

# **“TOWN OF GRANDVIEW”** **HISTORIC RESOURCES RE-SURVEY**



PREPARED FOR:  
The City of Grandview, MO

PREPARED BY:  
Rosin Preservation, LLC

August 2018



# **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**Mayor Leonard Jones, Jr.**

**City of Grandview Board of Aldermen**

Sandra Kessinger  
Damon Randolph  
Brian Hochstein  
Annette Turnbaugh  
Jim Crain  
John Maloney

**City of Grandview Historic Preservation Commission**

Elaine Brewer  
JoAnn Immele  
Mary Jones  
Gail Cheatom  
Christian Parchman  
Damon Randolph

**City of Grandview**

**Community Development Department Staff**

Chris Chiodini, Director  
Dave McCumber, City Planner

*This project is partially funded by a grant from the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Office and the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Grant awards do not imply an endorsement of contents by the grantor. Federal laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, age, handicap, or ethnicity. For more information, write to the Office of Equal Opportunity, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington D.C. 20210*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
PUBLIC MEETINGS .....	5
FIELD SURVEY .....	5
COMPILATION OF DATA.....	5
DATA ANALYSIS.....	5
ARCHITECTURAL ANALYSIS .....	6
ESTABLISHING DATES OF CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY HISTORIES.....	6
EVALUATION OF INTEGRITY .....	6
NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY .....	10
EVALUATING NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY .....	10
<b>HISTORIC CONTEXT.....</b>	<b>12</b>
THE CITY OF GRANDVIEW.....	12
<b>SURVEY RESULTS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY AREA.....	14
LOCATION AND SETTING.....	14
HISTORIC PROPERTY TYPES .....	15
ORIGINAL FUNCTIONAL PROPERTY TYPES .....	15
RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TYPES.....	16
COMMERCIAL PROPERTY TYPES.....	17
OTHER PROPERTY TYPES .....	17
ARCHITECTURAL STYLES AND FORMS .....	18
RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURAL STYLES .....	19
RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURAL FORMS .....	24
COMMERCIAL PROPERTY TYPES.....	29
OTHER PROPERTY TYPES.....	31
DATES OF CONSTRUCTION.....	37
ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY.....	37
<b>SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>41</b>
REGISTER-LISTED AND INDIVIDUALLY ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES .....	41
HISTORIC DISTRICTS .....	42
MULTIPLE PROPERTY SUBMISSIONS .....	45
CONSERVATION DISTRICTS.....	48
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>52</b>

# INTRODUCTION

The City of Grandview (City) contracted with Rosin Preservation, LLC to conduct a reconnaissance-level resurvey of historic resources within the boundaries of a previous survey, “Town of Grand View’ Missouri,” conducted in 2003 which includes the original town plat of Grandview. The purpose of this resurvey is to provide updated information concerning the presence of historic resources, their National Register eligibility, and to document any alterations or changes in integrity that may have occurred since the 2003 survey. This roughly 128-acre area contains a mixture of commercial, residential, educational, and industrial resources associated with the City’s early development through to the present.

The Survey Area contains 306 primary resources (*Figure 1*). The irregular Survey Area contains resources typical of residential neighborhoods, primarily single-family residences, and a central commercial core. The majority of the primary resources, defined as single-family residences, multi-family apartment buildings, or commercial buildings, maintain their historic functions. Nearly thirty-three percent of the primary resources have auxiliary resources such as garages or outbuildings. The primary resources represent a range of construction dates, from ca.1900 to 2003. Approximately forty-two percent were constructed between 1900 and 1918 while roughly fourteen percent were built during the post-World War II era. They reflect the early growth of the city and a mid-century expansion as families moved away from the commercial center and into less developed areas.


