



Name of Property: Greenhills Historic District
City, State: Greenhills, Ohio
Significant Dates: 1935-1950
NHL Criteria: 1 and 4
NHL Theme: I. Peopling Places
 4. Community and Neighborhood
 III. Expressing Cultural Values
 5. Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning
Previous Recognition: 1988, National Register of Historic Places
National Historic Contexts: XVI. Architecture
 W. Regional and Urban Planning
 VII. Political and Military Affairs, 1865-1939
 H. The Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941
 XXXI. Social and Humanitarian Movements
 A. Communitarianism and Utopianism
 XXX. American Ways of Life
 H. Suburban Life



NHL Significance:

- The Village of Greenhills represents highly important aspects of New Deal policy, an important period in the evolution of the American suburb, and pioneering innovations in house and neighborhood design as an adaptation of American garden-city planning to the climate, topography, and cultural preferences of the Midwestern United States
- As one of the three New Deal greenbelt towns built by the Resettlement Administration's Division of Suburban Resettlement, it is nationally significant under NHL Criterion 1 for its association with highly significant activities that shaped the Federal response to the Great Depression by providing economic relief in the form of employment for skilled and unskilled labor and making use of modern principles of design and lower-cost methods and materials of home construction in an effort to stimulate the building industry and raise the quality of life for working-class Americans.
- The village meets NHL Criterion 4 for its artistic merit and outstanding representation of the American Garden City movement, the widely acclaimed Neighborhood Unit Plan, and the innovative, cost-saving measures of group housing and large-scale home construction.
- Originally built as a demonstration of garden-city planning and a model suburb for lower-income Americans, the Village of Greenhills is a nationally significant historic residential suburb as defined in the nationwide Historic Residential Suburbs in the United States, 1830 to 1960, Multiple Property Submission (MPS).



Integrity:

- The historic integrity of Greenhills is reflected in the general layout of its plan as developed by Justin Hartzog and Roland Wank and the enduring character of the village, with its innovative and varied treatment of streets, integral pedestrian pathways, low-scale buildings, sense of openness, and ubiquitous parks. The original core of Greenhills retains a high degree of historic integrity overall. The site displays excellent integrity—the plan, its response to the natural topography, and land use distribution remain unchanged with only modest alterations to vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems.
- Secondary but also significant is the design of its buildings, primarily residential but with important public buildings that are very much intact. The village's residential units generally show very good integrity. While synthetic siding, replacement windows, and conversion of flat roofs to gabled ones are not unusual, all the original dwellings are easily recognizable. There has been some loss of housing—all of them S-type buildings, for which the designers predicted a sixty-year life expectancy because of their cheaper construction.
- The commercial center still retains its essential historic character. Although only partially completed by 1938, the shopping center along Eswin Street was built out according to the original plan after the period of significance. Although it was remodeled circa 1995, its basic massing, flat-roof profile, covered walkway with brick columns and pedestrian passages through the building to the rear parking lot all remain.

Owner of Property: Multiple (local government, private)

Acreage of Property: ~375

Origins of Nomination: NHL designation was identified as a strategy in the Greenhills Comprehensive Plan updated in 2009.

Potential for Positive Public Response or Reflection on NHL Program: NHL designation will bring attention to this Greenbelt town and generate interest in its preservation in response to developmental pressures in the greater-Cincinnati area.

Potential for Negative Public Response or Reflection on NHL Program: None known.

Landmarks Committee Comments:

Landmarks Committee Recommendation:



Public Comments Favoring Designation (received as of):

Advisory Board Recommendation:

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-900

USDI/NPS NRHP Registration Form (Rev. 8-86)

OMB No. 1024-0018

GREENHILLS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 1

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: Greenhills, Ohio, Historic District

Other Name/Site Number:

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: Roughly bounded by Damon and Ingram roads on the north, the corporate limit on the west and south, and Farragut Avenue on the east.

City/Town: Greenhills, Ohio

Vicinity: N/A

State: Ohio County: Hamilton Code: 061

Zip Code: 45218

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property

Private: X

Public-Local: X

Public-State: ___

Public-Federal: ___

Object: ___

Category of Property

Building(s): ___

District: X

Site: ___

Structure: ___

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing

316

1

0

0

317

Noncontributing

116 buildings

0 sites

0 structures

___ objects

116 Total

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 180

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: 0

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this ___ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

Signature of Certifying Official

Date

State or Federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.

Signature of Commenting or Other Official

Date

State or Federal Agency and Bureau

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

- ___ Entered in the National Register
- ___ Determined eligible for the National Register
- ___ Determined not eligible for the National Register
- ___ Removed from the National Register
- ___ Other (explain): _____

Signature of Keeper

Date of Action

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 3

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic:	DOMESTIC	Sub: single dwelling
	DOMESTIC	Sub: multiple dwelling
	COMMERCE	Sub: stores
	EDUCATION	Sub: school
	SOCIAL	Sub: meeting hall
	RECREATION AND CULTURE:	Sub: swimming pool, fieldhouse
	LANDSCAPE	Sub: plaza, greenbelt
Current:	DOMESTIC	Sub: single dwelling
	DOMESTIC	Sub: multiple dwelling
	COMMERCE	Sub: stores
	EDUCATION	Sub: school
	SOCIAL	Sub: meeting hall
	RECREATION AND CULTURE:	Sub: swimming pool, fieldhouse
	LANDSCAPE	Sub: plaza, greenbelt

7. DESCRIPTION

ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION: 1) Modern Movement/Moderne and International Style
2) Late 19th and 20th Century Revivals

MATERIALS: BRICK, CONCRETE

Foundation: CONCRETE

Walls: BRICK; STUCCO; ASBESTOS; METAL: aluminum siding; SYNTHETICS: vinyl siding

Roof: CONCRETE; ASPHALT; STONE, slate; CERAMIC TILE

Other: GLASS BLOCK

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 4

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

INTRODUCTION

The Village of Greenhills, Ohio, is one of three U.S. government-sponsored, planned communities built on the garden-city principles during the Great Depression of the 1930s. The "greenbelt" towns were planned and built between 1935 and 1938 under the short-lived Suburban Resettlement program of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal government. Each town embodies land-use planning principles, social concerns, construction methods, and architectural concepts that coalesced in the 1930s and were at the forefront of Federal housing policy that would trigger and help shape the massive suburbanization of American cities in the post-World War II era. Together as a finite set, the towns represent an unprecedented effort to build large-scale, low-cost, scientifically planned residential communities outside major urban centers for moderate- and lower-income Americans, while providing employment for skilled, professional, and unskilled workers during the Great Depression. Independently, each town represents the work of a collaborative team of talented town planners, architects, and draftsmen, and is a unique regional adaptation of American Garden City design, community planning principles, and timely innovations in large-scale building technology and home construction.¹

The Village of Greenhills was built as a model suburb for moderate-income Americans and a demonstration of American garden-city planning and large-scale home building. It reflects the innovation of town planners Justin A. Hartzog and William A. Strong and principal architects Roland Wank and G. Frank Corder. Under the direction of John Lansill and Frederick Bigger of the Suburban Resettlement program of the Resettlement Administration (RA), the designers headed a collaborative team of more than 150 persons who helped design Greenhills. The federal program was carried out with the advice of notable consultants, including architect-planner Clarence Stein and housing analyst Catherine Bauer. The community is notable for its advanced application of the Neighborhood Unit Plan, innovative design principles for grouping small houses, and improved low-cost methods of home construction. These principles were introduced in the 1920s in several American communities, the most notable being Radburn, New Jersey, and Mariemont, Ohio.² These concepts were overwhelmingly endorsed at the highly influential 1931 President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership and laid the foundation for the Federal government's concerted efforts in the 1930s to stimulate home construction and demonstrate an ideal model for safe, spacious, and healthy communities for lower- and moderate-income Americans. In combination with other federally initiated reforms, including new mechanisms for mortgage lending and borrowing, Greenhills and the other greenbelt towns set the stage for the expansive suburbanization of metropolitan areas in the United States in the postwar period.

An adaptation of garden-city planning principles, which were first introduced by English social reformer Ebenezer Howard in *Tomorrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (1898), to the climate, topography, and cultural preferences of the Midwestern United States, the Village of Greenhills meets NHL Criteria 1 and 4 under the NHL themes, Peopling Places and Expressing Cultural Values. The village meets NHL Criterion 1 for

¹The largest and most publicized of the three towns was Greenbelt, Maryland, which was designated a National Historic Landmark (NHL) on 18 February 1997. Greendale was listed on the National Register 29 July 2005, and designated an NHL on 16 October 2012. Greenhills, Ohio, was listed on the National Register 12 January 1989 at the national level of significance. A fourth town, Greenbrook, New Jersey, was planned but due to legal issues concerning the acquisition of land was never built.

²Radburn, designed in 1928-29 by Clarence Stein and Henry Wright, members of the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA), was designated an NHL on 5 April 2005. Mariemont, Ohio, designed in 1921 by city planner John Nolen, was designated an NHL on 29 March 2007.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 5

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

its association with highly significant activities that shaped the Federal response to the Great Depression by providing economic relief in the form of employment for skilled and unskilled labor and making use of modern principles of design and lower-cost methods and materials of home construction in an effort to stimulate the building industry and raise the quality of life for working-class Americans. The village also meets NHL Criterion 4 for its artistic merit and outstanding demonstration of American garden-city planning, the widely acclaimed Neighborhood Unit Plan, and the state-of-the art, cost-saving measures of group housing and large-scale home construction. The Village of Greenhills is a nationally significant historic residential suburb as defined in the nationwide Historic Residential Suburbs in the United States, 1830 to 1960, Multiple Property Submission (MPS).

DESCRIPTION

The Greenhills NHL is based on the original plans designed under the leadership of Justin A. Hartzog, Chief Town Planner, in 1935-36 and revised in 1937 and the extent of the community built under the Resettlement Administration (RA) and Farm Security Administration between 1936 and 1938 with the assistance of labor funded by the Works Progress Administration (WPA) as well as small houses built for World War II veterans through January 1950, when the federal government sold the land within the corporate limits of the town to the Greenhills Homeowners Corporation. Hartzog was an accomplished designer and practicing landscape architect from Ohio, who worked with John Nolen, the Boston-based town planner whose firm was the most prominent in the country at this time. Educated at Cornell University, Hartzog had been involved in the planning of Mariemont, east of Cincinnati in the 1920s and continued to work in Nolen's office. Between the years 1933 and 1939, he also served on the National Resources Committee of the National Planning Board. The Chief Assistant Town Planner, William A. Strong, a Cleveland native who had a degree in landscape architecture and city planning from Harvard University, also had ample experience with city plans.³ It is significant that both were trained as landscape architects at leading schools, which were the first to offer master's degrees in that discipline. Architect Roland Wank, a European-born Modernist, also had a defining role in the shape of the plan and its buildings.

The historic core of the incorporated Village of Greenhills is illustrated by a plan drawn in 1938 (Figure 4). The village is characterized by a circuit road network bisected by Winton Road and joined by curving residential lanes, courts and cul-de-sacs occupied by semi-detached homes called "duplexes," and multiple-unit row dwellings, as well as detached single family houses; interspersed parks and recreational spaces; and a village center that integrates civic and commercial facilities. The Greenhills NHL Historic District today represents highly important aspects of New Deal policy, an important stage in the evolution of the American suburb, and pioneering innovations in house and neighborhood design. The period of significance extends from 1935, when construction began, to 1950, when the period of Federal management ended and homes were sold to private ownership. Like the other two completed greenbelt towns, Greenhills had dozens of single-family homes built shortly after World War II to accommodate veterans. This later development reflected the desire of its working-class residents for single-family dwellings with garages and private yards versus the earlier attached housing on superblocks with grouped garages.

Greenhills is located in Hamilton County, Ohio, about thirteen miles north of downtown Cincinnati (Figure 1). As one of the three "greenbelt towns," named for the belt of parks and farmland that was to encircle each community, the site for the village was carefully selected for its natural topography, consisting of rolling farm

³ Charles Bradley Leach, "Greenhills, Ohio: The Evolution of an American New Town," Ph.D. diss. Case Western Reserve University 1978, p. 170. "Planning Official J. R. Hartzog Dies," *Cincinnati Enquirer*, 23 Dec 1963: 24:2.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 6**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

fields dropping off into wooded ravines to the south and east, where the west branch of the Mill Creek ran in an eastward direction (Figure 3). The Hamilton County Park District (now known as Great Parks of Hamilton County), founded in 1930, envisioned the area along that part of the Mill Creek as an integral part of a parkway system. Of the 5,930 acres acquired by the U.S. government in 1935, 800 acres were retained within the corporate boundaries of Greenhills and 1642 acres were eventually incorporated into a permanent greenbelt, developed by the park district as Winton Woods Park. That park adjoins 534 acres transferred to the Army Corps of Engineers in 1950 in order to create the West Fork Lake Flood Control Reservoir, which is used for recreation and managed as part of the county park. In 1954, 3488 acres of federally purchased land north of the village limits was sold to the Cincinnati Community Development Association and eventually developed by the Warner-Kantor Corporation as a middle-class community known as Forest Park.

The large tracts acquired by the Federal government enhanced long-term prospects for controlled suburban growth and continued agricultural land use. The original idea was eventually to build five decentralized town units. RA administrator Rexford Tugwell viewed such acreage as conducive to operation of agricultural cooperatives similar to those being organized in the agency's rural resettlement communities. The larger acreage also served as a land reserve for future development of neighborhood units with an abundance of area set aside for recreational and conservation purposes. In concept, when the demand for new housing arose, the government (or a cooperative entity) would already own the land, protecting it from rising real estate costs and speculative competition.

The historic development of Greenhills was limited to the one town unit built on 800 acres between 1935 and 1938. Due to repeated cutbacks in funding, the original plans for the construction of 1,000 housing units were scaled down in 1937 to the 676 that made up most of the historic housing in the village. Additional homes were built after World War II in the unfinished sections of the town plan. In keeping with Ebenezer Howard's garden city concept, the original village was surrounded by a greenbelt left in agricultural and park use. RA administrator Rex Tugwell envisioned the remainder of the land as a cooperative agricultural venture and in the case of Greenhills, agricultural land was placed under the jurisdiction of a Cooperative Management Association set up for farm tenants. Rural lands were redivided and a large portion devoted to dairy and poultry farms. The cooperative venture did not last long, however, because farmers found it more lucrative to sell directly in Cincinnati.⁴

As with the other greenbelt towns, Greenhills's agricultural land use became marginalized over the years. Most of the greenbelt was transferred to the county park district, where it remains in open space and today provides a rural wooded setting for the historic town site. By the mid-1950s, the remainder passed into the hands of private developers who, responding to market forces, took a more aggressive approach to suburbanizing what in the thirties had been an exurban hinterland. The subsequent development at Greenhills, much of it planned by Justin Hartzog, departed from initial plans yet reflects some of his concepts of topographic planning, curving streets with quiet cul-de-sacs and pedestrian walkways.

The village of Greenhills lies south of the two-lane West Sharon Road and aligned along the north-south spine of Winton Road, a four-lane roadway. Both carry high volumes of traffic and connect with interstate highways serving the Cincinnati metropolitan area. Greenhills is the only one of the three greenbelt towns that remains surrounded by greenbelt. The historic district lies mostly on the west side of the village; there are several residential subdivisions built in the 1950s through 1970s on the east side of the village. In many areas, the woods that once marked the edges of the built-out area of the New Deal-era plan have grown into thick plantations that form a naturalistic boundary between the historic district and the surrounding newer

⁴ Leach, p. 266.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 7**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

development.

Stylistically, the design and materials of all the major civic and commercial buildings, reflect the influence of Stripped Classicism and International style, which provide the village center with a distinct, architectural unity and civic identity. These buildings are the work of architects Roland Wank and G. Frank Cordner, and their team of architects. In the 1930s Wank was the principal architect for the Tennessee Valley Authority and was involved in the design of several dam projects and employee housing and was closely involved in the planning and development of Norris, Tennessee. Most prominent is the centrally located Community Building (Photograph 5), which is set back on an extensive village green and features an asymmetrical plan and white-painted brick walls, classically inspired entrances and large multi-paned windows.

Most of the residential buildings also exhibit a functional, modernistic variant of the International Style, with flat-roofs, smooth surfaces and flat-roofed entry porches with simple supports. However, in the A and B sections, the first to be built, a simplified Colonial Revival style predominates, characterized by brick exteriors and gabled slate roofs. The architects were careful to provide a wide array of dwelling types by varying the number and type of interconnected units, experimenting with different roof types, adding porches and vestibules, and incorporating garages in different groupings and positions.

The Greenhills NHL district is roughly bounded by Damon and Ingram avenues on the north, the corporate limit on the west and south, and Farragut Avenue on the east, including the layout of the streets and development of blocks dating from the period of significance as well as the portion of the greenbelt within the corporate limits. (See Sketch Map.) The boundaries of the NHL district encompass about 375 acres and represent the historic core of the incorporated Village of Greenhills as envisioned by the town's planners and developed as a model community during the New Deal era.

The NHL district as proposed enlarges the 1988 National Register boundaries, which included only those resources built through the original construction period ending in 1938. The NHL boundaries include additional contributing resources that date to the period of significance, 1935 to 1950. In addition, the NHL boundaries encompass the complete circuit road system, which was of primary importance in the original plan. This involved including non-contributing homes on Farragut and Ingram built in the 1950s, but not the larger area beyond those roads that was sold and developed with residential subdivisions in the 1950s and 1960s.

The 317 contributing resources the Greenhills National Historic Landmark include one contributing site that represents the overall landscape of the historic village with its roads, natural features, parks, yards, and greenbelt as well as the swimming pool and monuments on the green. The NHL district also includes the Community Building, Shopping Center, and all of the Federally-built houses and housing blocks that retain integrity to the period of significance.⁵ The noncontributing resources include 116 buildings (2 institutional buildings, 4 church-related buildings, 12 commercial buildings, and 98 residential buildings). Many of the original residential units were built with garages that were either physically connected to the associated dwelling or built as detached structures in compounds. Although due to their small size they are not counted separately, they are considered important elements of each house and block ensemble and contribute to the overall village plan and historic setting.

⁵ While the 1988 National Register nomination counted each individual living unit as one contributing building, the current resource number is the result of counting each attached or semi-detached group of housing units, regardless of its size or number of units, as a single building.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 8**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

The Village Plan

The site of the original village lies south of the intersection of Winton Avenue and West Sharon Road (identified as Cameron Road on the 1936 regional map). In 1936 these roads were considered principal transportation routes. The proposed village site offered the potential for convenient automobile access to the region's major areas of employment at the same time it provided the topographic features conducive for creating a quiet and healthy, secluded village setting, where children would be safe from fast-moving traffic generated by peripheral roads. The topography of the site was mostly rolling, rising toward the north and west and leveling out on the east and south. The natural topography guided much of the land use distribution. A steep creek valley defined the southern edge of the entire village; lesser ravines bordered it on the east and west. Left natural, these areas served as the greenbelt. Clusters of housing were positioned on flat ground on ridge tops. The rest of the site consisted mostly of rolling farm fields with the occasional dip. Administrative, commercial, and institutional buildings were positioned in the center on flatter land.

The plan of the original section of Greenhills with its land use distribution and various features—vehicular circulation system, public parks and private yards, pedestrian circulation system, street trees, gardens, and other landscape improvements—is counted as one contributing site.

The Greenhills plan was produced primarily by Justin Hartzog, a prominent landscape architect, but with the active collaboration of architect Roland Wank. Together they provided the project with a wealth of talent, training, and knowledge. Their combined contributions account for the outstanding character of Greenhills's plan and the unique and distinctive qualities that remain highly visible in the village today. Hartzog, who served as the Chief Town Planner and the titular head of a team that included site planners, architects, landscape architects and engineers, brought extensive experience and knowledge in town planning, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and development of parks and parkways. Wank, a Hungarian-born architect steeped in modernism, brought experience with building new towns and dams for the Tennessee Valley Authority. He was concerned with providing a complete community for the public benefit and an aesthetic of functional simplicity.

The Greenhills plan is distinctive mainly as an adaptation of principles for town planning and suburban design drawn from the practices of the landscape architecture profession and innovations in American garden city planning. Foremost it embodied the Neighborhood Unit Plan which, previously demonstrated at Radburn, New Jersey, and Mariemont, Ohio, had been embraced at the 1931 President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership as the model for future town planning and suburban development. Adapted to the topography of the Ohio site, the design is mainly informal with mostly curvilinear streets laid out to follow the natural contours of a site deeply cut by ravines. This approach to design would distinguish the physical plan of Greenhills from that of the other greenbelt towns which were more closely derived from formal, geometrically ordered principles.

An article in *Pencil Points* in August 1936 illustrated the plan and noted its distinctive character:

The third resettlement town at Greenhills, Ohio, is located on a site consisting of several large finger-like building areas separated by deep ravines. Two important roads already crossed this property and, together with the natural contours, governed the new road system for the town, which consists of gently curving roadways and cul-de-sacs. The town center and common lies [sic.] near the junction of the main roads. The ravines, left largely in their natural state, provide recreation areas easily available from the residential groups.”⁶

⁶ John Dreier, “Greenbelt Planning: Resettlement Administration Goes to Town,” *Pencil Points* 17, no. 8 (August

PROPERTY NAME**Page 9**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

The layout of the original village is composed of a centrally located commercial and civic village center with outlying irregular residential areas and parks. The siting of the Community Building, offset by the large town square is the most formal element. The plan for Greenhills incorporated a variety of street types that would become prototypes for neighborhood planning.

The roadways are hierarchical and consist of a broad circuit road and narrow residential lanes and courts, many in the form of cul-de-sacs. The circuit road, comprising several collector streets—Cromwell, Damon, Farragut and Ingram Roads—gives a unifying structure to the town plan, connecting the west and east sides of the community and connecting the community with the main outlying county via Winton Road. Residential lanes and cul-de-sacs of varying lengths and configurations run off the circuit roads and provide a variety of settings for single and multiple-unit dwellings. The circuit roads were originally planted with evenly spaced trees, including elms, oaks, and ashes while informal, less regular plantings graced the roadside and yards on the quiet residential streets, in many cases providing a transition to the naturally wooded greenbelt beyond.

Installation and construction of the community's infrastructure were guided by the scientific method and cost-saving economies of large-scale development that the greenbelt towns were intended to demonstrate. Streets were laid out according to the highest community building standards for safety and convenience, with drains and sewers for efficient drainage. Practical considerations as well as the aesthetics of the plan guided the siting of dwellings in groups either along broad collector streets or in clusters along courts or cul-de-sacs.

Under the direction of the chief engineer, William G. Powell, the new town was fully equipped with public utilities. After studying the alternatives for independent new utilities, planners opted to obtain water from the Cincinnati Water Works, electrical power from Cincinnati Electric and Gas Company, and telephone service from Cincinnati and Suburban Bell Telephone Company, and to connect its sanitary sewers to the county system as the most economical approach. In keeping with state-of-the-art best practices and the recommendations of the 1931 President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, power and telephone lines were buried underground throughout the village, thus avoiding the unattractive clutter of overhead wires and utility poles. All streets were paved and equipped with street lamps and fire hydrants. Sidewalks lined both sides and granite curbs were provided in limited areas including the shopping center and at the ends of cul-de-sacs.⁷

The original village center built in the 1930s consisted of a small group of civic and commercial buildings on the east side of Winton Road. The municipal management building (Photograph 1, Figures 7 and 8), which housed the town's management offices, police and fire services and a post office, faces south overlooking the town commons.⁸ A second story provided space for doctors, dentists and businesses as well as a meeting room. Perpendicular to the management building, the retail faces a parking lot accessed by Eswin Street (Photograph 2, Figures 8 and 9). The retail is highly visible from Winton Road, but safely set back from it and separated by a berm to avoid traffic conflicts. Enfield Street curves around the rear, where there is a second parking lot and an open gable-roofed shed to house a farmers market. (Photograph 3) Most of the retail buildings are simple flat-roofed structures. To the north is a service station at the corner of Eswin and Enfield streets. The commercial center has expanded and evolved over time. Only the south portion and the service station on Eswin Street were

1936): 404.

