excel step was an attempt to streamline generating the original LHRI forms using Microsoft Word’s “Mail Merge” feature. Unfortunately this did not end up being helpful. It took a significant amount of time to create the Excel drop-down fields that matched the original LHRI form. Then it took more time to enter the data per those fields. Each structure took approximately 20-30 minutes to complete in the beginning.

The amended LHRI form aided in this and affected data recordation for the better. The new, simpler form cut time spent on the original process in half because of its use of technology to do the reverse of what we set out to do - each entry in PDF form could be generated into an all-encompassing Excel table. This would have been easier from the outset and is a positive change to the format. Unfortunately for this particular survey, the conversion occurred later, but for future surveys this change is a benefit.

Surveyors also did not realize the availability of certain data banks/tools, which led to future double work. For instance, the Tangipahoa Parish Assessor’s Office website has approximate date of construction information. This is not always accurate, but can be cross-referenced with the 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance map of Hammond and other sources to establish dates for the majority of local structures. These resources were not realized until much later in the survey process, which meant returning to already entered data and reworking it. Concerted project planning in the future would help with issues like this to prevent repeating time spent per entry.

Another challenge to this project was that there were more general components to the survey than necessary. For instance, while an interactive progress map is positive in providing community information, it was not necessary for the purposes of this project. Each point on the map took approximately 30 seconds to create, which means that over 11 hours of survey time would have been spent mapping the intended 1,400 points. That time would be better spent in the field.

Lastly, technical difficulties with software led to a lot of data reworking toward the end of the project. This doubled time spent per form. While it was convenient to use an interactive PDF, that PDF between different tech platforms performed differently. Fields would be filled out in Google Chrome, MS Edge, or even Adobe 9, but then when downloaded on another computer and reopened in Adobe DC, for instance, those fields would be changed or blank. Therefore multiple people had to repeat work on the same form. In a smaller survey this would not have been as time consuming, but with over 1,000 entries, this was labor intensive.

Considering all of the above, removing extra components to the process such as the map is essential for streamlining the survey process. In future work, the recommended simpler process of filling out the PDF and then generating an Excel will be strictly adhered to. That paired with
consistent software platforms and survey forms will make for a more manageable process. Leading up to that as well, if field notes are also done in a consistent manner, others entering that data at a later date will have an easier time translating the information. This is helpful when many people are assisting with a project, as was the case here.

Without the assistance of advanced technology (e.g. tablets or GIS devices), the future survey structure should resemble the below:

1. Plan daily route for fieldwork
2. Go to beginning of route
3. Photograph structure from at least 3 angles - the front and a 45-degree on either side
4. Take shorthand notes on buildings materials and other details not evident in photographs
5. Repeat for each structure along route
6. Return to office
7. Upload photos to computer
8. Fill out LHRI form PDF using field notes, established research tools, and attach photos directly from upload
9. Generate Excel list of data from LHRI Forms

ASSESSMENT RECORDS
At the culmination of this project, surveyors listed assessment numbers with addresses for the City of Hammond GIS Department to retrieve geographical data (i.e. latitude and longitude). After a couple of problematic data pulls, the GIS Department realized that the internal records for a notable portion of these properties were incorrect. Fortunately this led to them correcting that information in the city database. However, for the purposes of the survey project, this led to a delay and that information is missing from the survey forms.

COMMUNITY CURIOSITY
A last challenge in executing the survey was stopping work to answer questions from citizens. This took up time in the field. Citizens’ follow-up inquiries over the phone and by email likewise filled some survey hours.

Part of this was due to the fact that each structure surveyed was given a door tag notifying them that the surveyor had been on site (Figure 4). This door tag included a web address as well as the HHDC office contact information. This was done to create awareness, but in doing so it produced surprising inefficiency to the overall survey process.

Developing a set response or providing more information on the door tag could curtail some inquiries. Overall this was a welcome distraction to the project because it succeeds in creating opportunities for awareness and education.
ONGOING RECOMMENDATIONS

CONTINUED SURVEY EFFORTS
In conjunction with the discernment of National Register nomination opportunities from the Central Hammond Survey data, survey efforts should continue in-house. The HHDC office can hone an efficient survey structure based on key learnings from this process as well to continue documentation of Hammond.

This experience will make the office better suited to mount another consultant-led large-scale survey.

INCREASED AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY DOCUMENTATION
While the historic neighborhoods represented in this survey have predominantly White origins, portions have grown to have a noteworthy African American population. This evolution should be thoroughly researched before moving forward with certain nominations or producing other historic recognitions. This research is beyond the scope of this survey, but it should be a goal moving forward with future surveys and with all future National Register nominations where there is a component of African American history evident.

Increasing the representation of the local African American community in published projects similar to this will ensure a whole picture of Hammond history. This project surveyed the Wilson Street Cemetery at 502 N. Wilson (Figure 5), for instance. This overlooked parcel sits between the railroad tracks and a recently demolished historic Ranch house. It has barely legible headstones, which are understood to reveal African American inhabitants. Nothing else is known about the cemetery. It will be an important historic site to document further through either a National Register nomination or local publication.

COMMUNITY ACCESS TO INFORMATION
Information collected through this survey should be as transparent as possible. It will be available through the HHDC website and through the LASHPO Louisiana Historic Structures online map tool, but other methods of information distribution should be established to ensure that the public has all tools possible when doing research. Community accessibility is a key goal to any documentation project.