The “Town of Grandview” Historic Resources Re-Survey encompasses four objectives:

- 1) to identify, record, photograph, and evaluate through architectural/historic survey those individual properties and potential districts in the Survey Area that, on the basis of age, integrity and associations, meet the eligibility criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and
- 2) to substantiate such assessments; and to identify and characterize those portions of the Survey Area which, on the basis of insufficient age or integrity, exclude them from consideration for nomination in the National Register of Historic Places and to substantiate such assessments and
- 3) to update data generated during the 2003 survey of the project area, including identifying any changes in integrity or National Register eligibility and

- 4) to provide updated recommendations for future preservation activities based on the findings of the resurvey.

During March 2018, Rosin Preservation associates Rachel Nugent and Emily Lenhausen, and sub-consultant Brad Finch performed survey activities. Ms. Lenhausen and Mr. Finch completed field survey and photography. Ms. Nugent and Ms. Lenhausen entered data into a Microsoft Access Database. Finally, Ms. Nugent and Ms. Lenhausen analyzed the data, prepared the historic context, developed survey recommendations, and prepared this report of findings.

FIGURE 1- SURVEY AREA



“Town of Grand View” Survey Area



# METHODOLOGY

Rosin Preservation completed the “Town of Grandview” Historic Resources Re-Survey in conformance with the procedures for historic resources survey outlined in *National Register Bulletin 24: Guidelines for Local Survey: A Basis for Preservation Planning* and the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office *Standards for Professional Architectural and Historic Surveys*. Evaluation of resources for significance was in accordance with *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*.

The scope of work included the following:

- Public meetings.
- Field survey and photography of individual properties.
- Compilation of physical and historical information in a database and preparation of a report that summarizes the findings.
- Preliminary identification of each resource’s architectural style or property type, period of construction, and architectural integrity.
- Preliminary identification of all architecturally significant sites, objects, buildings, structures, and districts within the Survey Area.
- Evaluation and determination of properties and districts that appear eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
- Identification of changes in integrity or National Register eligibility that have occurred since the 2003 survey.
- Recommendations for future preservation of historic resources identified in the Survey Area.

## **PUBLIC MEETINGS**

Two public meetings were held during the project. An initial public meeting was held in March 2018 to inform property owners within the survey area and the general public of the scope and goals of the project. A subsequent public meeting was held July 11, 2018 at City Hall to inform the public of the results and recommendations.

## **FIELD SURVEY**

During field survey the consultants examined every resource in the Survey Area regardless of age, whether it had been previously surveyed, or its existing National Register designation. The team took high-resolution digital photographs and recorded information about the exterior physical appearance of each resource, specifically building materials, architectural style, and condition. Primary elevation photographs conform to standards for survey documentation set forth by the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

## **COMPILATION OF DATA**

Rosin Preservation compiled survey information for each resource in a Microsoft Access database. The database fields record each building's physical features (e.g., plan, materials, architectural style and/or property type, outbuildings, etc.) as well as historical information (e.g., date of construction, original and current function). This database was then used to prepare inventory forms in accordance with SHPO guidelines.

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

The consultants analyzed three categories of data to identify contiguous historic districts and/or individual properties that appear potentially eligible for National Register listing. The following three categories address issues important in determining the significance of a property and its National Register eligibility.

- Architectural Style/Property Type
- Date of Construction
- Architectural Integrity

The current condition and integrity of each resource was compared to 2003 values to determine if any changes in condition or integrity occurred during the intervening years. Any changes in these values were noted and considered when developing recommendations for future preservation activities.

The "Survey Results" section of this report provides a detailed description of this analysis and the survey findings for the Survey Area.

## **ARCHITECTURAL ANALYSIS**

After compiling and reviewing the results of the field survey, Rosin Preservation analyzed architectural styles and vernacular property types by reviewing photographs and database information. Rosin Preservation assigned each building an architectural style and/or vernacular property type. *A Field Guide to American Houses* by Virginia McAlester provided guidance for identifying properties by architectural style or building form and ensured the use of terminology consistent with National Register nomenclature.

## **ESTABLISHING DATES OF CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY HISTORIES**

Date of construction and property histories were extensively compiled during the previous survey. These records were updated as necessary using historic maps, aerial imagery, and county tax assessor records.