⁷ David Moore, personal interview, July 16, 2015.

⁸ Early plans called it the "Common," but a 1949 plat labeled it as the "Commons." It was subsequently named "Nick Bates Commons" by ordinance in honor of the first maintenance director of Greenhills.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 10**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

completed by 1938, and later store blocks were added in the 1950s to complete the original plan as the population grew. As a whole the shopping center is mostly intact, although it has undergone some changes, the most recent being the circa-1995 renovation that introduced a new synthetic fascia accented by a gable above the original grocery store, now vacant. Non-contributing commercial buildings were added on side streets beyond the original shopping center from the 1950s through the 1980s.

Along with the shopping center, the neighboring Commons, Community Building and swimming pool (Photographs 4, 5, and 6) create a village center with a strong sense of place. The grouping reflects the modest scale, village-like character, and functionality intended in the original plan, and the highly important location off Winton Road at the center of the village. The town commons (Photograph 4) is an essentially square green space defined by Farragut Street, which is part of the main circuit road, Eswin Street on the west, Endicott Street on the north and Enfield street on the east. It is mostly open, with clustered trees at the southwest and southeast corners and more regularly spaced trees on the north edge. Benches are scattered around the perimeter and clustered around trees. A recently added gazebo in the southeast corner is used for outdoor concerts and activities. In addition to the generous town commons, there are parks on the interior of the superblocks and a few planted medians and several small green spaces created by "U" and "L"-shaped lanes and at the ends of cul-de-sacs. The streets are lined today with shade trees, including oaks, maples, and pear trees; in the original plan, the streets were lined with American elms, which are now gone.

The original planting plans were important in establishing a garden-city ambiance in the community. Produced by the Senior Landscape Architect Joseph F. Whitney, who was trained in landscape design at Massachusetts Agricultural College and Harvard's School of Landscape Architecture, the planting plans for Greenhills softened the hard edges of the rectilinear buildings, helping them to blend with the landscape and to unify the different components of the village—dwellings of different types, public and commercial buildings, streets and public utilities—into a cohesive whole in which built elements merged smoothly with nearby parks and provided an overall ambience of a pleasant rural village.⁹ A unified planting plan was a defining element of the English garden cities and the American garden cities, Mariemont and Radburn, where landscape architects were specifically engaged to develop well-conceived and attractive plantings, with an emphasis on native species.

The planting plans for Greenhills provided for a variety of planting venues. These included unified plantings of street trees in planting strips, hedges along circuit roads, shrubs and flowering trees around buildings, and climbing vines on porches and garages. In addition to new plantings, a number of pre-existing trees were retained, particularly a beech woods in the southeast corner of the town site. In addition, much of the natural oak and maple woodland on the surrounding hillsides were designated part of the Greenbelt.

Although native species were emphasized in the recommendations of the 1931 President's conference, Whitney did not avoid using non-native plants, such as hybrid fruit trees and shrubs. While many of the trees were native—oak, dogwood, redbud—the plans called for many plants and shrubs that were easy to maintain, familiar to residents and evocative of small town America, based on long years of use in the region. Regardless of whether such species were technically local in the Midwest, their use was rationalized on the basis that such old favorites were culturally appropriate, had popular appeal, and adapted well to local growing conditions.

Private yards and gardens were an essential component of the Greenhills plan and were a feature of all house types. Each yard was divided into separate areas, including a small entry garden or border on the street side of the house, and a lawn for recreation (and hanging laundry) and a large flower and vegetable garden on the

⁹ "U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, FSA, Div. of Suburban Resettlement. "Final Report, Section I. Summary Description of the Greenhills Project." Nov. 1937, p. 16

PROPERTY NAME**Page 11**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

garden side. Many yards faced public neighborhood parks. Planting plans called for vines, tall shrubs and small trees near the garages and hedges and trellises with vines on the street sides of houses. Honeysuckle vines were prominent, as were privet and *taxus* hedges. Today, mature trees, hedges, shrubs, and fencing placed along lot lines define many of the yards, separating them from each other and from adjacent parkland. Most yards contain typical backyard plantings and many homeowners have added porches, patios, or additional rooms to the rear of their houses; few of these changes are of a size or scale to detract from the historic character of the district.

In adapting the neighborhood unit formula, the Greenhills plan integrated numerous variations for residential streets, cul-de-sacs, places, and housing courts, and introduced innovations in small house design and housing groups, the layout of the suburban yard, and the arrangement of residential streets. All of the residences lie less than a mile of the Community Building and shopping center. Most of the homes are arranged on curving and looping secondary streets with a variety of housing types—single-family, duplexes and larger multi-unit row dwellings—sometimes in pairs or clusters but generally varied depending on the topography and layout of the roads. The exceptions to this are Damon Road and Gambier Circle, developed in 1947 with nearly identical small single-family houses. The rest of the streets are cul-de-sacs with the occasional housing court. The cul-de-sacs tend to have more consistent housing types creating a symmetrical effect (Figure 3) especially on the terminating circles.

Particularly innovative was the spacious layout of clusters of detached and semi-detached (duplexes) dwellings with driveways, porches, and attached garages on cul-de-sacs such as Avenell Lane and Alcott Lane. While similar in design and materials, the houses here were arranged with variations to create a unifying rhythm of street-facing gables, modest set-backs, and alternating single and attached dwellings, while avoiding the monotony often associated with grouped dwellings. The symmetrical effect (Figure 3) created by the arrangement of houses facing the circular green at the end of each cul-de-sac provided a culminating, focal point for and reinforced the sense that each neighborhood grouping was its own private enclave. A 1936 article in *Pencil Points* illustrated a perspective drawing of the typical cul-de-sac envisioned for Greenhills and praised the grouping of houses “to insure a maximum of sunlight, air, space, and privacy for each and giving the whole the character of a pleasant, semi-rural village.”¹⁰

There are four distinctive examples of multi-family buildings grouped in a staggered symmetrical arrangement around open spaces and accessed only by walkways. Smaller groupings are found on Ashby and Cromwell while larger ones are located on Farragut Road. The group at 11 through 25 Ashby Road consists of two pairs of attached and staggered eight-family units flanking a common green space perpendicular to the street and accessed by a series of steps and a walkway (Photograph 12). The group at 34 through 62 Cromwell likewise comprises two pairs of staggered eight-unit buildings flanking an open space on axis with Damon Road, which terminates there (Photograph 16). Two eight-family units at 17 through 31 Flanders Lane flank a parking lot. The examples at 93 through 111 Farragut consist of two groups of ten-family units in five staggered flat-roofed sections flanking a green space with walkways on both the north and south side of the road in opposing “V” arrangements (Photograph 19, Figures 3 and 22).

Another variation of the as-built 1937 plan were two housing courts—Chalmers Court and Dewitt Court—with symmetrical arrangements consisting of rectangular parking lots accessed from the street by a driveway with row buildings on three-sides. Chalmers Court remains in its original configuration with a 4-unit S-type row house flanked by two 6-unit row houses, but Dewitt Court, which also had three S-type row houses, was demolished in 2008. Very few streets or cul-de-sacs are limited to a single housing type, the exceptions being

¹⁰ Dreier, *Pencil Points*, 417.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 12

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

the concentrations of multiple-unit row dwellings along Andover Road and Burley Circle and small single-family houses on Damon Road developed in 1947 for veterans. On Gambier Circle, also built for veterans, the dwellings are consistent in size but have varied orientations and garage configurations—some attached directly and others connected with a breezeway—likely intended to relieve monotony.

The residential lanes are very narrow, barely permitting two cars to pass one another. In some cases, such as Burley Circle, Belknap Place and Bradnor Place the streets are one-way in order to allow for on-street parking. Most residential lanes run north-south, giving dwellings the best orientation to benefit from sunlight and prevailing breezes.

An Abundance of Open Space

As a greenbelt town, Greenhills was characterized by an abundance of green space, which was consistent with recommendations of the 1931 President's conference for the ideal community of the future. Public parks, tree-lined streets, grassy borders, off-street pedestrian paths, play areas and open spaces within the interiors of superblocks combined to give Greenhills a pervasive sense of spaciousness. Respect for the region's natural topography and a coordinated program of planting enhanced the community character identifying it as an attractive, healthy, and verdant community that drew from the English Garden City movement as well as American developments in naturalistic landscape architecture and town planning. Many trees and shrubs were selected and planted throughout the community for unity and harmony, giving the community a cohesive character. Diverse species and distinctive patterns of design differentiated the neighborhood streets and centrally located town commons from the wooded hillsides and commonly used informal open spaces. In some places existing trees were selectively retained, and in others plantings were deliberate and followed popular trends in landscape design. The quality of spaciousness and the unified harmony of the natural landscape and the built environment continue to define the Village of Greenhills today.

Topography played an essential role in the organization of parks and pedestrian pathways in Greenhills. The steep and wooded creek valley on the south and west was transferred to the county park district and developed as part of the Greenbelt with a parkway running through it. "Level and gently sloping terrain was used for building construction where as more rugged areas within and surround the community are designated as parks, playground, allotment gardens and surrounding protective greenbelt."¹¹ A small ravine to northeast of the Community Building was reserved for recreation, eventually developed with tennis courts and a golf course. The reservation of lands that could not be easily built on was in keeping with the American nineteenth-century practices of the Olmsted firm and others.

Hartzog's 1938 plan shows the retention of the beech woods on the south-facing slope on the east edge of the village (Figure 8). Pedestrian pathways ran through other wooded areas connecting the school and playing fields with residential streets. Today, as originally planned, the greenbelt provides a dense naturalistic border and strong sense of enclosure, shielding the village from later development, visual intrusions, and the noise and activity of nearby arterial roadways. It reflects nineteenth-century practices of park and estate design that called for the development of border plantations to screen external influences. Enjoyed and managed as a naturalistic park since the 1930s, the landscape remains in a naturally wooded condition in the form of a county park.

East of the Community Building, a large oval playground provided plenty of room for school children to play. The Commons, west of the Community Building, is a somewhat more formal green space that provides a vista

¹¹ U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, FSA, Div. of Suburban Resettlement. "Section I. Summary Description of the Greenhills Project." p. 16.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 13**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

of this pivotal public building from Winton Road. It also provides a setting for the World War II monument, which is on axis with the entrance to the Community Building. Although the footprint of the school has expanded since the 1950s, the spatial relationship and visual character of the school's semi-circular driveway and setting on the Commons remain intact and signify the prominence that the community building/school held in the town's planning and its history as a neighborhood-based community. East of the community building/school, a parking lot has expanded into the west end of the oval park, where play equipment once existed. Despite this, much of the green space, pedestrian paths, and border plantations remain and retain the woodland setting and sense of enclosure intended by the 1930s plans.

Paved pedestrian pathways wend their way through the community, connecting the residential groups with parks, schools, and the village center. The intent of the plan was to provide residents with safe and convenient access to a neighborhood park without crossing a collector street. This was particularly true for residents living in the southwest portions of the village, however, to reach the Commons they had to cross Winton Road, a busy thoroughfare.

The plan for Greenhills set all of the residential buildings close to the street to reduce utility construction cost and maximize open space within the blocks. The service entrances were designed to front on the streets so that the living quarters could face gardens, open spaces and play areas, away from street traffic. Aside from private yards and gardens, there were designated neighborhood gardens and neighborhood parks beyond the rear yards. Even so, a reasonably heavy concentration of planting was provided on street sides in order to avoid a stark functional appearance. The intent was to create "the effect of a pleasant rural village, through informality of design and landscape architectural treatment."¹²

The community's emphasis on the private yard and home gardening shifted the care of the space from the village to the individual tenant and allowed the residents a private space to hang their laundry, and to plant flower and vegetable gardens. Residents were responsible for cutting the lawn and caring for the yard, and were instructed to plant their garden according "to a plan which has been prepared for each of the yards."¹³ These plans specified certain plants, selected by the design team for beautification, screening, and ease of care. Residents were further cautioned that only flowers and small vegetables could be grown in the yard. Larger produce, such as corn, could only be grown at the allotment gardens, which were shown in the southeast part of the Village on the plan dated March 2, 1936. That location is now athletic fields for the adjacent school. Widespread interest in vegetable gardening grew with the onset of World War II, with residents planting victory gardens in designated plots and expanding the size of the vegetable gardens in their yards.

The original plan took into account the need for play areas. The play area for older children was located behind the Community Building/school, while areas for younger children were located for the residential clusters on the inside of superblocks.¹⁴ The land in the northeast part of the village, along Ingram and Farragut east of the driveway to the athletic fields, was included in the original plan but developed after 1950 in a different configuration and so is not included in the district boundaries. By 1938, the athletic fields included a football field with a running track around it, bleachers (demolished) and a field house adapted from a small pre-existing

¹² Ibid.

¹³ U.S. Department of Agriculture, FSA. *Greenhills Manual*. (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938).

¹⁴ The Community Building is now used for only limited classes but the park behind it has a baseball diamond and play equipment for younger children. With the decline of the school-age population in Greenhills, play equipment has been removed from the residential areas except for Palma Park north of Andover Road.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 14**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

house. A baseball diamond was located east of the football field, where the Winton Woods Middle School now stands. Swimming was available near the Community Building. A golf course was proposed within the greenbelt and built in the 1930s. A small par-3 golf course was also built in the village in a park east of the swimming pool in the early 1950s.

Pedestrian Circulation System

An important characteristic feature of the New Deal greenbelt towns is the network of sidewalks and pedestrian pathways that link residential streets with nearby parks, the village center, and community facilities. Greenhills's pedestrian circulation system consists of paved pathways that run from the residential streets between homes to parks on the interior of superblocks, and along streets to the village center and schools. This character-defining feature indicates the response of planners and designers of the 1930s in adapting the suburban ideal to the increasing presence and potential dangers of the automobile in American life. Introduced in 1928 by Clarence Stein and Henry Wright in their creation of a "town for the motor age" at Radburn, New Jersey, the idea of a community with two interdependent but separate systems of circulation—one for automobile traffic and the other for pedestrians—was compatible with Clarence Perry's Neighborhood Unit Plan and became an essential component in the planning of the greenbelt towns and their demonstration of an ideal for modern suburban life.

However, because of the topography and bisection of the village by Winton Road, Greenhills did not have a fully independent pedestrian circulation plan. Although grade separations similar to those built at Radburn and Greenbelt were originally envisioned for Greenhills in the form of pedestrian tunnels to carry foot traffic safely across Winton Road they proved costly to build and were dropped from the plans when a major budget reduction occurred early in the construction phase.¹⁵ Instead stop signs were placed where major roads intersected and at the crossings of the circuit roads at Winton Road. Buildings were set back from the intersections to provide both drivers and pedestrians with wide, unobstructed views.

Most pedestrian paths were concrete walkways. In addition to curving pedestrian paths in parks, there were linear sidewalks following the alignment of streets on both sides, even in narrow cul-de-sacs, and walks to front doors. These walkways, along with paved driveways, curbs, and garages on residential streets were just being recognized as essential amenities for well-planned subdivisions.

In the description of the pedestrian circulation system that follows, the system is divided into five residential blocks, with streets labeled A through F. The walkways are most prevalent in the A and B and F sections. In the A block, a straight walkway runs from Ashby Street at the intersection with Alcott Lane into Ashby Park, which is located on the interior of the block and is surrounded by multi-unit row houses. Continuing through the park, this pathway connects to Avenell Lane. A second walkway through the center of a pair of symmetrically staggered row houses at 11 to 25 Ashby Avenue ends at Ashby Park. Between Alcott Lane and Andover Avenue a short pedestrian way known as Adelle Walk provides access to the fronts of two duplex buildings known as 1-2 and 3-4 Adelle Walk (Photograph 7).

The B block has several walkways that lead to parks on the interior of blocks defined by Burley Circle, which is bisected by Bachman Street. There is also a small triangular park, known as Bachman Park (Photograph 8), which is defined by Belknap Place, a dogleg street connecting with Bachman Street. Paved pathways into Big Burley Park on the west side of Burley Circle include one opposite Brompton Lane, a cul-de-sac, and two running from Bachman. These pathways all merge with a continuous walkway around the park onto which

¹⁵ Radburn's grade separations were highly celebrated; although such structures were intended for all the greenbelt towns, the only one built is at Greenbelt.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 15

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

fronts a variety of multi-unit row houses. Another path runs east from Belknap Place diagonally through the center of Little Burley Park to the east side of Burley Circle (Photograph 9).

Pathways in the C Block are limited to walkways linking the cul-de-sac of Chalmers Lane with Cromwell Avenue. Along the west side of Winton Road, a long mostly rectilinear, paved pedestrian path runs from Cromwell to Palma Park and to Andover Avenue. These walkways are not found in the D section, which was built later after the construction budget was repeatedly cut. On the east side of Winton Road pedestrian walks similar to those on Cromwell link large symmetrical complexes of row houses on Farragut, which are linked to each other and the street by a short series walkways as well as to playgrounds behind them and the Community Center/School further west.

Pedestrian walkways also knit together the village center, including the Commons, Shopping Center, Community Building/School, and swimming pool. The Commons is mostly a simple open space, straight-edged on the west, north and east, but with a curving edge on the south. Sidewalks line the Commons on all sides, but also cut the corners with sweeping curves. Despite the fact that the Commons provides a vista of the Community Building/ School, which symbolically constitutes the center of civic life, both lack the formality of symmetry. In the shopping district, wide walkways run under a canopy across the front of the shopping center, then turn corners and continue along the other commercial streets—Enfield and Endicott streets—that flank the center on north and south. The Commons continues to provide an uninterrupted view of the school and its design and spatial elements remain intact.

Vehicular Circulation System

The hierarchy of roads is a distinctive, character-defining feature of neighborhood unit planning. Developed in the 1920s at Mariemont and Radburn, it became a hallmark of the American Garden City movement, and was adopted as a key tenet of several New Deal community planning programs. Justin Hartzog stressed the importance of the roadways in planning.

The design of the system of roads and streets serving the town determines to a considerable degree the character of the community, and constitutes the first problem in development of the town plan...The relationship of streets to each other, as well as to the areas which they serve, is of directly significance to the character of the landscape and architectural treatment which may be employed to achieve attractiveness and thus directly affects the appearance of the community.¹⁶

This characteristic attention to roadways persisted when other elements of the Garden City movement lost favor and became one of the major influences on the design of postwar suburbs. At Greenhills, two main types of roads make up the vehicular circulation system: collector and residential (or service) streets. In turn, two major subtypes make up the community's residential roads: the long, narrow curvilinear lane that connects with two or more streets within the village and the short court that ends in a cul-de-sac.

The curvilinear sweep of groups of 1940s single-family homes on Damon Road contrasts markedly with the symmetrical arrangement of the occasional courts and cul-de-sacs. All of the streets in Greenhills were built to a width appropriate for its particular function, and had utilities placed underground (except for areas developed in the late 1940s on Damon, Drummond and Gambier Circle). The streets were paved, and equipped with street signs, fire hydrants, and electric street lamps. The plan included granite curbs and cuts for driveways but because of cost, these were not installed until 1999. All streets had sidewalks on both sides, which connected

¹⁶ Justin R. Hartzog, quoted in Leach, pp. 126-127.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 16**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

with paths to the dwellings.

Whether they are short Radburn-inspired courts that provide privacy and order to a small grouping of row buildings, or long, gently curving lanes with row buildings and duplexes laid out in a pleasing symmetrical or rhythmical progression, the streets of Greenhills were designed to the highest standards of suburban design. Each road was laid out in keeping with the best practices of the day. The collector streets carry traffic through the community and connect with the major roadway of Winton Road. Street development in the postwar period allowed further entry to the village from Sharon Road on the north. In the original section, the circuit road consisted of Cromwell, Damon, Farragut and Ingram roads, which connect to form a continuous but irregular oval bisected by Winton Road. They are all curvilinear streets, for the most part residential, although contiguous with churches and the Community Building where Cromwell and Farragut meet at Winton Road.

The design of four-way intersections known to cause traffic hazards in urban settings was avoided in favor of "T" intersections, especially in the residential areas. The main exceptions are the two four-way crossings on Winton Road. The original plan called for underpasses in these locations but these were eliminated for budget reasons. Parking has always been an integral element of the village's vehicular circulation system with service lanes and parking placed in front of and behind the shopping center, behind the Community Building, and in off-street parking lots lined with compounds of garages.

In 1936, when the streets were initially named, they were merely numbered, but by 1938, they were given for English surnames. Street names within the same block all began with the same letter, following the alphabet in the order of construction. The residential lanes in the southwest section begin with A (such as Andover and Alcott); those in the west section start with B (Burley and Burnham, and so on); those in the center begin with C (Cromwell and Chalmers); and those in the north section start with D (Damon, Drummond and Dewitt).

Inventory of Collector and Commercial Streets

The Winton Road is a centrally located, four-lane, tree-lined boulevard that runs north-south and divides the village into two unequal east and west sections. As a regional artery that pre-existed Greenhills and was widened, Winton forms an axial corridor that later connected to the beltway, I-275, which was built in the 1970s. Winton was treated as a parkway with limited controlled access to the community building, parks, and shopping center via the circuit roads of Farragut and Ingram. The shopping center faces Winton Road but has no direct connection, rather it is accessed by a service road, Eswin Street, which runs parallel to Winton between the circuit roads and is offset from Winton by a wide berm and lower grade. Eswin widens into a parking lot in front of the shopping center. This follows the practice of community builders and the FHA prototype of Arthur Heaton's Colonial Revival Park and Shop in Washington D.C. No residential buildings face Winton Road; only one building within the historic district, the Greenhills Presbyterian Church, faces directly onto Winton Road at the corner of Cromwell.

The section containing streets beginning with "E" is composed of the shopping center, the community building and swimming pool. This section lies in a depression of land east of Winton Road, which continues to slope down east of the district boundaries. This grade change results in one and two-story facades on the Eswin side, with two and three stories on the rear parking lot side. The Eswin Street buildings are connected by a flat-roofed covered walkway supported by brick piers. Concrete stairways between the buildings lead to the rear parking lot. Eswin Street, which runs in front of the shopping center, originally had a green space between the street and Winton Road, but it was recently reduced to provide more parking spaces. Enfield and Endicott Street run perpendicular to Eswin with Enfield Street curving behind the rear parking lot and terminating in front of the Community Building. Molloy Lane runs east between the swimming pool and the Community Building and dead-ends in a parking lot.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 17**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

The Commons is a roughly rectangular open space that sets the Community Building off from Winton Road. To the south, the borders the Our Lady of the Rosary Church complex and to the south, the retail strip of Endicott Street. The shopping center has two entrances on Eswin Street, north and south. The Commons is sparsely planted with trees and has three monuments—a World War II memorial obelisk and two granite boulders with bronze plaques—one dedicating the Commons to Nicholas G. Bates for faithful years of service to the Greenhills from 1936 to 1973, the other describing the Greenhills-Forest Park Journal's commemorative issue on the history of the community for the U.S. Bicentennial in 1976. It also has a circular wood gazebo at the southeast corner and 35 wood and concrete benches grouped around trees and facing into the square from the perimeter.