Portions of survey data will be integrated with the City of Hammond’s public GIS map - TanGIS. The City of Hammond Planning Department can append survey photos to relevant properties as well as use the information to update assessment cards for multiple addresses on individual lots. Also, as mentioned previously, some of the dates of construction on the Tangipahoa Parish Assessor’s Office website were inaccurate. The Central Hammond Survey dates could supersede those, making all research tools as accurate as possible.
Meetings focused on individual neighborhoods can address and enhance the information gathered in this survey. Data is always developing, so the survey information distribution should not be an endpoint. Meeting attendees can assist with guiding the process organically.
SURVEY RESULTS

CENTRAL HAMMOND SURVEY INVENTORY
A few noteworthy details of the 1,245 structures surveyed are as follows:

AGE
- 50 - 74 Years Old     394 32%
- 75+ Years Old      296 24%

OVERALL CONTRIBUTING   690 55%
OVERALL NON-CONTRIBUTING 555 45%

FORM
- Bungalow       82  7%
- Central Hall      91  7%
- I-House        8  0.6%
- Commercial       78  6%
- Gable-Ell      71  6%
- Minimal Traditional Cottage 87  7%
- Queen Anne 36  3%
- Ranch     340  27%
- Shotgun      12  0.9%
- Other     440  35%

STYLE
- Colonial/Classic Revival 41  3%
- Craftsman 177  14%
- Mid-Century Modern 254  20%
- Ranch 176  14%
- Queen Anne 26  2%
- Other 571  46%

NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC RESOURCE ELIGIBILITY
Queen Anne homes are under-appreciated and Hammond’s Queen Anne building stock dwindles accordingly. As evident above, there are only 26 Queen Anne style structures in Central Hammond. These rarities should receive appropriate recognition.

There are a notable amount of I-Houses observed within the bounds of the Central Hammond Survey. The I-House is a common form in the “I” states of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa as well as other areas with agricultural-based economies. They are therefore considered rare in Louisiana. Several were identified during the course of this survey. Two Hammond I-Houses are on the National Register already. A more intensive study resulting in nomination is appropriate as many Hammond I-Houses appear to be in poor condition (Figure 6)
Another National Register nomination focus should be structures designed by locally prolific mid-century architect John Desmond. His work epitomizes “Acadian Modernism” and is a character-defining feature to the Modern built environment of Hammond. Two Desmond public buildings were designated on the National Register in 2017. Of the approximately 92 buildings he designed or consulted on in Hammond, 40 were striking residences. This inventory is dwindling rapidly in recent years with one of his designed residences demolished during the course of this survey (Figure 3).

A few sites were preliminarily recognized as eligible as an individual resource because of either standout architecture or a connection to a local historic figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hammond Coca-Cola Bottling Co.</td>
<td>321 S. Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Cemetery</td>
<td>0 Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Ghost Catholic Complex</td>
<td>604 N. Oak, 507 N. Oak, 610 N. Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. James Morrison Home</td>
<td>310 NW Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Plaza</td>
<td>1007 W. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemurray Park</td>
<td>201 W. Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Baptist Church</td>
<td>100 J.W. Davis Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond Fire Station</td>
<td>1610 N. Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E. Cate’s Second Home</td>
<td>209 N. Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>802 W. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>112 N. Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding Commercial</td>
<td>309 Mooney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-House (Vacant)</td>
<td>605 E. Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangipahoa Parish Library</td>
<td>314 E. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Vacant)</td>
<td>303 N. Ellzey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Vacant)</td>
<td>600 W. Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY
A quirk of this survey was that each resource recorded was listed as in a “Potential District.” This was because Central Hammond has visually dense historic fabric. The HHDC’s hypothesis was that much of the ground covered within this survey’s boundaries is eligible in one way or another. This survey was executed to define boundaries and discover potentially underrepresented histories.

With that in mind, the three newly documented neighborhoods are all potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. As over half the large survey swath was contributing, the data recommends refining the neighborhood boundaries, but each should receive designation in the years to come. The significance is clear.

If overall neighborhoods aren’t deemed the appropriate focus of future nominations, consideration should be given to and Craftsman-centric district as well as a Ranch-centered district at least.
After survey data is mapped, definable boundaries will be revealed for potential National Register District nominations. Multiple property nomination is an efficient method to both expand the reach of federal tax credits, grant eligibility, and other incentives as well as to spark community recognition through publicizing historic significance.

Hammond continues to lose its historic housing stock though demolition and neglect. As mentioned previously, there are multiple properties that were recorded by this survey and have since been demolished. National Register Historic District listing is key to promote pride and community recognition as well as providing as many financial incentives as possible to encourage restoration.
FIGURE REFERENCES

Figure 1
201 N. Linden before and after demolition/new construction. Previous structure - pictured below left - was an historic center-hall residence with notable Colonial Revival potico. Structure was found on 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance map, so it was at least 85 years old when demolished in 2015. New structure - pictured below right - is a New Traditional residence built c. 2017.

Figure 2
408 E. Coleman before and after demolition/new construction. Previous structure - pictured below left - was a Queen Anne residence that was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1983 as the “June House.” New structure - pictured below right - is a Postmodern Ranch built with two sister structures on the same site.
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