## **EVALUATION OF INTEGRITY**

For this survey, properties were evaluated for integrity following the general standards utilized during the 2003 survey.<sup>1</sup> All properties eligible for listing in the National Register, whether for individual significance or as contributing elements to a historic district, must retain sufficient architectural integrity to convey the period of time in which they are significant.<sup>2</sup> The National Park Service uses the following areas to define integrity. A property must retain integrity in a majority of these areas to be eligible for the register.

- **Location:** The place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
- **Design:** The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- **Setting:** The physical environment of a historic property.
- **Materials:** The physical elements that were combined during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kerry Davis and Sally F. Schwenk, "The Town of Grand View," Historic Preservation Services, LLC., 2003: 10-12

<sup>2</sup> A contributing property to a historic district does not have to meet the same threshold for integrity as an individual landmark, but it must retain enough fabric to contribute to the significance of the district. Properties contributing to a district that is significant in the area of architecture must retain a higher degree of integrity than properties in a district that is significant for associations with an important individual or with historical events or patterns of history.

- Workmanship: The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- Feeling: A property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- Association: The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.<sup>3</sup>

Based on visual inspection, each building received an integrity rating of Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor reflecting how much of the original design, workmanship, exterior materials, and overall feeling of a past period of time remain.<sup>4</sup> The consultants employed a “glass half-full” approach to integrity evaluation, considering the reversibility of alterations as well as the quality of alterations. After assigning integrity ratings, the consultants compared current ratings with those determined by the previous survey in order to evaluate any alterations in integrity rating. Rosin Preservation developed the following criteria to serve as the basis for rating architectural integrity in this survey. The criteria are similar to those listed in the previous survey as the standards for evaluation have not changed significantly over time.

#### Excellent

- The original form and massing of the building are intact;
- The exterior cladding material has not been altered;
- The majority of the building's openings are unaltered or were altered in a sensitive and appropriate manner using similar materials, profiles, and sizes as the original building elements;
- Significant decorative elements, including porches, are intact;
- Design elements intrinsic to the building's style are intact;
- The overall feeling or character of the building for the time period in which it was erected is intact. Changes over a period of time are sympathetic and compatible to the original design in color, size, scale, massing, and materials;

---

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places, *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (Washington, DC: National Register Publications, 1998), 45.

<sup>4</sup> Architectural integrity differs from physical condition. A building with excellent integrity may be in very poor condition and, conversely, a building with very poor integrity may be in excellent condition.

- Character-defining elements from the time period in which the building had significant associations with events or important individuals remain intact; and
- If over fifty years in age, the building appears to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or would be a contributing element to a historic district.

### Good

- The original form and massing of the building are intact;
- Significant portions of original exterior cladding materials remain;
- Some alteration of original building openings or spaces has occurred using new materials and profiles, but not causing irreversible damage to the original configuration of openings and spaces;
- Significant decorative elements, including porches, remain intact;
- Alterations to the building are reversible and the historic character of the property could be easily restored;
- Additions to a secondary elevation are in an appropriate manner, respecting the materials, scale, and character of the original building design;
- The historic feeling or character of the building is slightly weakened by change or lack of maintenance; and
- The building would be a contributing element to a historic district and/or it might be independently eligible for register listing.

### Fair

- The original form and massing of the building are intact;
- Exterior cladding material has been altered or added; however, the cladding is similar in appearance to the original cladding or there is some indication upon visual inspection that if removed, enough of the original cladding material might remain that the property could be restored to its original appearance;<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Per National Register of Historic Places standards, a resource must be assessed *as is* when considered for listing. Although some alterations may be reversible, a property may not be considered eligible until these alterations have been reversed. Furthermore, the reversal of alterations does not guarantee the eligibility of the property.

- The majority of the building's openings were altered in an inappropriate manner using new materials, profiles, and sizes;
- Some alterations to significant decorative elements, including porches;
- Additions generally respect the materials, scale, and character of the original building design, but may be more difficult to reverse without altering the essential form of the building;
- Historic feeling or character of the building is retained despite alterations; and
- If the property has associations with a district's area of significance, the property might be a contributing resource to a historic district.