Greenhills is distinctive for the convergence of its collector streets into a circuit road that connects secondary residential lanes, cul-de-sacs and courts with the major artery of Winton Road as well as the civic and commercial center of the community. In the original section, the circuit roads are Cromwell, Damon, Farragut and Ingram streets, which form an irregular oval bisected by Winton Road. They are all curvilinear streets, for the most part residential, although contiguous with churches and the Community Building where Cromwell and Farragut meet at Winton Road. Street development after 1950 allowed further entry to the village from Sharon Road into new subdivisions in the northeast.

Cromwell Road begins at Winton Road and curves to the southwest where it merges in a four-way stop into Burley Circle at the intersection with Andover Road. Cromwell is exclusively residential except at the corner of Winton Road where the Presbyterian Church is located, and connects with Chalmers Lane, Drummond and Damon roads. Damon Road arcs northeast from Cromwell Road and carries traffic to and from Springdale Road, a major east-west arterial to Winton Road. Damon Road also provides access to Deerhill Lane, which was built in the 1960s, after the period of significance and not included in the NHL district. Ingram Road, which runs east from Winton Road skirts the shopping center and then becomes exclusively residential and merges with Farragut Road. Ingram Road was shown on the 1938 plan but housing was not developed there until after the village was sold in 1950; therefore it and the dwellings that line it are also not included in the NHL district. Ingram becomes Farragut Road at the T intersection with Gambier Circle. Farragut is the most important segment of the circuit road because it provides access to the Community Building/School, the Commons, and the shopping center. It also runs by Our Lady of the Rosary church complex. Only the first building of this complex, the school, built in 1942, with additions in 1952 and 1963, is contributing to the district. Two cul-de-sacs, Falcon Lane and Flanders Lane, extend southward from Farragut. Hadley Road, a residential street that runs southeast from Farragut, was built in stages. A short section of Hadley Road was completed in 1938 to access the athletic fields. In the 1950s, it was extended when additional residential construction was developed there. At that time, a driveway was installed just west of Hadley to reach the athletic fields and school buildings that were built after 1950 to avoid traffic on a residential street.

Inventory of Neighborhood Streets

In Greenhills, neighborhood streets are strictly curving residential lanes, circles, cul-de-sacs, and courts. All housing units have two stories unless described otherwise. The genius of the Greenhills design lies in the ability of all the constituent parts to gracefully dovetail with each other. Multiple-family dwellings, or group housing, are identified as three-unit, four-unit, six-unit, or eight-unit row houses. The streets and residential groups are laid out to follow the natural topography which gradually slopes southward toward the Mill Creek, which lies outside the district. Mill Creek flows west to east in a slightly southerly direction and forms the principal drainage for the lands within the NHL district. The residential streets in the district are located in seven general groups, each labeled alphabetically "A" through "G". The "A", "B", "C", and "D" streets are all located west of Winton Road, with the "A" streets at the south end, "B" streets west of the "A" streets; "C" streets near the

PROPERTY NAME**Page 18**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

center and "D" streets at the north end. The "E", "F", and "G" streets are on the east side. The "E" streets define the village center on the near east side, while the "F" streets are located at the south end and the one "G" street, Gambier Circle, is east of the village center.

Andover Road is the major entrance into the A and B sections from Winton Road. The street commences with a central island containing seasonal plantings. Two-story row houses comprise the most common type of housing on the road; there is only one single-family house (Photograph 10). The buildings nearest to Winton Road have entirely brick exteriors with slate gable roofs. The interior buildings are sheathed in stucco and brick, with newer siding covering most of the stucco exteriors. On the north is a large commons, known as Palma Park, which is accessed by two public walkways from Andover Road.

Adelle Walk is basically a concrete pathway through an open grassy lawn from Andover to Alcott (Photograph 7). Two brick duplexes face east on to it. The rear, or garden, side of 2-12 Ashby Street is adjacent to this area on the west.

Alcott Lane is a small curving street off of Ashby Street which terminates in a cul-de-sac in the form of a turning circle centered on a raised, grassy lawn. Half a dozen gable-roofed, 1 ½-story single-family homes (Photograph 11) and three duplexes line this street.

Ashby Street curves to the southwest and connects Andover and Avenell roads. It is occupied by duplexes and row buildings. A courtyard created by two staggered four-unit brick row buildings facing each other is located on the west side of the street (Photograph 12). Accessed by concrete steps and a central walkway, the courtyard's elevation on a rise above the street and plantings provide privacy and a sense of enclosure. A narrow concrete pedestrian path leads west from Ashby to Avenell Lane providing access to a small park in the interior of the block.

Avenell Lane curves to the southeast from Andover, crosses with Ashby and ends in a large cul-de-sac with a circular grassy lawn in the center. Single-family, duplexes and row buildings occupy this street (Photograph 13). As previously mentioned a paved pedestrian path leads connects Avenell Lane with Ashby and provides access to a small inner-block park.

Burley Circle is a one-way circular collector street that connects all of the other roads in the B section to the A and C sections. The inner ring, or odd-numbered, residences are all three-story and of the same basic type, with variations seen in windows and location of entrances. A pedestrian path leads from the southwest side of Burley Circle into Big Burley Park, while a second path provides access to Little Burley Park from the northeast side.

Bradnor Place is a short angled street with both ends connecting with Burley Circle. Three multiple-family row buildings are located there. All have slate-covered gable roofs and asbestos siding.

Briarwood Lane is a short cul-de-sac off of Burley Circle; it contains two row buildings, two duplexes and some newer garages. All of the buildings on Briarwood originally had flat roofs and asbestos siding.

Brompton Lane is a relatively long street that ends in a cul-de-sac. A variety of residences are present on the street, including single-family homes, duplexes and multiple-family row buildings, all of which were originally flat-roofed (Photographs 14 and 15). Buildings are either brick or covered with asbestos siding. An unpaved pedestrian path leads from the circle into the inner greenbelt.

Burnham Street takes the form of a loop with two entrances onto Burley Circle. It is lined with duplexes, single-

PROPERTY NAME**Page 19**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

family homes and row buildings. Buildings are brick and asbestos-sided and both flat roofs and slate-covered gable roofs are seen. A pedestrian path at the southwest side connects the street with the inner greenbelt.

Burwood Court, a small cul-de-sac that extends from Burley Circle, was originally a garage compound. Three buildings, two rectangular apartment buildings and a garage, replaced the garages in the 1960s. The apartment buildings, which were condominiumized in 1985, have face brick and mansard roofs. All three are noncontributing.

Bachman Street is a relatively short street that bisects Burley Circle. The topography rises in the center of Bachman Street's length, resulting in stepped massing of multiple-unit row buildings. A single-family residence, duplexes and row buildings are clad in stucco, brick veneer or asbestos siding. An abundance of mature oak trees adds pastoral ambience to the street.

Belknap Place is a small angled street that connects to Bachman at two points and one-way going south. Bachman Park, a grassy triangle of open space with majestic oak trees, separates Belknap from Bachman (Photograph 8). The residences are all multi-family brick row buildings with slate-covered gable roofs. A concrete walk leads northeast from Belknap Place through Little Burley Park to the east side of Burley Circle. Cromwell Road intersects with Winton Road and curves southwest down a hill to connect with Burley Circle and Andover Road. All of the original buildings are located on the southeast side of Cromwell Road and consist of two-story S-type row buildings with asbestos siding, which had originally had flat roofs, as well as a pair of 8-unit flats with staggered footprints flanking Cromwell Park (Photograph 16). A pedestrian path leads from Cromwell Road through Cromwell Park to the cul-de-sac of Chalmers Lane, and another leads east into Palma Park. The south end of Cromwell contains a large apartment complex on the west side and some mid-1950s single-family houses, which are not included in the district. A 1950s single-family house at 19 Cromwell at the intersection with Drummond Street is included as a noncontributing resource.

Chalmers Lane, a J-shaped street, curves from its entrance from Cromwell Road and ends in a circle. A court of three rows of garages was originally located at the off the circle, but the buildings have been removed and the court is now an open parking lot. To the south of the street is a large park, known as Palma Park that adjoins buildings facing south on Andover Road. All of the residences on this street are the S-type road building with asbestos siding and flat roofs; almost all have new gable roofs. Paved geometric pathways lead northwest into Chalmers Park, which is flanked by staggered row houses.

Chalmers Court comprises three two-story asbestos-sided row buildings grouped in a U-shaped formation around the original courtyard, which is a surface parking lot. Concrete walks run around the perimeter of the courtyard and lead to each dwelling unit. Oak trees stand in the planting strip and in the rear of the row houses.

Dewitt Street curves in a semicircle on the west side of Drummond Street. It has four 1930s row houses on the west side, all of which have asbestos siding and were originally flat roofed. However, the treatment of porches varies between one type with an enclosed projecting section adjacent to the porch like many of the row buildings in the C and D sections, while the other has a porch flanking a wood tool shed with a balcony on top of it. The east side of the street is part of Dewitt Landing, which was redeveloped beginning in 2004 after being reconfigured with single-family lots.

Damon Road is a curving street that comprises the northwest part of the circuit road and connects with Springdale Road, which runs off in a southwesterly direction. Damon is lined with small single-family Cape Cod houses built in 1947 for veterans (Photograph 17). The portion at 70 Damon Road, where a former school built in 1955 was adapted for use as the Alois Alzheimer Center.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 20**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Dewitt Court is a rectangular paved court which was originally developed with three S-type row houses—a four-unit building in the center flanked by two five-unit buildings. These row houses were razed in 2007 and 2009, but the paved court lined with oak trees remains and could receive new housing in the future.

Drummond Street connects Cromwell and the north section of Damon Road, the latter meeting Cromwell Road at its south end. Drummond is unusual in that its buildings reflect construction of various types and different times. The original plans called for it to be lined all with two-story row buildings but only five were built out of which three remain. Instead Drummond is mostly characterized by small 1 ½-story single-family houses with attached garages including five at the north end built in 1947 and 17 on the east side built in 1953. A 1962-vintage two-story gabled-roofed brown brick apartment building is located on the west side of Drummond, between the entrances to Dewitt Street.

Drummond Court no longer exists in its original form. It was originally an elongated semicircular block with four staggered apartment buildings flanking a rectangular green space edged with pedestrian walks. Beginning in 2004, this block was reconfigured with single-family lots and redeveloped with two-story, front-gabled houses and is now known as Dewitt Landing. Four homes at 39, 43, 47 and 51 Drummond Street are part of this recent development (Photograph 18).

The F section is the only original residential block on the east side of Winton Road. The area is characterized by the long staggered blocks of multi-unit flats which are sited in a perpendicular axis to Farragut Road (Photograph 19). These housing groups have open spaces between them, which is partly devoted to parking lots as shown on the original plans. A number of row buildings in the S-type design are found on all of the F streets. All of the buildings are two-story and are seen both in brick and with the original asbestos siding. Farragut Road, the circuit road on this side of Winton Road, abruptly changes to residential at the driveway to the high school and athletic fields. Newer single-family houses then line the street to the east, with a number of typical subdivision roads off of Farragut. The F section has the highest concentration of pedestrian pathways, which connect dwellings to each other and the open spaces around them.

Farragut Road, which is part of the circuit road network, is the main entrance to the commercial and civic center of the village and the only through street in the F section. The road contains a variety of housing types, most of them situated with a perpendicular axis to the street, originally with green spaces between (Photograph 16). The Our Lady of the Rosary church complex of buildings is located at the west end where Farragut intersects with Winton Road. It includes the school building, as well as the church, rectory and former convent—all two-story brick buildings built in the 1960s.

Falcon Lane is a short straight lane ending in a cul-de-sac. It has three 4-unit and one 5-unit S-type row buildings with asbestos siding and one single-family house, as well as two 3-car garage groupings (Photograph 17)

Flanders Lane is a relatively long curving street ending in a cul-de-sac. It also has two smaller cul-de-sacs running east from it at right angles. Housing on the street is composed of mostly S-type row buildings; a brick duplex at the end of the street faces an identical building at the end of Funston (Photograph 20). There is a recent cul-de-sac named FDR Walk running west with three duplexes and three single-family homes; all are noncontributing. FDR Walk was subdivided in circa 1999 and is structured as a Planned Unit Development of landminiums.¹⁷ It is a small circle with six two-story buildings—three duplexes and three single-family

¹⁷ A landminium is type of residential property in which the owner owns both the home and the land on which

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 21

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

dwelling.

Foxworth Lane is a cul-de-sac with three large row buildings in the S-type design. A large common space lies to the north of the street with walks leading out to Farragut Road. Foxworth Lane adjoins Foxworth Park to the north. A pedestrian path once led from the end of the lane to the athletics fields to the east. A chain-link fence now encloses the fields.

Funston Lane is a very short street at the end of Flanders Lane. The residences on the street are two duplexes, one with brick veneer, the other covered with asbestos siding and a row building with asbestos and vinyl siding.

Gambier Circle is a loop that runs west from Ingram/Farragut roads lined on both sides with small single-family houses with attached garages and varied orientations (Photograph 21). The circle was drawn in the 1938 plan with multi-unit row houses but because it was not developed until after World War II, the buyers' preference for single-family homes led to this departure in building type from the original layout. The west end of the loop is connected by a concrete walk running southwest to the adjoining oval park behind the Community Building/School. On the north side of the circle, former parkland that was developed into a nine-hole golf course in the 1950s adjoins the rear yards of the houses. Gambier Circle was originally lined with ash trees, which are mostly gone now because of the Emerald Ashborer infestation.

Ingram Road, which is the northeast component of the circuit road network, provides access to the north end of the shopping center via Eswin Street, but beyond that is a residential street lined with one-story single-family houses. Built in the 1950s, these homes are mostly brick-clad ranches and Cape Cods sited parallel to the street.

Housing Types and Construction

The original plan, as begun in 1935 and completed in 1938, included a variety of housing types—detached single-family, semi-detached duplexes, row houses containing from three to six units, and multi-family apartment buildings. While surveys of potential tenants indicated a marked preference for single-family homes, they simply were not affordable after the project was forced to absorb several rounds of budget cuts. While the grouping of houses was recognized by a number of housing analysts, including Henry Wright, Catherine Bauer, and Thomas Adams, as a major way of reducing construction costs and allowing greater area for yards and open parkland, it also provided the social advantages of neighborhood living. The placement of homes close to the street with little setback represents a striking departure from nineteenth- and early twentieth-century preferences for spacious front lawns in the upper-middle income suburbs derived from Olmsted and Vaux's archetypal suburb of 1869, Riverside. By the 1920s, the planning profession and zoning advocates were promoting mandatory setbacks. The approach in Greenhills was modeled after Radburn and Mariemont. The arrangement of the residential buildings on courts and cul-de-sacs created a sense of enclosure to the street, limited traffic and provided an intimacy intended to encourage neighborliness among residents.

Like the other Greenbelt communities, Greenhills was intended as a demonstration of innovative methods of home-building and the cost-reducing methods of large-scale construction. The overall emphasis was on providing a comfortable and convenient living arrangement for lower-income Americans, while offering the amenities and spaciousness commonly associated with upper-income neighborhoods or higher priced apartments built by developers in the 1920s. Building upon the successful innovations presented in previous Garden City communities, such as Mariemont and Radburn, the greenbelt communities were intended to

the home is built. The home is a part of a community, like a condominium, where the landscaping, maintenance and other services are provided by a homeowners' association.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 22**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

demonstrate 1) the usefulness of cost analyses prior to design, and 2) the savings inherent in the grouping of houses for economy, large-scale construction, and the use of less expensive building materials and methods of construction. Essential appliances and utilities provided modern standards of comfort and convenience and scientifically-derived house plans were created in which interior space was carefully calculated for function, life style, and efficiency.

The 676 dwelling units built in 1935 to 1938 were distributed among 185 buildings. Originally, 1,000 units were planned, but reduced funding resulted in the lower number.¹⁸ Of the 676 units that were constructed, 24 (3.5 percent of the total number of units) are single-family detached houses, 80 are in two-unit duplexes (12 percent), 96 are in three-unit row houses (14 percent), 180 are in four-unit row houses (27 percent), 60 are in five-unit row houses (9 percent), 84 are in six-unit row houses (12 percent); 112 are in eight-unit buildings (16.5 percent); and 40 are in ten-unit buildings (6 percent).

The designers produced 33 variations of floor plans. The two-bedroom configuration is most common, with 300 such units. Some 214 dwellings have three bedrooms, while 112 have one bedroom and 50 have four bedrooms. Every unit also incorporates a good-sized kitchen (ranging from ten by twelve feet to nine by seven-and-one-half feet), living room, and bathroom. All units had dining rooms except the one-bedroom flats.¹⁸

Residential buildings were built of insulated wood-panel construction, with exterior walls of brick veneer, stucco over hollow clay tile and light gray asbestos weatherboard siding. About fifty percent of the dwellings have full basements, and the rest are without. Originally about 25 percent had gabled roofs with slate, tile or asphalt shingles, and the rest had flat roofs with tar and gravel. Numerous housing units retain original elements such as steel awning windows with three horizontal panes, flat or shed-roofed entry porches, and slate or red tile roofs. However, the addition of gabled roofs and even a few mansards to flat roofs, replacement windows and enclosed breezeways are not unusual.

On the interior of a typical unit, the first floor typically consists of a living room, kitchen, dining alcove, and utility room, each with asphalt tile flooring (Figures 13, 16 and 18). A straight, wooden staircase with a streamlined wooden handrail provides access to the second-story hall and bedrooms which have maple or oak board flooring. Each unit has a single bathroom, typically located on the second floor. Many units now have carpeting or other materials on top of the original flooring. The walls are finished with plaster. Interior woodwork includes simple baseboards, wood picture moldings, and door and window surrounds. Other typical features were drapery tracks in doorways to the living room (Figure 20) and large closets in bedrooms.

When Greenhills opened to tenants in 1938, each unit came with an electric stove and refrigerator, an enameled steel or cast iron sink with drain board, and metal base and wall cabinets in the kitchen (Figure 21) and sink, recessed medicine cabinet, tub and toilet in the bathroom. Most units had individual steam heating systems with a coal-fired boiler, while large buildings of flats had central heating provided by the village and deep sinks for laundry. Units without basements had hot-water systems.¹⁹ In dwellings with basements, utility rooms were provided there and included a large coal bin, electric water heater and a double concrete laundry sink along with the furnace. Many units retain original sinks, bathtubs and toilets.

The designers of Greenhills had intended to furnish all the dwelling units with furniture designed by the RA's Special Skills Division. The simple, functional wooden furniture, published in *House Beautiful*, was

¹⁸ "Farm Security Administration announces Greenhills Rentals," USDA Press release, Jan 26, 1938. Village of Greenhills, Ohio.

¹⁹ Debbie Mills and Margo Warminski, *Images of Greenhills* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2013), p. 69.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 23**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

“specifically made to scale for the homes. All of the pieces matched in style to add ease in decorating. The furniture was built well and offered at an inexpensive rate.”²⁰ However, furnishings had to be eliminated from the budget due to a lack of funds, and the furniture proved too expensive for tenants to buy themselves.

Just 33 percent of the residential units were planned with an integral or attached garage. The garages are incorporated into the design of single-family and duplex houses but less common in multi-unit row houses (Photographs 11, 13, 15 and 20), some of which have grouped garages that are attached. Detached garages were typically provided in compounds consisting of opposing rows flanking a driveway off the street. The grouped garages are built of concrete block and most originally had flat-roofs and slag floors. All of the garages accommodated one car, and closed with a pair of wooden doors that opened outward. Throughout the village, most garage doors have been replaced and many slag floors are now paved with asphalt or concrete. Synthetic siding and a sloped roof have been installed on some examples and others have been demolished.

Of the original 185 residential buildings (676 dwelling units) in Greenhills, just 24 are single-family detached houses, 40 are duplexes; 32 are three-unit row houses; 45 are four-unit row houses; 12 are five-unit row houses; 14 are six-unit row houses; 14 are eight-unit buildings; and four are ten-unit buildings. Of the single-family homes, six have four bedrooms and eighteen have three bedrooms; the row houses have two, three, or four bedrooms; the eight-unit buildings have one bedroom flats; and the ten-unit buildings have two-bedroom flats.

Single-family houses in Greenhills built by 1938 typically fall into two categories. The most common is a three-bedroom dwelling, one-and-a-half stories tall, ell-shaped in plan, and capped with a cross-gabled slate roof (Photograph 11, Figures 16 and 17). The principal entrance is typically on the inside corner where the gable front meets the wing. Each house has a brick chimney and a breezeway connecting it with an integral garage. Some had a flat-roofed porch on the side facing away from the street. Another less frequent type of single-family dwelling is a four-bedroom house, two stories, rectangular in plan, with a side-gabled roof and an attached garage. An example at 18 Brompton (Photograph 14) is a Modern design with irregularly sized and placed windows, a curved canopy over the front door and a garage that projects from the front elevation. However, its red brick exterior and side-gabled roof are reminiscent of Colonial Revival.

The layouts of the single-family houses vary, but each features the reverse-front plan introduced at Radburn with the utility room and the kitchen on the street or service side of the house, and the living room and dining alcove away from the street on the garden side. In the cross-gabled example, two bedrooms are included on the first floor and two additional bedrooms and single bathroom are located on the second floor. In the side-gabled example, the four bedrooms are all on the second floor along with the bathroom.

Duplexes

The village's original forty duplexes contain 80 housing units. There are two types—either one-and-a-half-story or two-story dwellings—both with four-bedroom units and integral garages. The housing units that make up each duplex are arranged as mirror images with the garages side-to-side. They are essentially semi-detached single-family units connected as mirror images with garages in the center. The one-and-a-half story dwellings, located in the A Section, have a front-gable and ell plan with two bedrooms on the first floor and two bedrooms on the second. Examples are located at 33-35 and 36-37 Avenell (Photograph 13, Figure 24). Two-story duplexes, located in the B Section, are rectangular in plan, with side-gabled roofs and symmetrical three-bay elevations.

²⁰ Ibid, p. 71.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 24**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Each unit has two entrances, one on the service side overlooking the street and the other on the garden side. Each living room extends the full width of the house to either side of the kitchen and utility room. Each living room is afforded the maximum amount of privacy and in part faces the garden.

Multiple-Unit Row Houses

The original section of Greenhills includes 32 three-unit row or group dwellings, 45 four-unit row dwellings, 12 five-unit row dwellings, and 14 six-unit row dwellings with a combination of two- and three- and four-bedroom units. The two-story housing unit is the basic component of each multi-unit row, in various configurations throughout the community to suit families of various sizes and life styles. Many dwellings have integral garages while others have detached garages nearby. All have individual entrances and yards. Row dwellings vary in plan; some have simple rectangular footprints, while others have end units that are set back or front-gabled. Still others have staggered fronts or stepping grades where they are built on sloping ground. Roofs were either side gabled or flat; flat roofs retrofitted with gabled ones are not unusual. Unlike the single and duplexes, the principal entrance of each unit faces the street. Details include flat entrance porches with pole or brick supports and interior brick chimneys (Figures 13, 24, 15, 18, and 19).

There are various types of multiple-unit row dwellings in the village, which fall into two basic categories. Examples in the A and B Sections, the first to be built, are more traditional, with brick or stucco exteriors, slate roofs, garages and basements. In subsequent sections, federal budget cuts required a cheaper approach to housing construction, resulting in the design of S-type row houses. Instead of brick facing and slate roofs used in the initial construction on the A and B blocks, S-type houses, which appear in the C, D and F sections, were built of wood frame with asbestos siding and flat roofs.

Examples of the earlier type with garages appear in various rhythms, with garages in pairs or groups corresponding to the number of units. Three-unit row houses have a variety of two-bedroom and three-bedroom units, sometimes mixed and other times consistent. Most three-unit row houses, such as 13-15-17 Andover (Photograph 10) don't have integral garages, although a few examples have a single garage attached to an end unit that is larger. An example is 1-3-5 Andover, in which unit 1 has 4 bedrooms and a garage, while 3 and 5 are two-bedroom units without garages.

The four-unit row house at 7-9-11-13 Brompton comprises a pair of two-story duplex buildings connected by a projecting one-story group of four garages (Photograph 15). Other examples, such as 10-12-14-16 Brompton, are arranged with three two-story units on one side of the projecting garages and a single two-story unit on the other side. There are also variations with two pairs of projecting garages with a duplex in the center and single houses on the ends (14-16-18-20 Ashby). Four-unit row houses without garages, such as 11-13-15-17 Ashby and 19-21-23-25 Ashby (Photograph 12), consist of two pairs of staggered rectangular-plan, side-gabled duplexes facing a Common central green space.

Four-unit buildings also house varying numbers of bedrooms; some have identical three-bedroom units (19-21-23-25 Brompton) or all two-bedroom units (112-114-116-118 Burley Circle), while others have a combination of two- and three-bedroom units in various rhythms, i.e. 3-2-2-3 (30-32-24-26 Burley Circle); 3-3-2-2 (59-61-63-65 Burley Circle) or 3-3-2-3 (8-9-10-11 Belknap), often with the larger units on the ends. Wherever possible, four-unit row dwellings are arranged so that the utilities and plumbing are located back to back in each pair of units (Figures 18 and 19). Each house unit has a private yard and a porch on the garden side. The layout of the house units in the five- and six-unit buildings with built-in garages, is similar to the three- and four-unit row houses.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 25**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Multiple-unit S-type Row Houses in the C, D and F sections

S-type row houses were developed after budget cuts required a cheaper approach to housing construction. Instead of brick facing and slate roofs used in the initial construction on the A and B blocks, S-type houses, which appear in the C, D and F sections, were built of wood frame with asbestos siding and flat roofs (Photograph 20, Figure 14). Basements were eliminated. Garages, when included, were not attached, but in most cases built in gangs and located off-site. They are easily recognizable by their projecting utility rooms and entrance porches, which provided two doors—one for the front entrance and the other directly into the utility room. All S-type row houses had two- and three-bedrooms grouped in various combinations of three, four, five and six units. The number of bedrooms can be easily identified by the number of windows on the street-side elevation. The interior layout exhibits economy of plan by arranging bathrooms and kitchens in each pair of units back-to-back.

Multiple-unit Flats

Multiple-unit Flats, which were built in the C, D and F sections, consist of two-story dwellings with one- and two-bedroom units on a single floor, with eight or ten units in each building. The eight-unit buildings, all with one-bedroom flats, are arranged in two rectangular modules that are connected but offset. There is an entrance porch on each side of every module with two doors—one leading to the first-floor flat and the other to the second floor—so that all flats have doors on both sides. The entrance porches all include a balcony above. For the sake of economy, the plans arranged kitchens in each pair of units set back-to-back. Fourteen eight-family units were built along Cromwell (Photograph 16, Figure 22), Drummond Court and Farragut Road, however eight now remain.

The ten-unit buildings, all with two-bedroom flats, consist of five square modules, also connected but staggered, with flat roofs and brick facing. There were four ten-unit flats built, all in one group on Farragut Road with opposing pairs on each side of the street (Photograph 19, Figure 22). Like with the eight-unit examples, the ten-unit also have an apartment entrance on one side of each module articulated by an entrance porch which provides a balcony above. The eight-unit flats were originally clad in asbestos siding; some are now covered with aluminum or vinyl siding. The ten-unit flats are clad in face brick, which provides a more upscale appearance. Apartments are arranged with stairways in between units, which would enhance soundproofing and privacy.

The Dillon Subdivisions (1947)

The street layouts of Damon Road and Gambier Circle were included in the 1937 plan but envisioned with multi-unit row houses of various sizes. The streets were built by 1938 although a semicircular lane off Damon Road, labeled Darien Place, was not, nor were the row houses. The undeveloped areas were originally divided into parcels of similar size to those developed in the original village. In 1947, these areas were replatted by Justin Hartzog with 72 small (.2-acre or smaller) parcels on Damon Road (with the exception of an 8-acre lot at 70 Damon reserved for a school built in 1955 and not included in the district) and 49 similarly sized lots on Gambier Circle. Five small parcels on Drummond were also created. These parcels were sold to developers known as The Dillons, who built small single-family homes backed by federal insurance and marketed to war veterans. These parcels were the first ones privately sold, in anticipation of the eventual sale of all the federally owned housing in Greenhills (which occurred in 1950). County auditor's records indicate these homes were built in 1947.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 26**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

The houses are generally six-room brick-faced Cape Cod-style dwellings, in the range of 1300 to 1400 square feet (Photograph 17, Figure 4). Although small, they have four bedrooms--two on the ground floor and two in a finished attic. These dwellings are typically set parallel to the street and have garages connected with a breezeway or attached directly. On Gambier Circle (Photograph 21), the monotony of long rows of like houses is relieved by setting some with the gable-end facing the street on wedge-shaped lots created by the curve of the street. Front-facing gable ends are treated with half-timbering reminiscent of Tudor Revival. The Dillon subdivisions also included five lots on the upper west end of Drummond Road, which was only partially built out by 1938 with four S-type row houses (two of which have since been demolished). Also built in 1947, these homes—at 67, 71, 75, 79, and 99 Drummond Road—are the same type as those erected by the Dillons on Damon and Gambier. The design of the houses and their arrangement along curving neighborhood streets reflect the revised FHA standards first published in 1940. The houses in these 1947 subdivisions fall within the period of significance and are considered contributing.

Later Housing

Eighty-four residential buildings were constructed within the historic district after 1950, which marks the end of the period of significance, and are thus considered noncontributing. These include 17 single-family Cape Cod houses built on Drummond Road in 1953, 19 single-family ranch and Cape Cod homes built on Farragut Road in 1952 through 1958, a brick Modern single-family house at 119 ½ Farragut Road built in 1956, 30 single-family ranch and Cape Cod homes built on Ingram Road in 1952 through 1954, 5 brick ranches built on Cromwell Road in 1954 through 1964, a four-building Modern apartment complex (counted as one non-contributing building) at 63 Cromwell Road built in 1962, a single-family house at 11 Falcon Lane built in 1966, a four-unit apartment house at 89-95 Burley Circle built in 1968, two six-unit apartment buildings on Burwood Court built in the 1960s, another 1960s six-unit apartment house at 25 Cromwell Road, and nine units in six buildings built in 1999-2001 on FDR Walk off of Falcon.

The Village Center

The Greenhills plan locates the civic and commercial center on level ground east of Winton Road, the major north-south corridor, roughly in the physical center of the circuit roads (Figure 3). As built between 1936 and 1939, the center included two administrative/institutional buildings, two commercial buildings, a farmers' market shed and a swimming pool. All were freestanding buildings, although the commercial buildings were envisioned for eventual expansion into a multi-unit shopping center. The Greenhills Management Building combined the village offices, police and fire stations, while the Community Building/School served both school children and adults. The shopping center was designed to include a co-op food store, a food storage locker plant, and other consumer services, such as a valet shop, barber shop, and beauty parlor. The second commercial building was an automobile service station, located at the north end of the current shopping center.

Administrative and Community Buildings

The original Greenhills Management Building (1938, contributing) is situated at 14 Endicott Street, on the north side of the Commons and at a right angle to the shopping center. It was built to house the village management offices and the police and fire departments. Another example of the International Style, the concrete-block building is two-stories (three stories on the rear), rectangular, and flat-roofed with a band of windows at the second floor. Originally, the fire Station occupied the projecting east end of the building. Village management and a credit union were located on the first floor and offices for doctors, dentists and businesses were on the second floor. The east end, which housed the fire department, was originally one-story and had two garage bays for fire trucks. The Greenhills branch library, which was located in the Community Building/School beginning

PROPERTY NAME**Page 27**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

in 1939, moved into the former management building in 1954 and expanded to its present size in 1956.²¹ After village offices moved to a Colonial-inspired two-story brick building (noncontributing) at 11000 Winton Road in 1959 (Photograph 22), the rest of the management building was converted to commercial use; the garage bays were filled in with storefronts and a second floor with aluminum and glass window wall, was added. Otherwise the building is intact except for alterations to windows on the first floor. (Photograph 1). The post office moved into the Management Building in 1956. Initially it was located at One Alcott Lane, and moved to the shopping center by 1940.

The Greenhills Community Building and School (contributing), now known as the Winton Woods Alternative School Center, faces west at 8 Enfield Street overlooking the Commons (Photographs 4 and 5). It was designed for 800 children with classrooms, a library and a gymnasium/auditorium with a seating capacity of 1200. In the early years, an adult education program and a youth center operated in the building, and social events and Sunday church services were held there. The building's rectilinear massing, irregular plan, smooth white stucco exterior, banded multi-pane windows exemplify the International style. Though flat-roofed for the most part, the streamlined five-bay temple front, which provides access to the gymnasium/auditorium, gives it the monumental character appropriate for a civic building, yet its off-center placement makes it less formal. A two-story, flat-roofed wing added to the south end in 1970 is consistent with its original character. The building retains a high degree of historic integrity befitting its stylistic prominence and location.

On the interior, the Community Building features several works of New Deal art. The gymnasium has a bas relief sculpture and decorative frieze above the stage, and WPA murals remain in the former library and music room. The sculpture in the gymnasium, entitled "Community Life," depicts a farmer and a factory worker. This a terra cotta bas relief was created by Whitney Atchley (Figure 11). The frieze above the gymnasium stage comprises 18 small black earthenware panels with white stylized symbols of the arts, industries, and sports. In the library, a frieze of murals by Richard Zoellner illustrate "The Ohio River Influence" (Figure 12.) The largest work of art is a mural covering the south wall of the second-floor music room, now known as the Pioneer Room. Entitled, "The Joy of Music," it was painted by Paul Chidlaw and features musicians and dancers of various genres. Another mural, 8-feet-high and 180-feet-long painted around the perimeter of the cafeteria by Leo Murphy was painted over.

As previously mentioned, the Commons is a roughly rectangular green space, with concrete pedestrian pathways around the perimeter, mature trees around the edges, benches around the trees, four memorials, and a recent gazebo in the southeast corner. A World War II monument stands on the west side of the Commons, on axis with the entrance to the Community Building. The initial wooden mockup of the monument, dedicated on June 2, 1944 was replaced in 1950 with the current geometric concrete obelisk with a stepped base and bronze plaque listing the names of seven residents who perished in the war.²² There are two granite boulders with bronze plaques—one dedicating the Commons to Nicholas G. Bates, longtime chief of the Greenhills Volunteer Fire Department, for faithful years of service to the Greenhills from 1936 to 1973; the other describing the *Greenhills-Forest Park Journal's* commemorative issue on the history of the community for the U.S. Bicentennial in 1976. The gazebo is a circular wood structure at the southeast corner. There are 35 wood and concrete benches grouped around trees and facing into the square from the perimeter. On the east side of the Commons, also aligned with the Community Building, there is a tapered steel pole dedicated on July 2, 1986 which represents the "Shadows of Freedom." At certain dates and times the pole casts a shadow on each of ten plaques set in the ground at various spots to highlight various patriotic events—Independence Day, Memorial Day, Constitution Day, the end of the Civil War, Veterans Day, the founding of Greenhills, the attack on Pearl

²¹ Carol Lippmeier, *Act of Congress, Book I, Greenhills, Ohio, 1938-1976* (Greenhills: Greenhills Civic Foundation History, 1976), p. 17.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 52

PROPERTY NAME**Page 28**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Harbor, Korean War cease-fire, the end of the Vietnam War, and the day that Ohio was granted Statehood.²³

The swimming pool complex (contributing) at 10 Enfield Street includes a pool, an Art Deco concrete-block bathhouse at the south end, and a Moderne reinforced concrete canopy on flared supports at the north end (Photograph 6). The bathhouse features a flat roof, porthole windows in the upper part of the walls, and a flat-roofed semicircular porch. The bathhouse originally had symmetrical wings containing changing rooms; these were removed in 1986 because they were collapsing, and glass block was used to fill in the openings in the porch. In 1995, the pool was renovated and enlarged, including the addition of a large water slide. The original baby pool was removed in 2014. The geometric roadways providing access to the pool areas from the west, are still intact. The pool, bathhouse and canopy still retain enough of their original character to be considered together as a contributing resource.

The Whallon House (NR#73001473, listed May 17, 1973), immediately north of the current municipal building at 11000 Winton Road is also included in the NHL district. Built in 1816, the Whallon House is a two-story brick former dwelling with a five-bay front façade. A fine example of the Federal style, this house was one of only two historic structures that were saved in construction of the new town.²⁴ During construction, it was used as an office for senior planners and after 1938 it was used successively for council meetings and other town functions, and as offices for the American Legion. It is still owned by the town.

Commercial Buildings

The original plans envisioned an E-shaped shopping center with a large parking lot in the rear, where a farmers' market shed was planned. The shopping center would be developed in stages as the population of Greenhills gradually grew large enough to support the businesses. By 1938, the first commercial block was erected at the south end of the site designated for the center, the service station was built at the north end, and the farmer's market shed was put up in the rear parking lot.

The initial commercial block (1938, contributing), flat-roofed building finished with brick, remains at the south end of the current shopping center. Like all the commercial blocks to follow, the building was one-story on the front and two stories on the rear. The front was originally lined with large storefronts composed of grouped, multi-pane display windows and transoms. The first tenants were the Greenhills Co-operative Grocery, a food storage locker plant, a drug store, a valet shop, barber shop, and beauty parlor. The shopping center, which was one of the first examples of a strip mall in the country, was unified by a covered walkway with slender square brick piers topped by a narrow sign band. The canopy of the walkway was curved at the south end where it turned the corner to connect with the original Management Building (Photographs 1 and 2).

The original layout provided angled parking in front on both sides of Eswin Street, which was one-way to simplify traffic flow. A second aisle was added to the parking lot in 1986, adding 42 more spaces of angled parking.²⁵ The rear of the buildings faced a much larger parking lot, which provided access to the food storage locker plant. The parking lot is original to the plan and represents a continuation of the separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The farmers' market shed (1938, contributing) is a simple structure with a gabled corrugated fiberglass roof supported by steel pipe columns on a raised concrete plinth (Photograph 3). The shed

²³ Lippmeier, *Act of Congress, Book II, Greenhills, Ohio, 1938-1997*, n.p.

²⁴ The second building is the James L. Baker Homestead, which was adapted as a comfort station for the athletic field.

²⁵ David Moore, email to Beth Sullebarger, 17 Aug. 2015.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 29**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

retains all its original elements except the roof, which was originally corrugated metal, and replaced by the Kiwanis Club in the late 1976 for the national bicentennial.²⁶

The former Greenhills Cooperative Service Station (1938, noncontributing) still stands at 48 Eswin Street at the corner of Enfield, at the north end of the shopping center. A 60-foot setback from the front of the shopping center provides a parking lot, where originally there were gas pumps. This simple, concrete-block structure has three garage bays and a small office and continues to be used for car repairs. A remodeling by the Shell Oil Company in 1966 added face brick and a wood-shingled mansard over the formerly flat roof.²⁷ Upon removal of the brick facing and shingled parapet, the integrity of the building could be reevaluated and its contributing/noncontributing status reconsidered.

Athletic Fields

As previously mentioned, by 1938 the athletic fields in the southeast portion of the village included a football field with a running track around it, bleachers (demolished) and a field house/comfort station. A baseball diamond and four tennis courts shown to the east of the football field on the original plan, no longer exist, having been replaced by the Winton Woods Middle School. The athletic fields are included in the overall site, which is contributing. The field house (contributing) consists of a small one-story brick side-gabled core with concrete block wings containing rest rooms, unified by a shallow hip-roofed porch across the front and sides. The brick core, which now has two wide window openings in the center flanked by two flush doors, has a plaque placed there by the Greenhills Historical Society naming it the James L. Baker Homestead, and stating that Mr. Baker resided there with his family from 1932 to 1935. This building is the sole resource in the district that pre-existed the Greenhills development.

An Expanding Village Center (1950 to the present)

It was not until the 1950s that the shopping center was fully built as envisioned, with addition of three more buildings. The central commercial block (noncontributing), the keystone of the center, is a concrete-block building that extends deeply to the rear and is flanked by concrete walkways with stairs connecting the front walkway with the parking lot in the rear. This building was envisioned as a movie theater in the original plan, but was not built for that use. Instead movies were shown in the auditorium of the Community Building and the center building was erected in 1953 for an IGA supermarket and a bowling alley, which remained for many years.²⁸ The next commercial block at 28-40 Eswin (noncontributing), its design and construction similar to the first commercial block, was added on the north side of the IGA in 1953. This was followed by the two-story Eswin Building at 42-44-46 Eswin (noncontributing), built to house a bank, stores and offices. The Eswin Building is distinguished by its additional story, brick facing on front and back and a projecting bay on the left side of its front elevation. The second floor has a band of windows with aluminum spandrels. Together, this group of commercial buildings create a continuous strip from the Management Building on Endicott Street to the service station at the corner of Eswin and Enfield. The entire shopping complex is unified by the extension of the covered walkway up to the projecting portion at 46 Eswin. This last space, which was occupied by a bank, is now a café. The entire shopping center was remodeled circa 1995 and refaced with synthetic stucco and a new taller sign band (Photograph 1). The back and side elevations retain much of their original appearance.²⁹

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Records of the Village of Greenhills, Ohio.

²⁸ Movie screenings in the Community Building ended in 1947. The bowling alley closed circa 2012.

²⁹ Records of the Village of Greenhills, Ohio.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 30**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Several commercial buildings were built in the 1950s and 1960s. On Endicott Street, these include three noncontributing one-story buildings at 4-6, 8, and 12 Endicott. 4-6 Endicott was built as a laundry store and restaurant circa 1962. 8 Endicott is a one-story wood-frame office building with a cross-gabled roof and large wood multi-pane windows giving it a domestic appearance. 12 Endicott is a simple rectangular, flat-roofed building with brick facing retrofitted with vinyl infill on the front. On Enfield, three noncontributing commercial buildings were added—a one-story concrete-block building at 1 Enfield (noncontributing) built in 1960 as a state liquor store; a one-and-one-half-story brick building at 3-5 Enfield (noncontributing) erected in 1986, and a one-story concrete-block warehouse at 20 Enfield (noncontributing) built circa 1980.³⁰ North of the shopping center, at 50 Eswin Street, a noncontributing concrete-block retail building was built for Albert's Supermarket and occupied by Johnny's Toys from 1976 to 2009.

Five church-related buildings were built near the civic center of Greenhills. Although land was set aside for this purpose in the early plans, only one of these buildings was built during the period of significance—Our Lady of the Rosary School (contributing) built in 1942, with additions in 1952 and 1963, at 17-19 Farragut Road. This catholic congregation was established by 1940, and initially met in the Community Building. Today the complex consists of the church, rectory, school and convent. The church (15 Farragut) and rectory, connected by a breezeway, were built in 1960, the convent was built in 1968; all three are noncontributing.³¹ The School is a long, rectangular two-story brick building on a high basement set parallel to the street. The entrance on the east end is dramatized by a squat square tower ornamented by a frieze of decorative tile mosaic and topped by a pyramidal roof. The church is a tall one-story brick building with a steeply pitched front-gabled roof with low eaves. The front has a single arched stone surround with double doors and above, an arched window with stone mullions forming a cross. Eight bays of small stained glass windows table on the side elevations extend from the roofline to the stone water table. The rectory, which is connected by a breezeway on the west side of the church, is a two-story, side-gabled brick building, four-bays-wide. The gabled roof of the breezeway extends across the two left bays of the rectory and over a projecting front porch in the second bay. The convent is a simple rectangular brick building with a side-gabled roof. Set back behind the church, the convent has a six-bay front elevation, with paired aluminum windows.

The Greenhills Community Presbyterian Church, 21 Cromwell Road (noncontributing), stands at the northwest corner of Winton and Cromwell roads, opposite the village Commons. The church complex is a brick, Neo-Colonial-style building with a U-shaped footprint. The front elevation facing Winton Road has a gable front at each end joined by a gable-roofed connector. The south wing, completed in 1956, houses the worship space while the north wing, completed in 1957, holds classrooms. The south wing is more prominent, with a large expanse of geometric stained glass windows in the east wall and a modest copper spire on the ridge near the east end. The remaining fenestration consists mainly of two-story bays of windows with stone spandrels. The north wing was extended in 1967 with an addition on the rear.³²

INTEGRITY

The historic integrity of Greenhills is reflected in the general layout of its plan as developed by Justin Hartzog and Roland Wank and the enduring character of the village, with its innovative and varied treatment of streets, integral pedestrian pathways, low-scale buildings, sense of openness, and ubiquitous parks. Secondary but also

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ "Histories of Our First Churches," Scrapbook, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Forest Park Branch, n.d., Records of the Hamilton County Auditor.

³² Ibid.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 31**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

significant is the design of its buildings, primarily residential but with important public buildings that are very much intact. To appreciate the historic integrity of the village, it is necessary to consider not just aspects of bricks and mortar but also the full array of design principles and social values that underlie the town's planning and realization. As an entire ensemble, the community remains a unique and irreplaceable national treasure.

The original core of Greenhills retains a high degree of historic integrity overall. The site displays excellent integrity—the plan, its response to the natural topography, and land use distribution remain unchanged, and vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems have changed only slightly. The roadways, considered to be the most important part of the plan by Hartzog, have been widened slightly. Because of cost factors, granite curbs envisioned throughout the village in the original plan were installed only in the village center and the circles of cul-de-sacs by 1938. To improve the appearance of the street edges, the village installed rolled concrete curbs on the circuit roads over the years; on residential lanes, however, the village fulfilled the original design intent by installing continuous gray granite curbs matching existing examples in 1999.³³

The village's residential units generally show very good integrity. While synthetic siding, replacement windows, and conversion of flat roofs to gabled ones are not unusual, all the original dwellings are easily recognizable. There has been some loss of housing—all of them S-type buildings, for which the designers predicted a sixty-year life expectancy because of their cheaper construction. A number of S-Type buildings have been removed at the north end of the village between 2002 and 2009, including two five-unit row houses at 84-86-88-90-92 and 94-96-98-100-102 Drummond Street; an end unit, 82 Drummond, of a six-unit row house; four four-unit row houses at 1-2-3-4, 5-6-7-8, 9-10-11-12 and 13-14-15-16 Drummond Court; another four-unit row house at 45-47-49-51 Dewitt Street and two five-unit and one four-unit row house at Dewitt Court: 1-2-3-4-5, 6-7-8-9, and 10-11-12-13-14. Fortunately Chalmers Court remains very much intact. In total, 45 out of 676 original housing units or less than ten percent have been lost. The loss of three 1947-era houses on Damon Road for expansion of the Alois Alzheimer Center and a similar house at 65 Damon Road destroyed by fire, did not significantly impact the integrity of the village.