#### Poor

- The form and massing of the building were altered;
- Exterior materials were altered;
- The majority of the building's openings, such as windows and doors, were altered in an inappropriate manner using new materials, profiles, and sizes;
- Multiple decorative elements, including porches, have been altered;
- Alterations are irreversible or would be extremely difficult, costly, and possibly physically damaging to the building to reverse;
- Later additions do not respect the materials, scale, or character of the original building design;
- The overall historic feeling and character of the building is significantly compromised; and
- Further investigations after removal of non-historic materials and alterations may reveal that the structure retains greater architectural integrity than originally apparent and should be re-evaluated.

In order to determine the presence of and understand alterations made to buildings within the survey area, each property was examined closely. Alterations made within the past fifteen years were determined by comparing each property's current appearance with its documented 2003 appearance. Comparisons were made using survey forms and photographs produced by the 2003 survey. A visual inspection of each property noted the presence of non-historic materials and suspected alterations in form, massing, or plan. Aerial imagery and available Sanborn Insurance Maps were utilized to narrow down periods of alteration which pre-dated the 2003 survey. In most cases, exact dates of alteration were not able to be determined and, consequently estimates were provided. Estimates were determined using the above comparison data as well as general knowledge concerning the availability or popularity of elements such as asbestos shingle. The

determination of alteration dates proved challenging due to a general unavailability of historic imagery or records concerning many alterations.

## **NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY**

Following data analysis, the consultants made preliminary evaluations of all inventoried properties according to the criteria and standards for historic resources established by the National Park Service. This included a preliminary assessment of individual eligibility for listing in the National Register and/or as contributing elements to a National Register historic district.

### **EVALUATING NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY**

In addition to retaining integrity of their historic architectural design, properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places must meet certain criteria of historic significance. Historic significance is the importance of a property to the history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture of a community, a state, or the nation. Information such as date, function, associations, and physical characteristics affect significance.

To be listed in the National Register, properties must have significance in at least one of the following areas.

- Criterion A: Association with events, activities, or broad patterns of history.
- Criterion B: Association with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- Criterion C: Embody distinctive characteristics of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- Criterion D: Have yielded, or be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

The consultants analyzed data relating to the architectural integrity and historic significance of each surveyed property to identify contiguous districts and individual properties that appear potentially eligible for National Register listing.<sup>6</sup> Rosin Preservation used the following terminology to complete this analysis.

---

<sup>6</sup> SHPO staff makes official determinations of National Register eligibility for properties in Missouri.

- **Individually Eligible** applies to properties that retain excellent architectural integrity and clearly represent associations with the established historic context(s). A property that independently meets the National Register Criteria for Evaluation can also be contributing to a historic district if it falls within the district boundaries and has associations with the district's areas of significance.
- **Contributing to a District** applies to properties that do not retain sufficient integrity or associations to merit individual listing but would enhance the historic associations and the architectural qualities of a historic district. A National Register district is a significant concentration of sites, buildings, structures, or objects that are united historically or aesthetically by design, physical development, or historic events. Contributing properties do not have to be individually distinctive, but must contribute to a grouping that achieves significance as a whole. The majority of the components that define a district's historic character, even if they are individually undistinguished, must possess integrity, as must the district as a whole. Contributing buildings typically have "Excellent" or "Good" integrity, although there may be occasions where resources with "Fair" integrity are contributing.
- **Non-Contributing to a District** applies to individual properties located within a historic district that have lost their historical integrity, were not present during the period of significance or do not relate to the documented significance of the district. In some cases, non-contributing buildings, those with integrity ratings of "Fair," can be reclassified as contributing if alterations are reversed to reveal intact historic fabric and features.
- **Not Eligible** applies to individual properties located outside an area of resources that could potentially form a historic district. These resources either no longer possess historical integrity due to alterations or do not represent significant associations with historical events or provide excellent examples of an architectural styles.
- **Less than Fifty Years of Age** applies to properties that are less than fifty years old and have not reached the general threshold for National Register eligibility. The National Park Service considers fifty years to be the length of time needed to develop historical perspective and to evaluate significance. The National Register Criteria do allow the designation of properties that are less than fifty years of age if they can document exceptional significance. For this Survey, the fifty-year cut-off was 1968. Buildings in this category that received integrity ratings of excellent or good may be eligible for the National Register once they reach fifty years.