Despite the loss of some housing units, residential streetscapes still retain a considerable degree of physical integrity with relatively little infill. A few garages were replaced with housing, such as at 25 Cromwell Road, 11 Falcon Lane, and Burwood Court but the presence of these developments is less noticeable because they are set back farther from the street than original dwellings or sited perpendicular rather than parallel to the street. On Funston Lane, a dwelling was added above a row of three garages, with the central garage converted to an entrance hall; however its location on a deep cul-de-sac and setback from adjacent houses reduces its visibility. A small one-story single-family Modern-story brick house was built at 119 ½ Farragut Road in 1956. Circa 2000, a new subdivision west of Falcon Lane, known as FDR Walk added six buildings containing nine landminiums; however it is a tight cul-de-sac on a site planned for garages that were never built, and represents a treatment somewhat similar to the original plan.

The development known as Dewitt Landing has resulted in 14 new single-family homes being built between 2005 and 2015 on Dewitt and Drummond; two more are planned. These new homes occupy single-family lots carved out of the semicircular superblock after multi-family S buildings were demolished. The new two-story Craftsman-style homes differ in size and style from the more modest single-family homes built on surrounding streets in the 1950s. However, the latter were also a departure from the 1930s plan, which envisioned all S-type residences on larger lots.

The commercial center still retains its essential historic character (Photograph 1). Although only partially

³³ Records of the Village of Greenhills, Ohio.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 32**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

completed by 1938, the shopping center along Eswin Street was built out according to the original plan after the period of significance. Although it was remodeled circa 1995, its basic massing, flat-roof profile, covered walkway with brick columns and pedestrian passages through the building to the rear parking lot all remain. Storefront windows have been covered but transoms are intact. The parking lot in front was expanded, but retains the angled parking arrangement of the original. The Greenhills Cooperative Service Station has been remodeled but it still reflect its historic character. Like most business districts, the commercial center of Greenhills continued to grow in response to market forces, but expansions that occurred after 1950 are limited to two low-scale buildings on Enfield and four one-story buildings on Endicott, filling out the blocks on the north and south ends of the center. Although noncontributing, these buildings do not detract from the historic shopping center because of their location on side streets and their low scale.

Among the original public buildings, the old Management Building at 14 Endicott Street is still relatively intact and continues to house the post office and the Greenhills branch of the public library. The Community Building/School retains excellent integrity of design and materials, and while it was expanded in the 1950s with a flat-roofed south wing that addition is very compatible with the original building. The swimming pool continues to reflect its period character despite alteration of the bathhouse and expansion of the pool. Most of the parks in the 1938 plan remain, including their paved pedestrian pathways, although original play equipment is gone and so are most plantings except for now stately oak trees. The village commons remains at the heart of the village. The large greensward northeast of the pool was converted to a golf course in the mid-1950s, but importantly it remains a green space. The golf course was developed as part of the Greenhills Country Club, which formed in January 1950 and disbanded in 1976.³⁴ The country club also took over the management of the pool, installed two tennis courts in a ravine formerly used as an outdoor amphitheater and built a wood-frame clubhouse in 1955-56 just east of the pool. Enlarged in 1973, the clubhouse is now operated as Molloy's on the Green catering hall, and considered noncontributing.³⁵

Other changes near the civic center after 1938—specifically the construction of two churches and related buildings—occurred on land on the south and west sides of the set aside for this purpose in the early plans. One of these buildings, Our Lady of the Rosary School, was built on Farragut Street in 1947 during the period of significance and is considered contributing. During the early days of the village, newly formed religious congregations were invited to meet in the Community Building and it was understood that construction of church buildings would eventually occur once sufficient numbers of congregants and financial resources were amassed. Our Lady of the Rosary church, rectory, and convent, were built in the 1960s and are thus noncontributing, but they are not incompatible with the character of the village. The 1955 Greenhills Community Presbyterian Church is similarly set on a site that the original plan reserved for a church on Winton Road opposite the Commons.

While the historic core of Greenhills has seen alteration of and removal of historic buildings as well as the addition of new ones, most changes since 1950 have occurred on the periphery of the historic village and have been excluded from the NHL boundaries. However, in order to include more of the inner greenbelt, ten additional non-contributing buildings were included. Specifically, these are a former school at 70 Damon Road that was built in 1955, enlarged in 1967 and subsequently converted to a nursing home in 1982; a cluster of apartments built in 1962 at 63 Cromwell Road; and five single-family homes built in the 1950s and 1960s at 64, 66, 68, 70, and 72 Cromwell Road. Two clusters of cul-de-sacs built in the 1960s in the "B" and "D" sections were excluded; they are Beckford and Bayham drives, Deerhill Lane and Dayspring Terrace. Although these

³⁴David Moore, email to Beth Sullebarger, 17 Aug. 2015.

³⁵Lippmeier, *Act of Congress, Book I, Greenhills, Ohio, 1938-1976*, p. 17.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 33**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

later subdivisions have larger lots and larger homes, their cul-de-sac arrangement is consistent with the original plan. In order to include the complete circuit road system within the NHL boundary, 30 additional non-contributing one-story homes built between 1952 and 1958 on Farragut Road and Ingram Road were included. Other residential subdivisions developed after 1950 beyond the circuit road in the northeast quadrant of the village were also excluded.

At the north end of Winton Road, there are a few noncontributing institutional buildings including the two-story brick municipal building at 11000 Winton Road (1959) and the concrete-block hall of the Hugh Watson Post 530 of the American Legion (1959) at 11100 Winton Road, which together flank the historic 1816 James Whallon House (NR#73001473, listed May 17, 1973). Farther north, the First Baptist Church was completed in 1961 at 11195 Winton Road at the southwest corner of Sharon Road. A classroom wing was added in 1966.³⁶ North of the shopping center, a noncontributing concrete-block retail building built in 1953 at 50 Eswin Street for Albert's Supermarket and occupied by Johnny's Toys from 1976 to 2009 was included in order to allow the northern boundary of the district to include the Whallon House, which was used in the 1930s to house planners during construction.³⁷

The exceptionally high integrity of the overall plan and setting—including the network of roadways, system of pedestrian pathways, residential streetscapes, and prominently sited Community Building/School—outweigh the loss of the integrity throughout the village. Despite architectural alterations, loss of some housing units, and new infill construction, the village-like scale and character of the residential streets civic and commercial center remain intact and continue to function as important defining elements of the overall historic plan.

Most important, however, is the retention and even expansion of the greenbelt lands, a defining element of Ebenezer Howard's garden city concept and Rex Tugwell's Utopian vision. Of the three greenbelt towns, Greenhills still surrounded by its greenbelt mostly because of its rough topography and its transfer to the Hamilton County Park District, which preserved it as Winton Woods Park. In addition, the inner greenbelt was saved by the Village, which went to court to save it from development. While these park reservations fall outside the NHL district boundaries, they provide undeveloped parkland, recreational areas, and other compatible land uses that echo the original greenbelt purpose and the then-current ideas about regional planning.

Residential subdivisions after 1950 in Greenhills are somewhat different but compatible with the original 1938 village. Justin Hartzog, who was hired by the federal government in 1946 to help the village draft a plan and zoning ordinance to guide future private development in anticipation of the sale of Greenhills, essentially redrew the 1937 plan. Shortly after buying the village, the Greenhills Homeowners Corporation found a developer, Kenneth Hammond, who was interested in building homes on the undeveloped property but only detached homes set on small lots set on more conventional curvilinear streets Common to subdivisions of the time.³⁸

Despite their initial disagreement, Hammond hired Hartzog, who laid out lanes in long curvilinear loops with small lots. As in the original sections, Hartzog included paved pedestrian pathways to allow residents to cut through the long blocks and connect with the village center, at least in the "I" and "J" sections. New single-family residences were erected there and on the "H" blocks with setbacks typical of 1950s subdivisions, yet the spacious character and naturalistic setting typical of Greenhills neighborhoods of the 1950s and 1960s imply this influence, while also reflecting a new generation's ideas about land-use planning and design of garden

³⁶ Ibid, p. 42.

³⁷ Ibid, p. 69.

³⁸ Leach, pp. 268, 282.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 34**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

suburbs. The new residential development provides a compatible addition to the village and appears to compliment rather than detract from the suburban ideals of 1930s planning.

CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES: INVENTORY

<u>Address</u>	<u>Building Type</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>
1-3-5 Andover Road	3-unit row house	1938
7 Andover Road	single-family house	1938
13-15-17 Andover Road	3-unit row house	1938
19-21-23-25 Andover Road	4-unit row house	1938
27-29-31 Andover Road	3-unit row house	1938
47-49-51 Andover Road	3-unit row house	1938
2-4-6 Andover Road	3-unit row house	1938
8-10-12 Andover Road	3-unit row house	1938
14-16-18 Andover Road	3-unit row house	1938
20-22-24-26-28 Andover Road	5-unit row house	1938
30-32-34 Andover Road	3-unit row house	1938
36-38-40 Andover Road	3-unit row house	1938
42-44-46-48-50-52 Andover Road	6-unit row house	1938
1-2 Adele Walk	2-unit duplex	1938
3-4 Adele Walk	2-unit duplex	1938
1 Alcott Lane	single-family house	1938
3 Alcott Lane	single-family house	1938
5-7 Alcott Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
9 Alcott Lane	single-family house	1938
11-12 Alcott Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
2 Alcott Lane	single-family house	1938
4 Alcott Lane	single-family house	1938
6-8 Alcott Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
10 Alcott Lane	single-family house	1938
3 Ashby Street	single-family house	1938
11-13-15-17 Ashby Street	4-unit row house	1938
19-21-23-25 Ashby Street	4-unit row house	1938
27-29 Ashby Street	2-unit duplex	1938
2-4-6-8-10-12 Ashby Street	6-unit row house	1938
14-16-18-20 Ashby Street	4-unit row house	1938
22-24 Ashby Street	2-unit duplex	1938
1-3-5-7-9 Avenell Lane	5-unit row house	1938
11 Avenell Lane	single-family house	1938
13-15-17 Avenell Lane	3-unit row house	1938
19-21-23 Avenell Lane	3-unit row house	1938
25 Avenell Lane	single-family house	1938
27 Avenell Lane	single-family house	1938
29 Avenell Lane	single-family house	1938
31 Avenell Lane	single-family house	1938
33-35 Avenell Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
2 Avenell Lane	single-family house	1938

PROPERTY NAME**Page 35**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

10 Avenell Lane	single-family house	1938
12-14-16-18-20-22 Avenell Lane	6-unit row house	1938
30 Avenell Lane	single-family house	1938
32-34 Avenell Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
36-37 Avenell Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
1-3-5 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
7-9-11 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
13-15-17 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
35-37-39 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
41-43-45 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
47-49-51 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
53-55-57 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
59-61-63-65 Burley Circle	4-unit row house	1938
67-69-71-73 Burley Circle	4-unit row house	1938
75-77-79-81 Burley Circle	4-unit row house	1938
83-85-87 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
101-103 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
105-107-109-111 Burley Circle	4-unit row house	1938
113-115 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
117-119-121-123-125-127 Burley Circle	6-unit row house	1938
2-4-6 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
8-10-12 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
14-16-18-20 Burley Circle	4-unit row house	1938
22-24-26-28 Burley Circle	4-unit row house	1938
30-32-34-36 Burley Circle	4-unit row house	1938
54 Burley Circle	single-family house	1938
56-58-60-62-64-66 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
76-78 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
80-82 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
84 Burley Circle	single-family house	1938
86-88 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
90-92-94 Burley Circle	3-unit row house	1938
96-98 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
100-102 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
104-106 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
108-110 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
112-114-116-118 Burley Circle	4-unit row house	1938
120-122 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
124-126 Burley Circle	2-unit duplex	1938
1-2-3-4 Bradnor Place	4-unit row house	1938
5-6-7-8-9-10 Bradnor Place	6-unit row house	1938
11-12 Bradnor Place	2-unit duplex	1938
1-3-5-7 Briarwood Lane	Two 2-unit duplexes	1938
9-11 Briarwood Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
13-15-17-19 Briarwood Lane	4-unit row house	1938
21-23 Briarwood Lane	2-unit duplex	1938

PROPERTY NAME**Page 36**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

7-9-11-13 Brompton Lane	Two 2-unit duplexes	1938
15-17 Brompton Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
19-21-23-25 Brompton Lane	4-unit row house	1938
27-29 Brompton Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
31-33 Brompton Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
34-35 Brompton Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
2-4-6-8 Brompton Lane	4-unit row house	1938
10-12-14-16 Brompton Lane	4-unit row house	1938
18 Brompton Lane	single-family house	1938
22-24 Brompton Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
28 Brompton Lane	single-family house	1938
30-32 Brompton Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
3-5 Burnham Street	2-unit duplex	1938
7-9 Burnham Street	2-unit duplex	1938
11-13 Burnham Street	2-unit duplex	1938
15 Burnham Street	single-family house	1938
17 Burnham Street	single-family house	1938
19-21 Burnham Street	2-unit duplex	1938
23 Burnham Street	single-family house	1938
25-27-29-31 Burnham Street	4-unit row house	1938
2-4-6-8 Burnham Street	4-unit row house	1938
10 Burnham Street	single-family house	1938
22 Burnham Street	single-family house	1938
24-26-28-30 Burnham Street	4-unit row house	1938
1-3-5 Bachman Street	3-unit row house	1938
7-9-11 Bachman Street	3-unit row house	1938
13-15-17-19-21 Bachman Street	5-unit row house	1938
23 Bachman Street	single-family house	1938
25-27-29-31 Bachman Street	4-unit row house	1938
2-4 Bachman Street	2-unit duplex	1938
6-8 Bachman Street	2-unit duplex	1938
24-26-28-30 Bachman Street	4-unit row house	1938
1-2-3-4 Belknap Place	4-unit row house	1938
5-6-7 Belknap Place	3-unit row house	1938
8-9-10-11 Belknap Place	4-unit row house	1938
10-12-14 Cromwell Road	3-unit S-type row house	1938
16-18-20-22 Cromwell Road	4-unit S-type row house	1938
24-26-28-30 Cromwell Road	4-unit S-type row house	1938
32-34-36-38-40-42-44-46 Cromwell Road	8-unit flats	1938
48-50-52-54-56-58-60-62 Cromwell Road	8-unit flats	1938
1-3-5-7-9 Chalmers Lane	5-unit S-type row house	1938
11-13-15 Chalmers Lane	3-unit S-type row house	1938
17-19-21-23 Chalmers Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938
25-27-29-31-33-35 Chalmers Lane	6-unit S-type row house	1938
14-16-18-20 Chalmers Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938
26-28-30-32 Chalmers Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938

PROPERTY NAME**Page 37**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

1-2-3-4-5-6 Chalmers Court	6-unit S-type row house	1938
7-8-9-10 Chalmers Court	4-unit S-type row house	1938
11-12-13-14-15-16 Chalmers Court	6-unit S-type row house	1938
1-3-5 Drummond Road	3-unit S-type row house	1938
59-61-63-65 Drummond Road	4-unit S-type row house	1938
72-74-76-78-80 Drummond Road	5-unit S-type row house	1938
67 Drummond Road	single-family house	1947
71 Drummond Road	single-family house	1947
75 Drummond Road	single-family house	1947
79 Drummond Road	single-family house	1947
99 Drummond Road	single-family house	1947
1-3-5-7-9-11 Dewitt Street	6-unit S-type row house	1938
13-15-17-19-21 Dewitt Street	5-unit S-type row house	1938
23-25-27 Dewitt Street	3-unit S-type row house	1938
37-39-41-43 Dewitt Street	4-unit S-type row house	1939
14 Endicott Street	Former Management Building	1938
Enfield Street	Farmers' market shed	1938
8 Enfield Street	Community Building & School	1938
10 Enfield Street	Swimming pool, bathhouse, canopy	1938
1-24 Eswin Street	Shopping Center	1938
17-19 Farragut Road	Our Lady of the Rosary School	1942, 1952, 1967
25-27-29-31-33 Farragut Road	5-unit S-type row house	1938
35-37-39 Farragut Road	3-unit S-type row house	1938
41-43-45 Farragut Road	3-unit S-type row house	1938
83-85-87-89-91 Farragut Road	5-unit brick row house	1938
93-95-97-99-101-103-105-107-109-111 Farragut Road	10-unit flats	1938
113-115-117-119-121-123-125-127 Farragut Road	8-unit flats	1938
129-131-133-135-137-139-141-143 Farragut Road	8-unit flats	1938
42-44-46-48-50-52-54-56 Farragut Road	8-unit flats	1938
58-60-62-64-66-68-70-72 Farragut Road	8-unit flats	1938
74-76-78-80-82-84-86-88-90-92 Farragut Road	10-unit flats	1938
94-96-98-100-102-104-106-108-110-112 Farragut Road	10-unit flats	1938
114-116-118-120-122-124-126-128 Farragut Road	8-unit flats	1938
130-132-134-136-138-140-142-144 Farragut Road	8-unit flats	1938
1-3-5-7-9 Falcon Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938
2-4-6-8-10 Falcon Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938
12-14-16-18 Falcon Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938
20-22-24-26 Falcon Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938
1-3-5-7-9-11-13-15 Flanders Lane	8-unit flats	1938
17-19-21-23-25-27-29-31 Flanders Lane	8-unit flats	1938

PROPERTY NAME**Page 38**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

33-35-37 Flanders Lane	3-unit S-type row house	1938
39-41-43-45 Flanders Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938
47-49-51 Flanders Lane	3-unit S-type row house	1938
53-55 Flanders Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
57-59 Flanders Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
61-63-65-67 Flanders Lane	4-unit row house	1938
2-4-6-8-10 Flanders Lane	5-unit row house	1938
30-32-34-36-38-40 Flanders Lane	6-unit S-type row house	1938
44-46-48-50 Flanders Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938
52-54-56 Flanders Lane	3-unit row house	1938
1-3-5-7-9-11 Foxworth Lane	6-unit S-type row house	1938
13-15-17-19 Foxworth Lane	4-unit S-type row house	1938
21-23-25-27-29-31 Foxworth Lane	6-unit S-type row house	1938
1-3-5-7 Funston Lane	4-unit row house	1938
9-11 Funston Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
6-8 Funston Lane	2-unit duplex	1938
Fridman Field	Fieldhouse	1938
6 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
8 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
10 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
12 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
14 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
15 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
16 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
18 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
19 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
20 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
21 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
22 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
23 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
24 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
25 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
26 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
27 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
28 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
29 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
29 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
30 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
31 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
32 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
32 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
33 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
34 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
35 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
36 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
37 Damon Road	single-family house	1947

PROPERTY NAME**Page 39**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

38 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
39 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
40 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
41 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
28 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
28 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
28 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
28 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
28 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
28 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
29 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
30 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
31 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
32 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
33 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
34 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
35 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
37 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
38 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
39 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
40 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
41 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
42 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
43 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
44 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
45 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
46 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
48 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
49 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
50 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
51 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
52 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
53 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
54 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
55 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
56 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
57 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
58 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
59 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
60 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
61 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
62 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
63 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
67 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
69 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
71 Damon Road	single-family house	1947

PROPERTY NAME**Page 40**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

73 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
75 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
76 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
77 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
78 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
79 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
80 Damon Road	single-family house	1947
4 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
5 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
6 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
8 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
10 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
11 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
12 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
13 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
14 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
15 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
16 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
17 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
18 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
19 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
20 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
22 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
24 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
26 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
27 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
28 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
30 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
32 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
33 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
34 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
36 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
37 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
38 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
40 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
42 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
43 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
44 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
46 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
47 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
48 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
50 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
51 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
52 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
53 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
54 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947

PROPERTY NAME**Page 41**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

56 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
57 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
58 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
60 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
61 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
62 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
64 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
65 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
66 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
68 Gambier Circle	single-family house	1947
11000 Winton Road	James Whallon House	1816

NONCONTRIBUTING RESOURCES: INVENTORY

<u>Address</u>	<u>Building Type</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>
89-91-93-95 Burley Circle	4-unit apartment house	1968
2-4-6-8-10-12 Burwood Court	6-unit apartment house	1960s
14-16-18-20-22-24 Burwood Court	6-unit apartment house	1960s
19 Cromwell Road	single-family house	1954
25 Cromwell Road	6-unit apartment house	1969
21 Cromwell Road	Greenhills Community Presbyterian Church	1956-57-67
63 Cromwell Road	5-building apartment complex	1962
64 Cromwell Road	Single-family house	1950
66 Cromwell Road	single-family house	1964
68 Cromwell Road	single-family house	1956
70 Cromwell Road	single-family house	1958
72 Cromwell Road	single-family house	1955
65 Damon Road	single-family house	2001
70 Damon Road	Nursing home/former school	1960,1967,1982
2 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2014
10 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2015
18 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2014
22 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2007
26 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2007
30 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2007
34 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2007
38 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2006
42 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2014
46 Dewitt Street	single-family house	2009
6 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
10 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
14 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
18 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
22 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
26 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953

PROPERTY NAME**Page 42**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

30 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
34 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
38 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
39 Drummond Road	Single-family house	2005
42 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
43 Drummond Road	Single-family house	2005
46 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
47 Drummond Road	Single-family house	2005
50 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
51 Drummond Road	Single-family house	2005
54 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
58 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
62 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
66 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
70 Drummond Road	Single-family house	1953
4-6 Endicott Street	Laundromat/restaurant	1962
8 Endicott Street	Office	c 1960
12 Endicott Street	Store	c 1955
1 Enfield Street	Restaurant/store	c 1955
3-5 Enfield Street	Stores block	1986
10 Enfield Street	Molloy's on the Green	1955, 1973
20 Enfield Street	Warehouse	c. 1980
28-40 Eswin Street	shopping center	1953
42-44-46 Eswin Street	Eswin Building	c 1955
48 Eswin Street	Service Station	1938, 1966
50 Eswin Street	Retail	1959
130 Eswin Street	Former IGA/Bowling Lanes	c 1952
11 Falcon Lane	single-family house	1966
1-2 FDR Walk	duplex rowhouse	2001
3 FDR Walk	single-family house	2000
4 FDR Walk	single-family house	2000
5-6 FDR Walk	duplex rowhouse	2000
7 FDR Walk	single-family house	2000
8-9 FDR Walk	duplex rowhouse	1999
15 Farragut Road	Our Lady of the Rosary Church	1960
15 Farragut Road	2S brick rectory	1960
15 Farragut Road	2S convent	1968
119 1/2 Farragut Road	Single-family house	1956
150 Farragut Road	single-family house	1957
154 Farragut Road	single-family house	1956
158 Farragut Road	single-family house	1956
162 Farragut Road	single-family house	1958
166 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
170 Farragut Road	single-family house	1954
174 Farragut Road	single-family house	1955
178 Farragut Road	single-family house	1955

PROPERTY NAME**Page 43**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

182 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
186 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
190 Farragut Road	single-family house	1953
194 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
198 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
202 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
206 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
210 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
214 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
218 Farragut Road	single-family house	1952
300 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
304 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
308 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
312 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
316 Ingram Road	single-family house	1954
320 Ingram Road	single-family house	1954
324 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
328 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
332 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
336 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
340 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
344 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
348 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
352 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
356 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
360 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
364 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
368 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
372 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
376 Ingram Road	single-family house	1953
380 Ingram Road	single-family house	1952
384 Ingram Road	single-family house	1959
388 Ingram Road	single-family house	1952
392 Ingram Road	single-family house	1952
396 Ingram Road	single-family house	1952
400 Ingram Road	single-family house	1952
404 Ingram Road	single-family house	1952
408 Ingram Road	single-family house	1952
412 Ingram Road	single-family house	1952
11000 Winton Road	Municipal Building	1959

PROPERTY NAME**Page 44**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:

Nationally: X Statewide: Locally: Applicable National
Register Criteria:A X B C X DCriteria Considerations
(Exceptions):A B C D E F G

NHL Criteria:

1 and 4

NHL Theme(s):

I. Peopling Places
 4. Community and Neighborhood
III. Expressing Cultural Values
 5. Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning

Areas of Significance:

Community Planning and Development; Politics/Government; Architecture;
Landscape Architecture

Period(s) of Significance:

1935-1950

Significant Dates:

1935-1938

Significant Person(s):

N/A

Cultural Affiliation:

N/A

Architect/Builder:

Hartzog, Justin R. (Chief Planner); Strong, William A. (Assistant Planner); Wank,
Roland A. (Principal Architect); G. Frank Cordner (Assistant and Principal
Architect)

Historic Contexts:

XVI. Architecture
 W. Regional and Urban Planning
VII. Political and Military Affairs, 1865-1939
 H. The Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941
XXXI. Social and Humanitarian Movements
 A. Communitarianism and Utopianism
XXX. American Ways of Life
 H. Suburban Life

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 45

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Village of Greenhills represents highly important aspects of New Deal policy, an important period in the evolution of the American suburb, and pioneering innovations in house and neighborhood design. An adaptation of American garden-city planning to the climate, topography, and cultural preferences of the Midwestern United States, the Village of Greenhills meets NHL Criteria 1 and 4 under the NHL themes, Peopling Places (community and neighborhood) and Expressing Cultural Values (architecture, landscape architecture, and urban planning). As one of the three New Deal greenbelt towns built by the Resettlement Administration's Division of Suburban Resettlement, it is nationally significant under NHL Criterion 1 for its association with highly significant activities that shaped the Federal response to the Great Depression by providing economic relief in the form of employment for skilled and unskilled labor and making use of modern principles of design and lower-cost methods and materials of home construction in an effort to stimulate the building industry and raise the quality of life for working-class Americans. The village meets NHL Criterion 4 for its artistic merit and outstanding representation of the American Garden City movement, the widely acclaimed Neighborhood Unit Plan, and the innovative, cost-saving measures of group housing and large-scale home construction. Originally built as a demonstration of garden-city planning and a model suburb for lower-income Americans, the Village of Greenhills is a nationally significant historic residential suburb as defined in the nationwide Historic Residential Suburbs in the United States, 1830 to 1960, Multiple Property Submission (MPS). The original section of Greenhills retains a high degree of integrity of location, setting, design, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association.

The Suburban Resettlement program and the design of Greenhills reflect maturing ideas about American town planning, as well as government-supported efforts to provide employment, stimulate the construction economy, and, in doing so, demonstrate fundamental improvements to the quality of housing and community life for working-class Americans. This program was fueled by an optimism that social problems could be remedied and urban blight eliminated through the planning and design of safe, healthy, and affordable communities set apart from the center city. It was also based on the possibilities that economies of scale, new materials, and new approaches to design offered in reducing the cost of construction. Such planning entailed regional and community planning, the careful selection of a decentralized site with transportation access to employment and recreational areas, the large-scale development of efficient modern homes using new materials and methods of construction, and the arrangement of streets, pedestrian pathways, housing, and community buildings to form a spacious and healthy village environment.

Greenhills and the other greenbelt towns exemplify the goals of the New Deal, not only as models of scientifically and aesthetically planned communities, but as responses to the desperate unemployment and housing crises of the era. Finally, the greenbelt towns represent social, economic, and political experimentation unparalleled in American history. The Federal government built and retained ownership of each town, yet encouraged the residents to govern themselves and to work together through cooperative associations to establish and operate the town's businesses and institutions. Planned and constructed in a relatively brief and unprecedented period of government sponsorship, Greenhills and the other greenbelt towns made a bold statement about community planning and presented a radical challenge to the individualistic capitalism and entrepreneurship that characterized American society, traditional patterns of growth, and the home-building industry.

Greenhills was built as a model suburb for lower-income Americans and a demonstration of American garden-city planning and large-scale home building. It reflects the collaboration of town planners Justin R. Hartzog and William A. Strong and principal architects Roland A. Wank and F. Frank Cordner. Together the four designers headed a collaborative team of more than 150 persons who helped design Greenhills. The design team interpreted garden-city principles and American planning traditions, modified by environmental

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 46

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

conditions and target population preferences, to create a community with an innovative site plan that safely accommodated the automobile while conserving natural features, and that incorporated abundant parks, and high-quality housing that was modern yet economical in layout and materials.

Greenhills reflects the influence of the 1931 President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, advances in professional theories for home construction and community planning, and the development of national standards for subdivision design, large-scale development housing, and community enhancement. The community represents one of the most comprehensive New Deal housing programs and reflects one of several alternatives for deterring urban blight and solving the nation's shortage of low-cost housing. The 1930s represented a brief but intense period of experimentation in which the Federal government assumed leadership for promoting community development and housing reform in suburban, rural, and urban areas of the country. Other New Deal housing programs included the small house and large-scale rental housing programs of the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration (1933-1935), Federal Home Loan Administration, Subsistence Homestead Division of the Public Works Administration (1933-1935), Tennessee Valley Authority (est. 1933), Federal Housing Administration (est. 1934), Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Resettlement Administration's Rural Resettlement program (1935-1944) and United States Housing Authority (est. 1938). A Central Housing Committee was established in 1935 within the National Resources Planning Board to coordinate the activities of the various housing agencies.

PEOPLING PLACES: THE GREENBELT TOWN PROGRAM AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF GREENHILLS

The greenbelt town program was unique among the Federal initiatives undertaken during the Depression and was intended to address three major problems worsened by the economic conditions of the era: widespread unemployment, expanding urban slums, and the shortage of decent housing.

The economic collapse of the Depression found 14 million Americans out of work and 4 million families receiving public assistance by 1933. Some 273,000 families would lose their homes to foreclosure that year. The building industry was especially hard hit as one-third of the unemployed had worked in the building trades. Housing construction fell to one-tenth of its 1925 figure, exacerbating a pre-existing housing shortage and forcing the urban poor and the rural migrants, drawn to cities in search of work, to crowd into the deteriorated housing in city slums. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, swept into office with his pledge of economic recovery, was inaugurated in March 1933. Within the first few months of Roosevelt's New Deal administration, Congress had enacted the National Industrial Recovery Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The creation of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Subsistence Homesteads Development Division, among others, followed.³⁹ The purpose of these agencies and programs was perhaps best articulated by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and director of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works (PWA), who stated, "Our business is to put men to work, to do it quickly, and to do it intelligently."⁴⁰

Historically, the Federal government had only intervened in the housing market during wartime, but the desperate situation encouraged the President to support Federal initiatives that would build housing, raze slums

³⁹ Robinson & Associates, Inc. and Jeffrey Shrimpton, "Historic Context: Public Housing in the United States, 1933-1949," Draft Report Prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Register, 14 August 1997, p. 19; Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America*, (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1983), p. 220. Portions of the historic context for the theme Peopling Places have been adapted or reproduced from the Statement of Significance that previously appeared in Linda Flint McClelland, Daina Penkiunas, and Elizabeth L. Miller. "Greendale, Wisconsin, NHL Nomination", 19 April, 2012.

⁴⁰ Harold Ickes, "Public Works in the New Deal," *Architectural Forum* 59 (September 1933): 151.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 47**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

and otherwise improve living conditions for the 63 percent of the population that was considered low-income (making less than \$1,500 annually). The Subsistence Homesteads Development Division relocated farm families from depressed areas to experimental agricultural communities, such as the Penderlea Homesteads (North Carolina) and Matanuska Valley (Alaska) Colony. Jobless industrial workers were resettled in government-created rural towns such as Arthurdale, West Virginia (for former coal miners), Aberdeen Gardens, Virginia (for African American families), and Jersey Homesteads, New Jersey (for Jewish garment workers), where residents could supplement farming with part-time employment in a cooperative factory. The PWA, through its short-lived Housing Division, bought land in urban slums, cleared each site, and attempted to build new, low-cost housing; headed by architect Robert Kohn of the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA), this program resulted in the nation's first low-income public housing developments such as Carl Mackley Homes in Philadelphia, Lockefield Gardens in Indianapolis, Hillside Homes (designed by Clarence Stein) in New York City, and Techwood Homes in Atlanta, Georgia. However, acquiring urban parcels proved expensive and time-consuming. Ultimately, very little public housing was built.⁴¹ The Housing Division was dismantled in 1935, and the dialogue over how to fund housing for the nation's poorest groups continued until 1937 when the Wagner Act established a program of Federal funding for housing projects carried out by local housing authorities.

The nation's first town to incorporate a complete greenbelt was Norris, Tennessee, a community completed by the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) in early 1935. Established by Congress in May 1933, the TVA was the federal government's first regional planning agency and remains the largest. It was conceived to bring electrical power, flood control, and economic development to the poverty-stricken watershed of the Tennessee River. In area, it covered most of Tennessee as well as parts of Alabama, Mississippi, and Kentucky, and small slices of Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia.

The enterprise resulted from the efforts of Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska and used federal experts and electricity to modernize the region's economy and society. The TVA concept was shaped by four key individuals—Arthur E. Morgan, chief engineer of the TVA dams and its first appointed director; Frederick Gutheim, a regional planning prodigy connected with the Regional Planning Association; John Nolen, Jr., the nation's foremost town planner; and Charles W. Eliot II, a landscape architect who had been director of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and later the National Resources Planning Board.⁴²

The TVA resulted in construction of dozens of dams, including 29 hydro-electric plants, and other projects. The first dam, built on the Clinch River, was named the Norris Dam after the program's sponsor. In planning housing for the dam workers, it was decided to build a permanent new town, also known as Norris, rather than a temporary construction camp. To accomplish the TVA's ambitious program, Morgan hired Earle Sumner Draper as Director of Land Planning and Housing, Roland Wank as Chief Architect, and Tracy Augur as Chief Town Planner.⁴³

The Norris town plan was designed specifically for the mountainous terrain around Knoxville. In their approach, the planners considered both Kingsport, TN—a company town laid out by John Nolen in 1915 with the assistance of Earle Sumner Draper—and Radburn, NJ, designed by Clarence Stein and Henry Wright and completed in 1929. From Kingsport, the planners adopted a protective belt of Government-owned land as an essential part of the town plan. Besides its function of permanently preserving open land within easy reach of the residents, it helped to preserve the unity of the town itself by establishing a recognizable boundary between it and any other urban development that might take place nearby. It would also provide recreation area for

⁴¹ Wright, *Building the Dream*, pp. 220-22.

⁴² Creese, 75

⁴³ Leach, 109

PROPERTY NAME**Page 48**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

townspeople and visitors to the dam and space for garden areas and farms. Because the greenbelt at Radburn was somewhat limited, the planners considered Norris to be "the first self-contained new town in this county to use it completely."⁴⁴

From considering the plan of Radburn, it became apparent that its tight street layout would not work in the case of Norris. Instead, Draper, Augur and Wank decided that "a more protracted and less geometric pattern was appropriate to a landscape which was nearly fifty percent steep slopes." [Leach, 109] The new town of Norris was "an adept and clever plan, with an unprecedented variety of superblocks, loops and cul-de-sacs," arranged in response to the mountainous topography. Another innovative feature was the creation of Norris Parkway, a dedicated green corridor laid out according to the natural topography and designed to provide scenic and efficient access to, from, and around the town.⁴⁵

In February 1935, Rexford Guy Tugwell (1891-1979), then Undersecretary of Agriculture, approached John Lansill, the director of the Land Utilization Division of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, about acquiring 15,000 acres of sub-marginal land adjacent to the National Agricultural Research Station at Beltsville, Maryland, not far from Washington D. C. Tugwell, an agricultural economist who had left Columbia University to advise Roosevelt as a member of his "Brain Trust," proposed to reclaim the land for reforestation and recreation and possibly build a town for employees of the research station on the site. Reputedly the most radical of Roosevelt's advisors, Tugwell was an outspoken proponent of land use reform and the cooperatives movement. Tugwell held a realistic view of the hardships of farm life, and did not see relocating the urban poor to farms as the solution to their poverty. He was also familiar with contemporary ideas in urban and regional planning, such as that of the self-supporting, decentralized garden city promoted by members of the RPAA. Tugwell saw the garden city as the solution to several of the problems confronting the nation. In the short run, building the new town would create hundreds of jobs. In the long run, the satellite community would provide jobs and decent housing for the poor in a suburban setting, surrounded by a greenbelt of farms and parkland, with municipal governance and businesses operated by consumer cooperatives. In addition, the town would illustrate the benefits of community planning, and serve as a counterpoint to the low-quality subdivisions and speculative land purchasing that was causing urban blight and spreading outward from the cities. Lansill endorsed Tugwell's proposal and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration began securing options on the land at Beltsville (Berwyn, Maryland) in March 1935.⁴⁶

On April 8, 1935, Congress enacted the Emergency Relief Appropriations Act, providing over \$4 billion (the largest single appropriation in American history) for public works projects that would provide work for the unemployed. The President was given the authority to allocate the funds, sparking a competition among the various Federal agencies for a share of the monies. Tugwell pitched his idea for a new town at Beltsville, Maryland, to the President. Roosevelt, a firm believer in the benefits of country living, responded so enthusiastically, Tugwell expanded his proposal to encompass the construction new towns outside large industrial cities across the nation.⁴⁷ This was the genesis of the greenbelt town program. Tugwell later stated: "My idea [was] to go just outside centers of population, pick up cheap land, build a whole community, and

⁴⁴ Augur, 22.

⁴⁵ Creese 242.

⁴⁶ Alanen and Eden, pp. 3-5; Joseph L. Arnold, *The New Deal in the Suburbs: A History of the Greenbelt Town Program, 1935-1954*, (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1971), p. 31; Elizabeth Jo Lampl, "Greenbelt NHL Nomination," 22 March 1996, pp. 25-26.

⁴⁷ Arnold, p. 31; Alanen and Eden, p. 5; Lampl, p. 26.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 49**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

entice people into it. Then go back into the cities and tear down whole slums and make parks of them."⁴⁸

To facilitate the greenbelt town program, Roosevelt and Tugwell created the Resettlement Administration (RA), authorized by Executive Order 7027, signed by Roosevelt on April 30, 1935.⁴⁹ Tugwell was made director of the new agency, and several existing rehabilitation and conservation programs were transferred to it, including the Subsistence Homesteads Development Division. Within the RA, Tugwell immediately organized the Suburban Resettlement Division (SRD), appointed John Lansill director, and charged the division with the task of developing the greenbelt town program. The executive order gave the RA the power to "administer approved projects including resettlement of destitute or low-income families from rural and urban areas, including the establishment, maintenance, and operation in such connection, of communities in rural and suburban areas."⁵⁰

Plans for the greenbelt town program evolved over the summer of 1935, guided by four men: John Lansill; Warren J. Vinton, economist and chief of SRD's Research Section; Frederick J. Bigger, an architect and planner who was a former member of the RPAA and had been tapped to provide a designer's perspective; and Tugwell himself, who convened a panel of distinguished experts such as Ernest J. Bohn, president of the National Association of Housing Officials; educator John Dewey; and economist Stuart Chase as well as representatives of disciplines such as child care and social work.⁵¹

The greenbelt town program placed major emphasis on suburban land-planning, large-scale construction, and the safety issues posed by increasing automobile ownership. Warren Vinton wrote:

We stand on the threshold of all the new potentialities of large-scale planned developments. Great and extraordinary congestion on the land is no longer a necessity; rapid transit and the automobile have made possible an almost indefinite expansion of metropolitan areas. Housing may now, more easily than in the past, be located in open spaces, affording ample fresh air, sunlight, and areas for recreation. With the automobile there has come a necessity for changed types of urban land planning. New and even radical innovations are in the offing, such as superblocks, open spaces penetrating housing areas, and the complete separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The three great Greenbelt towns now being built by the Resettlement Administration of the Department of Agriculture are experiments in these new and modern techniques of land planning.⁵²

Vinton and the staff of the SRD's Research Section studied 100 major industrial cities to determine where to locate greenbelt towns. The principal criteria used in selecting these cities were a stable and diverse manufacturing sector, inexpensive land available on the outskirts of the city, and a progressive political climate

⁴⁸ Stanley Buder, *Visionaries and Planners: The Garden City Movement and the Modern Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 176.

⁴⁹ Lampl, pp. 24-25, quotes Tugwell's diary as reading, "The President and I between us invented the RA."

⁵⁰ Executive Order No. 7027, 30 April 1935, reprinted in U.S. Resettlement Administration, *First Annual Report, 1936*, (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1936), pp. 1-2.

⁵¹ Alanen and Eden, pp. 6-8. The authors relied heavily on an unpublished report of the program prepared by Henry Churchill, John S. Lansill Papers, University of Kentucky Special Collections, Lexington, Kentucky.

⁵² Vinton, Warren Jay. "A Survey of Approaches to the Housing Problem," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 190, Current Developments in Housing (March 1937), p. 12. This article encourages large-scale housing operations. Vinton was formerly director of his own development company in Detroit.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 50**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

likely to support public works. Twenty-five cities met these criteria. Further consideration narrowed the list to eight: St. Louis, Missouri; Cincinnati, Ohio; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Chicago, Illinois; New Brunswick, New Jersey; Dayton, Ohio; Chattanooga, Tennessee; and Washington, D. C.⁵³

Meanwhile, Frederick Bigger had brought in housing expert Catherine Bauer and several planning consultants, many of whom were experienced in garden-city planning or were RPAA members, including Henry Wright, Clarence Stein, Tracy Augur, Earle Draper, John Nolen and Jacob Crane. These individuals convinced Lansill that the quality of the design was crucial and should not be left to engineers (which Tugwell had done initially, with predictably unimaginative results). Through their influence, Tugwell was persuaded to refocus the program with the purpose of creating four state-of-the-art greenbelt towns that would serve as models of community planning.⁵⁴

On September 12, 1935, President Roosevelt allocated \$31 million to the RA for the greenbelt town program, with the implication that an additional \$38 million might be granted in the future. The smaller-than-hoped-for budget was encumbered with the requirements that all the land for the towns must be purchased by December 15, 1935 and that the towns must be completed by June 30, 1936. By November 1, 1935, the locations selected for the four greenbelt towns were Washington, D.C. (Greenbelt, Maryland); Cincinnati, Ohio (Greenhills); New Brunswick, New Jersey (Greenbrook, which was dropped in May 1936 as the result of a pending law suit); and Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Greendale).⁵⁵

In October 1935, Bigger was named Chief of Planning for the SRD. With the assistance of the prominent urban planner John Nolen, Bigger selected a team of planners, architects, engineers and other staff for each town.⁵⁶ Shortly after his appointment Bigger articulated the purpose of the greenbelt town program, as follows:

(a) To secure a large tract of land, and thus avoid the complications ordinarily due to diverse ownerships; in this tract to create a community, protected by an encircling green belt; the community to be designed for families of predominantly modest income, and arranged and administered (managed) so as to encourage that kind of family and community life which will be better than they now enjoy, but which will not involve subjecting them to coercion or theoretical and untested discipline; the dwellings and the land upon which they are located to be held in one ownership, preferably a corporate entity to which the Federal Government will transfer title, and which entity or corporation will rent or lease the dwellings but will not sell them; a municipal government to be set up in character with such governments now existing or possible in that region; coordination to be established, in relation to the local and state governments, so that there may be provided those public services of educational and other character which the community will require; and, finally, to accomplish these purposes in such a way that the community may be a tax paying participant in the region, that extravagant outlays from the individual family income will not be a necessity, and that the rents will be suitable to families of modest income.

(b) To develop a land use plan for the entire tract; to devise, under the direction of the Administrator, a system of rural economy coordinated with the land use plan for the rural portions of the tract surrounding the Suburban community; and to integrate both the physical

⁵³ Alanen and Eden, p. 12; Arnold, p. 39.

⁵⁴ Alanen and Eden, p. 7.

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 43.

⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 7.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 51**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

plans and the economies of the rural area and the Suburban community.⁵⁷

The RA's suburban resettlement program was conceived as an adjunct to the rural resettlement program that had begun as the Subsistence Homestead Program under Ickes's PWA program. As many of the Federal housing initiatives, the impetus for this program came from the 1931 President's conference, specifically, the recommendations of the Committee on Farm and Village Housing, which had closely examined the living conditions of the nation's rural population and called attention to the need for immediate reform. The committee identified the need for the development of housing standards within reach of different groups of people in rural villages—standards that considered the type of architecture, the structural plan, and the methods of financing and reflected the "growing interest in village planning for individual comfort and social efficiency." These common considerations justified the extension of the agency's work into the area of suburban resettlement according to E. L. Kirkpatrick, the professor of rural sociology who was a member of the committee in 1931 and became the assistant regional director for the RA's Midwest office.⁵⁸

Following Tugwell's departure, the program redefined its focus, dropping the more controversial aspects of cooperative land use and linking it instead to the more popular programs of the Federal Housing Administration (established 1934), which offered mortgage insurance and technical assistance for new privately financed and constructed subdivisions. As Kirkpatrick explained in 1937:

Suburban Resettlement is trying to demonstrate a feasible method of providing adequate low-rental or reasonable-cost dwellings in home-like surroundings. It is attempting to show that urban workers as well as farmers have access to homes that are equipped with the essentials for healthful and satisfactory living. In doing this, it hopes to open a new road for America's builders and money lending institutions.⁵⁹

Although short-lived and falling short of the RA's original ideal, the greenbelt town program succeeded in creating three model communities, planned and built with Federal relief funds and labor in the course of a three-year period. These communities took form at a time when numerous Federal programs were seeking ways to stimulate the building industry, put people to work, stave off urban blight, provide a template for healthy and safe communities, and control future urban growth through land-use planning. Taken together the greenbelt towns provide an ideal of neighborhood planning, garden-city design, and low-cost housing design that was endorsed by the Federal government, with the input of some of the nation's leading planners and designers, as a model for future town planning and suburban development. Viewed individually, each of the three towns is a unique and enduring record of 1930s ideas about land-use planning, highly important advances in the housing field, and the interdisciplinary collaboration of some of the nation's finest designers and most forward-looking theorists.

Greenhills: Origin and Progress

Cincinnati was selected as the location of a greenbelt town project for a variety of reasons. It had a historically and geographically sound economy with a diverse industrial base. With its "combination of river and rail transportation, low cost fuel resources, accessibility to various ore deposits and a large reserve of available

⁵⁷ Arnold, pp. 84-85; reproduced from U.S. Resettlement Administration, *Greenbelt Towns: A Demonstration in Suburban Planning*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1936), p. 1.

⁵⁸ E. L. Kirkpatrick, "Housing Aspects of Resettlement," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 190, Current Developments in Housing (March 1937), pp. 98-99.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 99; the inner quotation comes from RA, *Greenbelt Towns*.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 52

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

labor," it was expected to become a leading center of industry. A high percentage of its population was already employed in a large diversity of manufacturing jobs.⁶⁰ Hamilton County had a substantial agricultural sector. The area was "well adapted to profitable farming, but intensive and largely unplanned use of the land has resulted in serious depletion of soils over large areas; prosperous farms are interspersed with run-down properties."⁶¹ Local farmers could benefit from training and a demonstration of modern land planning and farm management. Moreover there was extensive farm land that could be acquired economically. The city had a serious housing problem affecting moderate-income families and a need for employment.