# HISTORIC CONTEXT

## THE CITY OF GRANDVIEW

The City of Grandview is located in Washington Township, Jackson County, Missouri. Washington Township organized in 1836, following an influx of settlers taking advantage of good crop and pasture lands.<sup>7</sup> The township benefitted from steady growth and increased settlement until the Civil War. The conflict devastated Jackson County, forcing many residents of Washington Township to leave, although many of the residents later returned to rebuild.

Following the Civil War, Jackson County experienced a surge in population growth. In 1887, Kansas City & Southern Railway Company laid new track through what would later become Grandview. The company constructed a small depot adjacent to the tracks in April 1889.<sup>8</sup> In May 1889 the survey and subdivision of land began. That winter, James G. Feland and James W. Jones filed the first plat of the Town of Grandview, consisting of sixteen rectangular blocks adjacent to the railroad tracks. By early 1890, the first commercial structure was built in Grandview. Additional commercial and residential development followed rapidly. The Kansas City, Nevada, & Ft. Smith Railroad Company, later the Kansas City, Pittsburgh, & Gulf Railroad, leased several miles of track from the Kansas City & Southern Railway Company and purchased additional “rights of way” beginning in 1890, adding Grandview’s second rail line. The company built a depot servicing this new line in Grandview by May of 1897.<sup>9</sup> The construction of lines by both railroad companies cemented Grandview’s status as a market town and regional hub, insulating it from the national economic depression 1893. While growth slowed in other parts of the nation, Grandview continued to expand.

Commercial and residential development surged during the first decades of the twentieth century. Commercial growth continued to be located largely near the railroad tracks, offering such services as lodging and livery rental. This commercial growth spurred residential development nearby. Several additions were filed, including Dyer’s in November 1910, followed shortly by Feland’s and Davidson’s in April 1912. The placement of these additions near the railroad tracks facilitated access to affordable building materials brought in on the rail lines. In 1912 Grandview incorporated as a town with a population of approximately 400.<sup>10</sup> By 1914, Grandview possessed four area grade schools and one secondary school. That year, the grade schools combined to form Consolidated School District Number Four.<sup>11</sup> In 1920, the school district built a permanent, larger

---

<sup>7</sup> Kerry Davis and Sally F. Schwenk, “The Town of Grand View,” Historic Preservation Services, LLC., 2003: 50

<sup>8</sup> Neither depot remains extant. Ibid, 55.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, 56.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, 59.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, 64.

school to house elementary and high school students. The new school, located at 1001 Main Street, opened in 1922.<sup>12</sup>

In the mid-1920s the commercial center of Grandview experienced a physical shift. The replacement of State Highway No. 1 with U.S. Highway 71 approximately one mile east of downtown Grandview spurred this shift. The new U.S. Highway connected Grandview to other area communities and increased traffic connections to and from Kansas City, approximately sixteen miles to the north. To take advantage of the new travel corridor, commercial development began to expand eastward.<sup>13</sup> Additional road improvements were made under Judge Harry S. Truman and the Public Works Administration, which served to connect the residents of Grandview to outlying communities and markets. These road improvements laid the groundwork for future suburban development.

Following World War II, Grandview experienced a suburban building boom which resulted in annexations that extended the city in all directions. Massive population growth spurred commercial development and the construction of new schools and civic resources. Grandview Airport, constructed during the war, became the Grandview Airforce Base in 1954. Shortly afterwards, Grandview Airforce Base was recommissioned as Richards-Gebauer Air Force Base. Throughout this time Grandview continued to experience significant growth due in large part to its association with the military base, which influenced both commercial and residential development.