Cincinnati's greatest advantage, however, may have been its demonstrated interest in planning and public housing. In 1925, Cincinnati became the first city in the nation to adopt a comprehensive master plan by city council.⁶² Cincinnati housing advocates had participated in the President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership in 1931. These included Bleecker Marquette, head of the Better Housing League, and Murray Seasongood, attorney, civic reformer, and mayor of Cincinnati elected in 1925, who served as president of the National Municipal League. Both participated in a committee on Blighted Areas and Slums. Walter S. Schmidt, president of Frederick A. Schmidt Company, Cincinnati's leading real estate firm, participated in the committee on large scale operations.⁶³

In September 1935, the Frederick A. Schmidt Company had begun optioning land for the RA in northern Hamilton County. Despite resistance from a number of landowners, by early December 1935, when purchasing began, Schmidt's company had optioned over 10,000 acres in the vicinity of the rural community of Mount Healthy, an exurb about 13 miles north of downtown Cincinnati. The RA eventually bought 6,846 acres at a total cost of \$1.8 million, making the average price per acre \$268, which was about \$100 higher than that paid at Greenbelt but \$100 less than the price per acre in Greendale.⁶⁴

Each greenbelt town project had its own design team. The Greenhills staff was led by Justin R. Hartzog, chief planner; William A. Strong, assistant chief planner; Roland A. Wank, principal architect; and G. Frank Corder, who began as assistant architect and became principal architect after Wank returned to his job with the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). Over 150 people were a part of the Greenhills team including support personnel and consultants in diverse fields such as wildlife management, real estate analysis and agricultural practices. RA advisors included Tracy Augur (on planning), Earle Draper (on planning) Catherine Bauer (on housing), and Clarence Stein (on cost analysis). The Greenhills team was headquartered with the other project teams in the Washington mansion of socialite Evelyn Walsh McLean. The Greenhills project opened a local office in Mount Healthy directed by Cincinnati architect Harry M. Price as the Chief Planners Representative.⁶⁵ The field research for the project, including topographic surveys and social research on blue-collar families in Cincinnati, were carried out from the Ohio office. The Greenhills team shared offices in Washington with the designers working on the other greenbelt towns, including Henry Wright, co-designer of Radburn, educator, and author of *Rehousing Urban America* (1936, who headed the team designing the Greenbrook New Jersey, project.

⁶⁰ Summary Description of the Greenhills Project, Nov. 1937, p. 7

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Cincinnati's Planning History, p. 21, www.plancincinnati.org, accessed September 5, 2015

⁶³ President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership in 1931, p vii and viii.

⁶⁴ Leach, p. 93

⁶⁵ List of Personnel to September 1, 1937, Hartzog Papers

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 53

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Justin R. Hartzog (1892-1963), who served as the chief planner and the titular head of the Greenhills team that included site planners, architects, landscape architects and engineers, brought extensive experience and knowledge in town planning, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and development of parks and parkways. Hartzog was born in Ada, Ohio, a tiny university town and grew up in various places in northern Ohio and southeastern Michigan. In 1910, he entered Denison University in Granville, Ohio, where he studied botany and engineering, and earned a B.S. degree in 1914. From there he went to Cornell University for a Master's Degree in Landscape Design. After graduating from Cornell in 1917, Hartzog joined the Army as a second lieutenant in the Construction Division as a "camp planner."⁶⁶

After the war, Hartzog travelled in Europe and Mexico. In 1921, he went to work as a draftsman for the eminent planner John Nolen in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Nolen is reputed to have operated the largest and most proficient of the consulting firms engaged in city planning during the 1920s and many of the better-known planners began in the profession by working under him. In 1926, Nolen made Hartzog an associate of the firm. After Nolen's death in 1937, Hartzog opened his own office in Harvard Square, Cambridge, where he practiced until 1954. In that year, he moved to Fayetteville, Ohio, where his wife, the former Margaret McCafferty, was from. He lived there until his death in 1963.⁶⁷

Simultaneously with his private consulting, Hartzog held many government positions, particularly after the start of the Depression. Between 1933 and 1939, he served in many positions on the National Resources Committee of the National Planning Board, as a consultant to Maine, New Hampshire and Rhode Island, and as a member of the New England Regional Planning Commission. Between 1938 and 1942, Hartzog was a consultant with the United States Housing Authority and served as regional coordinator in New England for the Office of Defense Housing Coordination from 1940-1941. Also in the 1940s he was a consultant to the Federal Public Housing Authority and Chief Consultant for City Planning for the National Housing Agency. Hartzog was recognized professionally as a fellow in the American Society of Engineers, American Society of Landscape Architects, and the Royal Society of Landscape architects. In addition, from 1939 to 1943, he was an Assistant Professor and Visiting Critic at M.I.T. and Cornell.⁶⁸

As Nolen's associate, Hartzog designed several new towns, including Venice and Clewiston, Florida, and Happy Valley, Tennessee. He designed the parks for Mariemont, Ohio. He also drew plans and wrote planning reports for a large number of small and medium-sized cities throughout the East and Midwest, in Nolen's office and on his own. The new towns of Mariemont, Venice and Clewiston, while undeniably among the finest examples of planning for their time, were very formal arrangements, like most of John Nolen's new town schemes, and had none of the rambling features of Greenhills. Happy Valley, on the other hand, south of Knoxville on the Little Tennessee River, was little more than a small collection of houses, and would hardly qualify as a "town" for design purposes. Therefore, the design for Greenhills must have come from some other source than Hartzog's previous work in the area of new town design.⁶⁹

Hartzog's primary concerns in the field of planning were highways and parks. Hartzog believed that streets determined other land-uses, and that the location of highways were therefore of prime importance. One the fundamental arteries of a town had been laid out, the rest would more naturally fall into place. Hartzog's interest in parks was somewhat limited, in that he believed all parks, including "wilderness" areas, needed a

⁶⁶ Leach, p. 109-110.

⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 110.

⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 111.

⁶⁹ Ibid. 111-112.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 54**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

design in order to be functional in a human context, and park design was the extent of Hartzog's concern with nature. Although he felt it was unfortunate that waterfronts in urban areas had been generally preempted by industry, he believed this was an economic necessity. Parks were naturally created from the lands deemed unusable for commercial purposes. Hartzog thought parks should be designed to bring the land into accord with the desired purposes for the tract. The function was settled upon after the acquisition of the property. Despite these attitudes, Hartzog believed that outdoor recreation was a necessity and not a luxury, and that insufficient park space existed within most urban settings. He thought that metropolitan park commissions should be formed with the mandate to purchase and improve park lands within an hour's drive of city residents.⁷⁰

Based on these opinions, Hartzog saw the planning process as functioning within the following priorities: 1) circulation, 2) living and working areas, 3) recreation. Like his mentor, John Nolen who considered himself a town planner, he valued small towns and promoted industrial decentralization. Overcrowded cities, in his view, were created with the influx of industrial works and their families. Longview, Washington, a new community designed in 1922 by George Kessler, was cited by Hartzog as an ideal example of an industrial community.⁷¹

William A. Strong (1892-1980) went to work for the Cleveland City Planning Commission in 1920 after receiving his master's degree in city planning from Harvard University. Born in Joliet, Illinois, he was a graduate of the University of Illinois. From 1925 to 1977, he was in private business, first as a partner with Arthur Hadden Alexander, another Harvard-educated landscape architect, then on his own from 1944 until 1961, and then with Strong & Hill.

By the time he joined with Greenhills planning staff in November 1935 as Assistant Chief Town Planner, he had 15 years of experience. After leaving the Greenhills project, Strong continued his involvement with public housing by planning the landscaping for Woodhill Homes and Carver Park in Cleveland. Both were developed in 1939-1941 for the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority and resembled Greenhills with their row houses, curving streets and cul-de-sacs. His other major projects were serving as landscape architect for Kent State University for more than thirty years, from 1937 to 1968; for the Holden Arboretum from 1956 to 1977; and the Fine Arts Garden during the latter period. Strong was named a fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects, and served that organization as a trustee. From 1948 to 1962 he chaired the publication board of *Landscape Architecture* magazine, and received a medal for outstanding service in 1975.

His civic life included serving as chair of the Cleveland Heights Planning Commission and the Forest Hill Park Commission, as a trustee of the Cleveland Regional Association from 1937 to 1971 and as a member of the Cuyahoga County Planning commission from 1934 to 1947. According to Strong and other members of the staff, the town plan for Greenhills was primarily a collaboration of Hartzog and Roland Wank.⁷²

Roland A. Wank (1898-1970), who served as Chief Architect, was a modernist who brought experience with building new towns and dams for the Tennessee Valley Authority. He was concerned with providing a complete community for the public benefit and an aesthetic of functional simplicity.⁷³ Wank was among the first generation of European-trained Modernist architects to immigrate to the United States. Born in Budapest, Hungary, in 1898, he attended the Academy of Fine arts and the Royal Technical University in Budapest but in 1919 he transferred to the Technical University at Brno, Czechoslovakia. Brno was a hotbed

⁷⁰ Ibid. 113.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Leach, 108.

⁷³ George S. Koyl, ed., *American Architects Directory* (New York: R.R. Bowker Co., 1955), 556.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 55**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

for ideas related to the “new” architecture, particularly with respect to cubism, functionalism and nationalism, and Wank was there in the same year Walter Gropius organized the Bauhaus, an institution dedicated to modern architecture. The Bauhaus in Weimar, Germany, just a short distance from Brno.⁷⁴

After serving as an officer in the Austrian army during World War I, he worked for various engineering and construction firms before coming to New York in 1924. There Wank initially joined Fellheimer and Wagner in 1927, but took a brief hiatus to work with Springsteen & Goldhammer on two public housing projects—the Consumer’s Cooperative Association housing and the Amalgamated Dwellings on Grand Street, both completed in 1929. The latter was built for the Amalgamated Housing Corporation, a cooperative society established by a garment-workers union, and was considered “a resounding success, marrying modernist aesthetics to a socially progressive program of cooperative housing. It was awarded an American Institute of architects (AIA) New York Chapter Gold Medal in 1930, and Wank was reaffirmed in his vision of modern architecture’s role in social reform.”⁷⁵

Wank soon returned to Fellheimer and Wagner to work on two transportation projects that reflected his flare for industrial aesthetics: a railway station (1932) in Hamilton, Ontario, and the magnificent Union Terminal (1929-33) in Cincinnati, Ohio, for which he was project architect, in collaboration with principal design consultant, Paul Philippe Cret. Wank’s role in the magnificent Art Deco Union Terminal, which earned an AIA Gold Medal, helped him obtain a lead position with the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). As the TVA’s principal architect from 1933 to 1944 he was responsible for designing fifteen dams, powerhouses, employee towns, and recreational projects that won him wide acclaim, especially when the TVA was featured in a comprehensive exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in 1941. He continued to work for the TVA while assigned to the Greenhills project, and by the late 1930s was recognized as the nation’s expert on the construction of prefabricated and demountable housing. At the onset of World War Two, he designed a series of prefabricated dwellings for the Clinton Engineering Works in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, where thousands of men and women were secretly employed in developing the atomic bomb. His work for the TVA and Atomic Energy Commission brought him in contact with industrial architect Albert Kahn and for two years he led the Design Department of Albert Kahn Associates (1944-45). Subsequently he rejoined Fellheimer & Wagner as a partner in the firm. He continued to design in the Modernist style, as exemplified by noteworthy structures such as the International Paper Company (Sterling Forrest, NY) and structures for the New Jersey Turnpike. His other major works include designs for the New Jersey Turnpike Authority (1950-1954), Hoffmann-LaRoche Laboratories, Nutley, N.J.; and Eastman Kodak Laboratories, Rochester, N.Y. In 1961, the firm’s name was changed to Wank Adams Slavin Associates to reflect the new partnership, and the firm continues to this day.⁷⁶

Wank taught postgraduate seminars as a visiting professor of architecture at MIT and Princeton, Cornell, Columbia, and Harvard universities. He received an honorary doctorate from Fairleigh Dickinson University, and contributed articles to technical journals. He won three AIA gold medals for Cincinnati Union Station and the Grand Street Apartments and Ford Plant in St. Louis, and was named a Fellow of the AIA.⁷⁷

Wank has been hailed by Reyner Banham as one of the most consequential American practitioners in the International Style, and he is justifiably celebrated for the powerful modernist expression he contributed to the

⁷⁴ Christine Macy. “The Architect’s Office of the Tennessee Valley Authority.” In *The Tennessee Valley Authority: Design and Persuasion*. Ed. Tim Culvahouse (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2007), 30.

⁷⁵ Macy, 32.

⁷⁶ <http://www.wasallp.com/#!/firm/history>, accessed August 13, 2015; Macy, 40.

⁷⁷ Obituary, *N.Y. Times* (4/24/1970).

PROPERTY NAME**Page 56**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

dams and powerhouses constructed by the TVA from 1933 to 1944. Throughout his career, Wank showed a willingness to cooperate with engineers and landscape architects on large-scale projects that had a strong commitment to social betterment. . . . While in the office of Fellheimer and Wagner, he worked on the Union Terminal in Cincinnati, demonstrating his ability to integrate architectural design with demanding engineering in a very complex project.⁷⁸

On October 6, 1935, G. Frank Cordner, who had previously occupied the position of assistant Chief of the Architectural Section, was appointed Principal Architect and Project Principal to serve in conjunction with Wank. On November 20, 1936, Wank withdrew and returned to the TVA. Born in New Jersey in 1888, G. Frank Cordner was an architect who specialized in government housing for low-income residents. Little is known about his childhood or education. Early in his career he worked on construction of the Panama Canal (circa 1910-1914). While in Panama, he met his wife, Shellie Dunn, whose father served as chief veterinarian for the canal project. Cordner and Shellie married in Detroit, her birthplace, in 1916, and were living there in 1930, according to the U.S. Census, with his mother Delia and daughter Jane. Cordner practiced architecture in Detroit as a partner of Lancelot Sukert and as an individual.⁷⁹ Cordner served several terms as an officer of the Michigan Society of Architects.

By the early 1930s, Cordner had become a pioneer in low cost housing in Michigan.⁸⁰ His participation as an adviser to the President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership in 1931 gave him the chance to confer with players at the national level, including housing advocate Bleecker Marquette, head of the Better Housing League in Cincinnati, and reflects that Cordner was already an expert in that field. His lecture on the topic of "Detroit's slum clearance and housing project" at the University of Michigan during the academic year of 1933-1934 also infers his experience in that area. In 1935, when he was hired to work on the Greenhills project in the Washington office, Cordner would have been about 47 years old.

After Greenhills, Cordner continued with government employment and worked for the Federal Public Housing Authority (FPHA) in Washington, and from there was sent to Puerto Rico in charge of the Government's large housing program there. His experiments with tropical housing there were reported in the *Journal of Housing* in December 1947. In 1948, he became engaged in general contracting as Steinbach & Cordner in Santa Fe. Most of his work was concentrated at Los Alamos, home of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, which was founded to undertake the Manhattan Project.⁸¹ After World War II, he went to work on low-income rental housing in the Philippines.⁸²

Planning Greenhills

Topography, housing type, cost of materials and local wage schedules determined the number of dwellings planned for the initial section of each greenbelt town. The first neighborhood units at Greenhills and Greenbelt were to have 1000 dwellings each, while Greendale and Greenbrook were to have 750 dwellings. By the end of January 1936, the preliminary study for the first neighborhood unit in Greenhills was approved by John Lansill.

⁷⁸ *American Architect and Architecture*, II, 2 (February 1938); Frederick Gutheim, article on Wank in *Architectural Forum* (9/1970), p. 58-59.

⁷⁹ *Weekly Bulletin*, Michigan Society of Architects, 1954.

⁸⁰ "Mass to be said Today for Mr. Shellie D. Cordner," ProQuest Historical Newspapers: *The Washington Post*, Aug. 19, 1942, p. 18.

⁸¹ *Weekly Bulletin*, Michigan Society of Architects, p. 6, December 7, 1948.

⁸² *Journal of Housing*, 1952, v. 9, p 145-46.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 57

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

The design team hoped that four more sections could be added to the town later, providing homes for about 25,000 people.⁸³

While the designers labored to prepare the plans, a study was undertaken by Milton Lowenthal, Associate Economic Analyst in the Research Section, in consultation with Warren Jay Vinton, Chief of Research, Roland Wank and Cordner. The study's purpose was to understand the characteristics, customs and living habits of local residents who were potential tenants and how these concerns might affect the planning, design, construction and equipment of the dwelling units to be built.⁸⁴ Questionnaires were distributed to families who visited the office but most of the data was obtained from individuals and groups familiar with the subject matter—mostly heads of agencies, churches and charities involved in housing, health, and education. Based on 760 questionnaires, the data showed that families in the target annual income range of \$1,000 to \$2,000 spent an average of between \$17 and \$24 per month in rent, so the rents at Greenhills would have to match this range.⁸⁵

The surveys showed that 69 percent of the respondents preferred a single-family house to an apartment or row house. But this was not considered an economically feasible type of housing for families with modest incomes. The initial plans for Greenhills, which were quickly reduced from 1,000 to 676 units, called for just 24 single-family detached houses, and all the rest in multiple-family dwellings. The latter group was to consist of 80 duplexes, 420 units grouped in rows of three to six units, and 152 flats. Some 300 of the dwelling units were to have two bedrooms, 208 of the dwelling units were to have three bedrooms, 112 were to have one bedroom, and 56 were to have four bedrooms.

The survey returns indicated that a typical Greenhills family would be composed of a husband, a wife, and two children. The principal (male) wage earner would hold a skilled manufacturing job paying \$1400 a year. The questionnaires also suggested that the projected population in Greenhills would be a youthful one, as close to 78 percent of the members of the families that responded were younger than 38 years of age, and 38 percent were sixteen and under. (Leach 304) Consequently, educational and recreational facilities would be especially important. Larger homes were desirable for growing families, and a majority of the residences would have two or three bedrooms. Public transit was not a part of Greenhills's plan mostly because Cincinnati industry was widely dispersed. About 90 percent of suburban and rural families owned a car, thus garages were planned for 67 percent of the homes.⁸⁶

The surveys also listed the community amenities future Greenhills residents hoped to enjoy. Most popular were a library (eighty-two percent), a swimming pool (seventy-seven percent), and baseball diamonds (sixty-three percent). Playgrounds for small children (fifty-eight percent) and a community hall (fifty-two percent) were also valued. Many desired a beauty parlor (forty-five percent), a bowling alley (thirty-seven percent), tennis courts (thirty-five percent) and a tavern (twenty-nine percent). Other amenities that were provided included a football field, an automobile service station, a drug store, health services, a barber shop, and village fire and police services. Although a high proportion requested a church of their denomination, constitutional law prohibited the government from building churches. Instead, church services could be held in the community building and the plan set aside several sites for future church construction.⁸⁷

⁸³ Leach, 3.

⁸⁴ Field Study by M. Lowenthal, Introduction.

⁸⁵ Leach, p. 307.

⁸⁶ Lowenthal, "Living Habits Report," p. 19, Final Report, 1937.

⁸⁷ Leach, p. 312.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 58

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Once the greenbelt program was authorized, work began as a furious pace. By mid-October 1935, 8,473 acres of land in the Mount Healthy area were under option and Justin Hartzog and Roland Wank were hired. On November 26 a general plan was released for Greenhills calling for the eventual construction of five neighborhood units containing either 5000 people or 1500 dwelling units with housing arranged on superblocks. The official groundbreaking on the first town section of 1,000 units occurred on December 18, 1935, but the first topographical data was not received in the Washington office until December 30.⁸⁸ Even so, by February 21, 1936, the main circulatory road system was staked out and adjustments were made in house siting plans in response to field conditions. By May 28, 1936 a crew of 1000 men was on the job. Employment on site reached a peak at about 1200 in in June 1936, when working drawings for houses were completed.

As summer moved into fall, the project lagged far behind schedule while the man-hours expended mounted alarmingly, in part due to an intense and prolonged heat wave. A bigger cause was the conflict inherent in the dual purposes of the greenbelt town program: to demonstrate that a model community for moderate-income families could be built efficiently and economically and at the same time to create jobs. Most of the laborers were paid through the Works Progress Administration (WPA), which provided the men with rudimentary, labor-intensive equipment such as picks, shovels and horse-drawn wagons. A frustrated Tugwell reportedly suggested to President Roosevelt that the laborers should be issued spoons.

In August 1936, unit cost figures from the field indicated that construction costs would far exceed the preliminary estimates. Wank responded by substituting S-type units in the form of multi-family rowhouses. He described them as being "inferior in layout, accommodations, construction and equipment" relative to the standard house, and "less convenient (although still livable)." He hoped that if the character of the town were well established before the S-houses were finished, the negative effect of their inferior design would be minimized. The S-houses, which had only four different plans as opposed to 31 plans for the previous houses, had to be built on flat ground. Designed without basements, porches, terraces or garages; the S-type houses would also have flat roofs and use less insulation. The coal storage areas would be smaller, heating pipes exposed, and rooms made narrower and deeper.⁸⁹ Significantly, the need to economize on materials and methods of construction, led to innovation. The exteriors were clad with asbestos-cement siding, which represented the first large-scale use of that material in the United States.⁹⁰ On September 19, 1936, the project was ordered to revise its plans and provide for only 784 dwelling in this first phase. Even with inclusion of the S-type units, this number was further revised downward in November to 770 units, and finally in February 1937 to 676 units.⁹¹

Due to cost overruns, the number of residences in the other greenbelt towns were to be reduced as well: Greenbelt to 885 dwelling units and Greendale to 572. This meant that the towns could not be turned over to a local cooperative housing authority because they would have too few residents and businesses to generate sufficient rents to support necessary municipal services and amortize the debt. The Federal government would have to retain ownership of all three towns for the foreseeable future. The Bankhead-Black Act, adopted June 29, 1936, allowed this, and permitted each greenbelt town to incorporate and operate as a municipal government, supported by "sums in lieu of taxes" paid by the Federal government. Retaining ownership of the towns had the added advantage of protecting the undeveloped land in each community from unscrupulous

⁸⁸Ibid, p. 117.

⁸⁹Leach, 156.

⁹⁰Cordner, "Architectural Planning," November 1937, p. 25.

⁹¹Leach, 161.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 59

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

developers; it also left open the possibility that the communities could be completed as originally intended should the funds become available in the future.

Progress in the greenbelt towns was further complicated by the resignation of Tugwell on November 18, 1936. He had been the lightning rod for anti-New Deal sentiment during the 1936 presidential campaign. An editorial in the *New York Times* had proclaimed Tugwell "a visible and personal link...between the *Comintern* in Moscow and the aspiring young reformers in Washington."⁹² Inflammatory accounts in the press labeling the greenbelt projects "Tugwell Towns" convinced many Americans that the program was anti-American and a communist experiment.⁹³

Following Tugwell's departure, the RA was absorbed into the Department of Agriculture. The RA was subsequently dissolved and the greenbelt programs transferred to a new agency in the Department of Agriculture, the Farm Security Administration (FSA), in September 1937. The FSA took over the RA's resettlement communities as well, of which thirty-eight had been completed, and eighty-four were unfinished. The greenbelt town program staff was reduced to a minimum and transferred to the FSA. Will W. Alexander, who had been Deputy Director of the RA under Tugwell, was named to head the new agency. New emphasis was placed on the three communities' purpose as low-cost demonstrations of the principles of large-scale planned development, home construction, and neighborhood planning.⁹⁴

On October 3, 1936, the Greenhills project was opened to the public for tours. A model house, with furnishings designed especially for the project, was on view at 7 Andover Road. In anticipation of the official opening in April 1938, the Federal government set up a Tenant Selection Committee to start screening applications. As many as 10,000 people had visited the site on a single Sunday in January 1938. Applicants were required to fill out as many as 14 separate forms and submit to a credit report and security check. Social workers inspected the applicant's current housing to "ascertain the adequacy of the existing living conditions, the relationship of income to rent at the existing home, and the family's attitude toward financial obligations, work, care of property, and the desire to locate permanently." The committee also sought out families who had a capacity for active citizenship, were interested in home life and children, and were suited for life in a close-knit community. Families also needed to be appropriately sized for available housing. Two-income families were excluded (wives were expected to stay home and take care of the children), and priority was given to family whose employment was near the project. Families with more than eight members could not be accommodated because only two persons per bedroom were allowed.⁹⁵

When the first tenants moved into Greenhills on April 1, 1938, rents ranged from \$18 a month (for a one-bedroom unit) to \$42 a month (for a 4-bedroom, single-family house). The Federal government established the rent schedule by calculating that each family should pay no more than twenty-five percent of its income in rent and utilities (which included water, heat, and electricity). Thus family income ranged between \$1080 and \$2,520 per year.⁹⁶

The planners of Greenhills envisioned it as a well-rounded modern community and strove to provide all the

⁹² *New York Times*, 19 November 1936, quoted in Arnold, p. 31.

⁹³ Arnold, p. 31; Lampl, p. 39.

⁹⁴ Alanen and Eden, pp. 52-53.

⁹⁵ Leach, p. 239-241.

⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 239.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 60

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

essential facilities and services to make it so. The new town featured a management building, fire and police station and school/community building. The latter incorporated classrooms for kindergarten through eighth grade, a public library, and a gymnasium with an auditorium where public social events and church services could be held. The commercial area included a service station, doctor and dentist offices, and retail spaces for a grocery, a variety store, a drug store, a barbershop, a beauty parlor, a tailor, and a shoe repair shop. Sites were set aside for the expansion of the commercial area, as well as for the erection of churches.

In addition, there were softball courts, horseshoe courts, hockey field, five playgrounds, and a baseball diamond. Most of the parks were left in a natural state or landscaped to look like the fields or pastures one might find on the edge of a rural area. To enhance the pastoral character of the community, electrical and telephone cables were installed underground. Finally, the historic 1816 James Whallon House (NR#73001473, listed May 17, 1973) at 11000 Winton Road, which served as an office for the RA field staff, was retained as a hall for the local chapter of the American Legion.

As they moved into Greenhills, all new tenants received a copy of the *Greenhills Manual*, which provided instructions on how to be a good neighbor and care for their new home and yard. In an attempt to instill in the residents pride in their home, as well as to protect the government's investment, the regulations prohibited such things as driving nails into the walls, installing exterior radio aerials, and planting corn in the yard, and asked "that parents instruct their children not to cut corners over the grass." The manual explained that a plan for the garden had been thoughtfully prepared for each yard and asked residents not to move or change the plants or create new beds. Other rules required that families with children of both sexes must live in a three-bedroom (or larger) home to prevent boys and girls from sleeping in the same room.⁹⁷ The first residents of Greenhills were aware that they were "guinea pigs" in a social experiment to test the "benefits to be gained through an organized community life" and often referred to themselves as "pioneers."⁹⁸

Besides getting the school operational, obtaining essential goods and services was a challenge. The first community initiative undertaken by Carleton Sharpe, the first village manager, was setting up Greenhills Consumer Services, Inc. (GCS) to manage the neighborhood shopping center, as had been done at Greenbelt. This was a cooperative, non-profit corporation with shares available for purchase in the community. At the time it was proposed, fewer than 100 families were living in Greenhills, but they were enthusiastic about the idea. On June 1, 1938, GCS leased the shopping center from the government with a loan from the Consumer Distribution Corporation, which also underwrote cooperatives in Greenbelt and Greendale, and took steps to open a general merchandise store, a food store, automobile service station, beauty parlor, barber shop and valet shop. Residents paid \$10 to participate in GCS and by 1940, there were about 400 members. Other cooperative enterprises established in 1938-39 included the Greenhills Credit Union, a local weekly newspaper--the *Greenhills News-Bulletin*, (still in publication), and the Greenhills Dairy Cooperative, which was made up of local farmers.⁹⁹

Before the village was incorporated, the RA created a Community Council in the summer of 1938 to fill the need for some form of democratic governance over the community's affairs. The Council had nine members elected by the residents, with seven from the town and two from among the farmers. The Community Council served as the governing body, establishing police, fire, sanitation and health regulations. It also set up committees to set up religious services, secure revision of bus scheduling and rates and to select a doctor and

⁹⁷ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, *Greenhills Manual*, p. 1.

⁹⁸ Leach, p. 220.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 231-232.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 61

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

dentist¹⁰⁰

After the Village of Greenhills was incorporated on August 29, 1939 and a new Village Council sworn in on November 26, 1939, the Community Council turned to organizing community activities and clubs with the support of Carleton Sharpe, the community's first manager. With an M.A. degree in political science from Syracuse University, he was well-qualified for the job. Before coming to Greenhills, he had served as an Assistant City Manager for Cincinnati and City Manager of St. Petersburg, Florida.¹⁰¹ The many social and civic organizations formed included a garden club, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and clubs for those interested in bowling, music, singing, handicrafts, dancing, drama, baseball, basketball, radio, philately, singing and chess.¹⁰²

School opened in the Greenhills Community Building and School in September 1938, with some 430 students and 18 teachers under the direction of R.K. Salisbury. Initially, the Greenhills school was part of the Science Hall Rural School District, which had a one-room schoolhouse known as Science Hall, located south of the town. In May 1939, the Hamilton County Board of Education created the Greenhills Rural School District, including just the area owned by the federal government.¹⁰³ Planning advisor Tracy Augur had recommended that greenbelt communities should never be placed in whole or in part in school districts outside the towns in order to maintain their cohesion as social units.¹⁰⁴ From 1938 through 1947, student enrollment in Greenhills more than doubled to 900, and the number of teachers grew to 30. During federal ownership, residents paid no school taxes because the federal government made payments to the district in lieu of taxes and carried custodians and maintenance workers directly on its payroll. However, in 1947, as the federal government prepared to divest of the greenbelt towns, the school district was reorganized as the Greenhills Exempted Village School District, which was dependent on the financial support of local citizens.

The Greenhills schools offered a complete curriculum for school-age children, from kindergarten through high school. The scholastic program offered many courses found only in larger, or private institutions. Other offerings holistically addressed the child's growth through the physical education departments, creative abilities through the Manual Arts and Home Economics departments, and artistic talents and appreciation through the Arts and Music departments. Training in good citizenship and government was developed through a Student Council, with faculty supervision.¹⁰⁵

The school helped strengthen a sense of community by offering evening classes for adults in commercial and vocational education, the fine arts, music, parent education and home-making. Catholic and Protestant religious services were held regularly in the gymnasium/auditorium on the weekends until separate church buildings were erected beginning in 1942. Two church groups were formed—one for Catholics and the other a Community Church consisting of 18 protestant denominations.¹⁰⁶ The public library, located in the Community Building and intended for both public and school use, opened on October 17, 1938. It remained in the building

¹⁰⁰ Lippmeier, Act of Congress, Book II, Greenhills, Ohio 1938-1997, n.p.

¹⁰¹ Leach, p. 218.

¹⁰² Greenhills, Second Anniversary, 1940 (Greenhills: Greenhills News Bulletin Association, 1940).

¹⁰³ Greenhills, Eighth Anniversary, 1946, (Greenhills: Greenhills News Bulletin Association, 1946).

¹⁰⁴ Leach, p. 226

¹⁰⁵ Greenhills, Eighth Anniversary Booklet, 1946.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 62**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

until 1954 when it moved to the Management Building.

Dwelling units in Greenhills filled up more slowly and turnover was higher than expected, but by 1940, all units were rented and the population of Greenhills stood at 2,677.¹⁰⁷ Families who came to Greenhills to take advantage of lower rents and save for a home of their own had been moving on. Even so, the Federal policy that removed families once their income exceeded the upper limit by twenty-five percent encountered resistance among dedicated residents who wanted to stay. In 1938, the Farm Security Administration (FSA) raised the top permissible income limit from \$2500 to \$3215, but even this was insufficient. In January 1940, rent schedules were revised to allow people who exceeded the maximum incomes to pay higher rents rather than forcing them out.¹⁰⁸

In the 1940s, there was increasing interest in sale of the village by the government. As early as July 1940, the Farm Security Administration announced that it would allow privately financed housing in the three greenbelt communities. In 1942, the Federal Public Housing Authority (FPHA) succeeded the FSA in the management of the greenbelt towns. In 1944, Oliver Winston, director of the General Field Office of the FPHA, began investigating approaches for expanding the greenbelt towns so that they would be large enough to be self-sufficient. The FPHA could then transfer the towns to a local homeowners association or public housing authority that could continue to operate them as planned communities, in accordance with the program's original intention. It was also anticipated that remaining lands would be privately developed.

A strong sense of community endured at Greenhills through the war years and continued to shape life in the town. In 1946, the eight anniversary publication celebrated its public amenities and many civic organizations, such as its volunteer fire department, Parent-Teacher Association, VFW, American Legion, masonic club, boy scout and girl scout troops, and political clubs—Republican, Democrat and even Non-Partisan. The demographic trends and long tenure of families within the community indicated that once accepted as Greenhills residents, most were content to stay in the community. Families often moved from one rental unit to another as their family needs or preferences changed. When new lots came up for sale on Damon and Drummond roads and Gambier Circle in the late 1940s, Greenhills residents were among the first to buy. When the original houses were finally sold in the early 1950s, many renters purchased the homes where they had been living, some since 1938.

Lawrence H. Tucker, who became village manager of Greenhills in 1942 after Carleton Sharpe left to head federal public housing in Cleveland, asked the FHPA for help with zoning within the corporate limits to prepare for new development.¹⁰⁹ FHPA hired Justin Hartzog in August 1946 to prepare a study for expansion within the entire 5930 acres. "Hartzog redrew the plan of 1937 for the Greenhills tract. It showed five neighborhoods (one was actually planned as an extension of the village of Greenhills) separated by strips of open land."¹¹⁰ The first neighborhood was to receive 500 new homes, and an extension to the east would add 1099 housing units on 160 acres. Hartzog's new plan also included 250 acres for an airport with an adjacent industrial park but also reserved 550 acres of farmland on the northern border with Butler County. The new plan maintained the hierarchical street system and pedestrian

¹⁰⁷ *The WPA guide to Cincinnati* [compiled by workers of the Writers' Project of the Work Projects Administration in the State of Ohio]; 1943, rpt. with a new introduction by Zane L. Miller and a new preface by Harry Graff. (Cincinnati: Cincinnati Historical Society, 1987), 498.

¹⁰⁸ Leach, p. 251.

¹⁰⁹ Greenhills, Eighth Anniversary Booklet, 1946.

¹¹⁰ Leach, p. 275.

PROPERTY NAME**Page 63**

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

pathways of the original section. Rather than cul-de-sacs, the new residential lanes were in the form of loops that began and ended at the collector streets.

While sale of the village as a whole was planned, sales of lots already platted in the first neighborhood moved forward. The federal government offered 120+ empty parcels on Damon, Drummond and Gambier Circle for sale in 1946. The intended result was the eventual sale of residential lots to private homeowners—primarily veterans. Attorney Charles Taft handled negotiations of the sale on behalf of the builders, known as The Dillons, who agreed to respect the spirit of the original plan even though they intended to build freestanding single-family houses for sale to veterans.¹¹¹

In April 1947, a committee of the American Institute of Planners assembled to watch the disposition of the greenbelt towns. Led by Sherwood Reader, the committee included many of the prominent planners who had been responsible for planning the greenbelt towns—Hartzog, Bigger, Augur, Stein, Jacob Crane (Greendale), and Hale Walker (Greenbelt). The marketing options considered were: 1. leasing to a non-profit group for operation and further development; 2. Soliciting for purchase among insurance companies or other large estate developers; or 3. Selling to the highest bidder. The committee advocated that the greenbelt areas be donated to the appropriate parks department, dedication of streets and utilities to the respective villages and raising of rents to market rates. They also suggested sales requirements that the towns be sold as a unit, that the character of the town plans be followed, and a condition that 1000 housing units be built within five years of the sale.¹¹²

When the FPHA dissolved in May 1947, management of the greenbelt communities was transferred to a new agency, the Public Housing Administration (PHA). The head of the PHA was John Taylor Egan, who had served as a senior architect on the design team that originally planned Greendale. Egan was given the task of disposing of the greenbelt towns. Congress also took a strong interest in the final disposition of the existing homes. The Housing and Home Finance Agency decided that priority in any sale of existing homes should be given to veterans who intended to occupy them.¹¹³

In early 1948, a group of village residents, who included veterans as well as non-veterans, formed the Greenhills Home Owners Corporation with the intention of buying the town as a unit. On behalf of the GHOC, Charles Taft, an attorney who had represented the building in the first sale of lots at Greenhills, petitioned Congress to obtain approval of the sale. Taft, whose brother was Senator Robert A. Taft, was able to obtain passage of a bill in August 1948 to provide FHA insurance of mortgages at 4 percent for up to 25 years. The GHOC found banks unwilling to lend because of potential negative publicity that would be associated with any foreclosure on a veteran, so additional measures were taken. Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, prompted by Arthur Marcus, the head of the American Legion Community Development Corporation, which wanted to buy Greendale, submitted a bill that allowed sale of the towns through negotiation. Passed in May 1949, the law authorized a negotiated sale, allowed the purchasers to pay 10% down and that balance over a period of 25 years at 4% interest, and provided the present occupants to remain in their homes by joining the veterans groups.¹¹⁴

The GHOC sought to purchase the entire expanse of 5049 acres (5930 acres less the 881 acres occupied by the

¹¹¹ "120 Moderate Cost Houses to be Built," *Greenhills Journal*, 13 April 1946, 1:1.

¹¹² Leach, pp. 277-278.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 279.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 279-280.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 64

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Hamilton County Park Board), but succeeded in raising only enough money to buy the land and buildings within the corporate limits. At \$3,511,300, the price was considerably less than the federal government's cost of \$11,508,000, but the latter included the purchase of all 5930 acres, construction of 676 dwelling units and installation of streets and utilities for 1000 units. In January 1950, GHOC took title, which included the shopping center. The cooperative, which had been operating twelve businesses there, agreed to pay rent to GHOC and continued operating. The GHOC immediately started to sell the housing to individual homeowners. The 676 units sold in 312 parcels; some residents bought several units in a rowhouse or apartment block they lived in while other tenants opted not to buy.¹¹⁵

It wasn't long, however, before the GHOC encountered financial challenges. Because all of the funds GHOC received from the sales had to be used to repay its low-interest loan, it had no funds to pay dividends to its investors. As GHOC faced bankruptcy, Charles Stamm, its vice president, managed to obtain a refinancing package from the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company. This enabled the GHOC to pay off the government loan in October 1951, and while it had a higher interest rate, it permitted the GHOC to keep fifty percent of any sales for the purpose of future development. The GHOC used these newly available funds to redevelop the shopping center. It built a new building on the north end of the complex and opened spaces on the back of the center, which up to then had been used as storage. This brought the number of stores operated by GHOC to 35 total.¹¹⁶

For further residential development, GHOC negotiated with Kenneth Hammond, a Buick dealer turned developer, about building homes in the eastern part of the village. In June 1951, Hammond's corporation agreed to build at least fifty homes every 18 months in exchange for option rights. The FHA, Veterans Administration, and local lending institutions who had an interest in the future development of Greenhills all saw Hammond as a responsible builder; however, he was traditional in his approach and objected to Hartzog's plan, with its sparse and irregular lanes and cul-de-sacs. Hammond wanted a plan with a more "standard curvilinear street pattern common to subdivisions of the time, a good deal of cut and fill work, use of much of the area preserved as greenbelt for residences [sic], and the building of only detached homes set on small lots."¹¹⁷

Hammond approached the Greenhills planning commission and village council asking for a blanket approval of a general plan for what he wanted to build but was rebuffed. The commission and council wanted more specific plans and gave the impression that no plans would be approved without Hartzog's involvement. Hammond approached Hartzog, who asserted that his 1947 plan would permit Hammond to achieve his development goals for the most part. Having no other option, Hammond hired Hartzog, who continued to defend his street layout and other aspects of his plan. Eventually, however, Hammond and Stamm persuaded Hartzog that such a layout was not economically viable in that post-war period.¹¹⁸

Hartzog eventually laid out lanes in long curvilinear loops with small lots. As in the original sections, he included paved pedestrian pathways to allow residents to cut through the long blocks and connect with the village center, at least in the "I" and "J" sections. New single-family residences were erected there and on the "H" blocks with setbacks typical of 1950s subdivisions, yet the spacious character and naturalistic setting typical of Greenhills neighborhoods of the 1950s and 1960s imply his influence, while also reflecting a new generation's ideas about land-use planning and design of garden suburbs. The new residential development

¹¹⁵ Ibid, p. 280.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, p. 281.

¹¹⁷ Ibid, p. 282.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, p. 283.

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 65

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

provides a compatible addition to the village and appears to compliment rather than detract from the suburban ideals of 1930s planning.

EXPRESSING CULTURAL VALUES: GARDEN CITY PLANNING AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD UNIT PLAN

Greenhills embodies the foremost principles of architectural design and urban planning of the 1930s. These principles had developed over a twenty-five-year period and built on the synthesizing of the American planning traditions of naturalistic residential areas and City Beautiful urban centers with English garden-city planning principles, which first appeared in the U.S. circa 1908. Refined through the defense housing projects developed for the Federal government during World War I, this synthesis was reinvigorated through the work of notable designers John Nolen, the town planner of Mariemont, Ohio, and Henry Wright and Clarence Stein, the designers of Sunnyside Garden, in Queens, New York, and Radburn, New Jersey.

Greenhills and the other greenbelt towns integrated Ebenezer Howard's garden-city principles with American planning traditions, following many of the conventions that planners Clarence Stein and Henry Wright had introduced in the design of Radburn, New Jersey, and planner John Nolen had incorporated in the design of Mariemont, Ohio, a Cincinnati suburb. The Resettlement Administration's brochure, *Greenbelt Towns: A Demonstration in Suburban Planning*, testifies to these influences by featuring photographs of Welwyn (1919), the British garden city, and by highlighting Radburn as "America's first scientifically planned garden town."¹¹⁹ In the case of Greenhills, its design was also influenced by the example of Norris, Tennessee, which designers Earle Sumner Draper, Tracy Augur, and Roland Wank integrated the Radburn Idea with advanced principle of subdivision planning and landscape design plan.

Ebenezer Howard's Garden City of Tomorrow

Ebenezer Howard (1850-1928) was an English social reformer who worked as a court stenographer in his native London. Howard was moved by the dreadful living conditions of the urban poor, illustrated in publications such as *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London* (Andrew Mearns, 1883), and *How the Other Half Lives: Studies among the Tenements of New York* (Jacob Riis, 1890). Influenced by the Utopian views of Benjamin Ward Richardson (*Hygeia, or the City of Health*, 1876) and Edward Bellamy (*Looking Backward: 2000-1887*, 1888), and the single-tax model developed by Henry George (*Progress and Poverty*, 1881), Howard proposed decentralizing London by creating a series of satellite cities around the metropolis, each of which would integrate the cultural advantages of the town with the healthful benefits of the country. Howard described his proposed garden cities in the treatise, *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (1898), re-issued in 1902 under the title, *Garden Cities of To-morrow*. Like many radicals of his day, Howard believed that the antisocial problems of the urban poor—alcoholism, violence, and crime—would disappear, and social cooperation naturally develop, if the poor were relocated to a better physical environment (this was the "peaceful path to real reform" hinted at in the title of his treatise). The garden city was to be comprehensively planned, self-sustaining, and limited in size (to 6000 acres with development confined to 1000 acres) and population (to 32,000 inhabitants). Howard's simple diagram showed a commercial center and central park, ringed with six mixed-income residential areas (each with a public school) and interspersed with parks and community facilities. Industry was to be concentrated along a railroad corridor around the edges of development, and the whole city was to be encircled with a broad "greenbelt" in agricultural and recreational use. The garden city was to be held in trust, its property never sold but rather leased to tenants. The community was to have a

¹¹⁹Portions of the historic context for the NHL theme Expressing Cultural Values have been reproduced or adapted from "Greendale, Wisconsin, NHL Nomination."

PROPERTY NAME

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 66

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

municipal government, while businesses and industries were to be administered by cooperatives. Finally, as property increased in value, this unearned increment was to be reinvested in the community for the benefit of the tenants.¹²⁰

The Garden City Association organized in Britain in 1899 in hopes of building a garden city. In 1903, Letchworth was erected outside of London, its construction financed by the Garden City Pioneer Company Limited, a subsidiary of the Garden City Association. Planners Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin designed Letchworth as a mixed-income community, with a formal town center and central park, clustered housing alternating with parks, land set aside for industrial use on the outskirts, and an agricultural greenbelt. In fleshing out Howard's diagram, Parker and Unwin drew inspiration from two English company towns, constructed by benevolent factory owners concerned about their employees living conditions: Port Sunlight and Bournville. Port Sunlight was developed in 1887 for the workers at the Lever Brothers soap-making firm, outside of Liverpool. Port Sunlight displays row housing clustered on the outer edges of each irregular-sized block, leaving the interior of the block in communal allotment gardens (a motif that would be picked up in later developments). George Cadbury of the Cadbury Brothers chocolate-manufacturing company established Bournville near Birmingham in 1894. Bournville was notable for its abundant greenspace, and for providing a private garden for each dwelling unit. The plan of Letchworth shows a variation of the Port Sunlight's residential blocks with interior green space, composed of larger blocks, each cut with a cul-de-sac. In 1906, Parker and Unwin designed the suburb of Hampstead Gardens (near London), which in keeping with garden city principles featured small commercial areas at the entrances into the plat, cul-de-sacs, and slightly curving residential lanes.¹²¹

Welwyn, a later garden city project, had substantial influence on American designers. The town was financed by a joint stock company and constructed near London in 1919. Designed by Louis de Soissons, Welwyn displays a town center with axial streets, slightly-curving residential lanes laid out in such a way as to preserve natural features, residential blocks of varying sizes each displaying several cul-de-sacs, and an encircling agricultural greenbelt. Although both Letchworth and Welwyn conformed to Howard's principles of physical design, neither was able to fulfill his critical social reform elements of communal ownership, cooperative management and reinvestment of the unearned increment. In the case of Letchworth, the directors of the Garden City Pioneer Company (who included W.H. Lever and George Cadbury) had promised investors a return of five percent. This proved too little to attract many investors, raising the cost of housing and making it too expensive for the low-income families Howard had hoped to serve. The housing at Welwyn was more affordable, thanks to a government subsidy. At both Letchworth and Welwyn, farming the greenbelts failed due to the poor quality of the soil. Finally, both communities experienced only limited success in attracting industry. Given this, it is perhaps not surprising that the Garden City movement, which became an international phenomenon, emphasized the physical design aspects of Howard's concept and generally ignored his social reform ideas. Garden-city planning principles were employed in the design of suburbs and subdivisions throughout the western world, due in large part to Unwin's popular book, *Town Planning in Practice* (1909), and his subsequent speaking tours. An entertaining lecturer, Unwin advocated designs composed of a formal

¹²⁰ Kermit C. Parsons and David Schuyler, eds., *From Garden City to Green City: The Legacy of Ebenezer Howard* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), pp. 3-4 & 40-41; David Barry Cady, "The Influence of the Garden City Ideal on American Housing and Planning Reform, 1900-1940," (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1970), pp. 7-15.

¹²¹ Parsons and Schuyler, pp. 41-42; Cady, pp. 8-9; Ames and McClelland, p. 42; Norman T. Newton, *Design on the Land: The Development of Landscape Architecture* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 448-52 & 456-60; Bruce E. Lynch and Cynthia D. Lynch, "Washington Highlands Historic District National Register Nomination," 28 September 1988, pp. 8-6.