Properties within the survey area reflect primarily early-twentieth century residential and commercial development as well as mid-century and post-World War II suburban expansion within the City of Grandview.

---

<sup>12</sup> See survey form JA-AS-088-276 for further information. Ibid, 64.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, 65.

# SURVEY RESULTS

## PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY AREA

### LOCATION AND SETTING

The “Town of Grandview” Historic Resources Re-Survey includes approximately 128 acres in Grandview, Jackson County, Missouri. The Survey Area contains 421 total resources bounded roughly by Lena Avenue on the north, 13<sup>th</sup> Street on the east, the westernmost set of Kansas City Southern Railroad Company tracks on the west, and Highgrove Road to the south with an extension to 133<sup>rd</sup> Street between two sets of Kansas City Southern railroad tracks (*Figure 1*). In total, the survey examined 306 primary resources, including single-and-multi-family dwellings, commercial and industrial buildings, and landscape resources plus 115 additional secondary resources, such as garages or sheds.

The Survey Area is relatively flat and follows an orthogonal street grid with numbered streets running north-south and named streets running east-west. Grandview Road in the east half of the Survey Area is an exception, running north-south between 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Streets. Grassy, gravel, or asphalt alleys, running north-south, bisect ten blocks within the Survey Area between 4<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Streets. East-west alleys bisect six blocks, primarily west of the easternmost set of railroad tracks. The size and number of lots varies within each block. Concrete sidewalks line both sides of Main Street between 5<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> streets within the Survey Area. Inconsistent segments of sidewalk are present on portions of the remaining streets.

The Survey Area is largely residential with commercial resources concentrated along Main Street. A small cluster of light industrial buildings is located near 7<sup>th</sup> Street in the northwest corner of the Survey Area. A school complex occupies a large block bound by Highgrove Road and Main, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> streets in the east portion of the Survey Area. Late twentieth and early twenty-first century infill includes single and multi-family residences such as duplexes and commercial buildings. These resources date from ca. 1970 to ca. 2013. Surface parking lots are concentrated near Main Street and within the west half of the Survey Area where they accompany commercial and light industrial resources. Vacant lots are infrequently interspersed throughout the Survey Area with the highest concentration located between the two sets of Kansas City Southern Railroad tracks in the west half. Variations in the character and types of resources provide information about the historic patterns of development that occurred in Grandview.

The majority of the residential resources are set back from the street, surrounded by open lawns. Mature trees and ornamental lawns characterize the landscaping. Wood or chain link fences enclose the rear portion of some lots. Many residential properties have secondary resources such

as garages or outbuildings. Some of these secondary resources reflect the style and materials of the primary resource; others are simple, utilitarian buildings. Commercial resources on Main Street largely feature flush set-backs and many share party walls. Main Street is bound by concrete sidewalks, curbs, and a narrow easement.

Early-twentieth and mid-century residential and commercial development characterizes the Survey Area. The resources represent a range of high style architecture and vernacular forms including Queen Anne, Craftsman, Historical Revival styles, National Folk Forms, and Post-War Housing Forms. Reflecting the time periods for these stylistic trends and waves of development in Grandview, over half (fifty-six percent) were constructed between 1900 and 1918 or during the post-World War II period (1946-1959).

### **HISTORIC PROPERTY TYPES**

To assist in understanding the historic property types found in the Survey Area, Rosin Preservation identified and surveyed properties based on their original function as well as their architectural style and/or vernacular building form/type. A property type is a set of individual resources that share physical or associative characteristics. Property types link the ideas incorporated in the historic contexts with the actual historic resources that illustrate those ideas. For example, in Grandview the concentration and frequency of post-war residential property types within the Survey Area reflects the rapid increase in the city's population following World War II. By examining resources according to (1) original function and (2) architectural style, the analysis addressed both shared associative (functional) characteristics as well as physical (architectural style/building form/type) characteristics.

### **ORIGINAL FUNCTIONAL PROPERTY TYPES**

Drawn from the National Register subcategories for function and use, the consultant identified different categories of historic building functions for the surveyed properties. While the functions of some buildings have changed from their original use, this analysis was based on the original building function. Figure 2 shows the distribution of primary resources by historic function.

**Figure 2: ORIGINAL PROPERTY TYPES**

<b>TYPE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
RESIDENTIAL: SINGLE-FAMILY	208
RESIDENTIAL: MULTI-FAMILY	6
RESIDENTIAL: SECONDARY STRUCTURE <sup>14</sup>	2
COMMERCIAL	54
EDUCATION	3
GOVERNMENT/PUBLIC WORKS	2
INDUSTRIAL	4
RELIGION: RELIGIOUS FACILITY	2
TRANSPORTATION	1
VACANT	8
UNKNOWN	16
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>306</b>

**Residential Property Types**

Residential property types account for approximately 71 percent of the resources in the Survey Area. Although these structures express a limited range of building forms and architectural styles, they provide considerable information about the influences that shaped the city as it grew throughout the early-to-mid twentieth century.

*Single-Family Residential Functional Property Type*

With 208 total such resources in the Survey Area, single-family dwellings account for nearly all of the residential property types surveyed. Their significance derives from the information they impart about the distribution and appearance of single-family dwellings erected in this community and reflect the variety of socio-economic groups dispersed throughout the neighborhood as it grew. This property type illustrates a variety of architectural styles and vernacular folk house forms that were popular during the era of their construction. All are detached dwellings located on rectangular lots platted on a grid system. The width of street frontage varies by lot. In general, the single-family residences are one- to two-and-one-half-story buildings constructed with masonry or concrete foundations; masonry, wood, stucco, asbestos, or synthetic wall cladding; and asphalt shingle gable or hip roofs.

---

<sup>14</sup> Includes secondary resources which have since been converted to single-family dwelling or mixed-use properties.

### *Multi-Family Residential Functional Property Type*

The Survey Area includes six resources which were originally multi-family dwellings. One ca. 1909 resource, 12902 Grandview Road, now functions as a single-family residence. With the exception of one ca. 1915 resource and one ca. 1971 low-rise brick apartment building, the remaining resources were constructed as purpose-built duplexes during the mid-twentieth century (ca.1950-1955). They reflect changing trends in architectural styles as well as the housing needs of the city. The resources are set back from the street, similar to the surrounding single-family houses. The buildings have simple rectangular forms and restrained architectural styles. Although the rectangular buildings have concrete foundations, the similarities with surrounding historic resources include, scale and massing, cladding, and roof shape. They have minimal applied ornament in keeping with the mid-century Minimal Traditional and Ranch forms.

### **Commercial Property Types**

Commercial property types account for approximately eighteen percent of the primary resources surveyed. They are primarily one and two-part or free standing commercial blocks. In general, the commercial property types are constructed with masonry or concrete foundations; brick or concrete block wall cladding; and flat roofs. Many feature storefront display systems or fixed sash display windows.

### **Other Property Types**

Industrial property types account for four resources in the Survey Area. These resources are concentrated near the railroad and are primarily located at the north end of 5<sup>th</sup> Street in the Survey Area. A steel radio antenna tower is located at the west end of Main Street in the Survey Area while free standing one-story concrete block buildings compose the remaining three resources. These resources date to the mid-twentieth century.

This survey also identified two religious facilities, three educational resources, and two public works resource. Because the survey included so few examples of these property types, it is not possible to define characteristics for the buildings in each category. However, it is worth noting that all have exterior architectural treatments that reflect conscious design choices specific to their functions and periods of construction. Other property types identified are landscape properties, including nine parking lots and one plaza.

## ARCHITECTURAL STYLES AND FORMS

Classifications based on shared physical attributes include categorization by architectural styles and/or vernacular building forms or types. The architectural styles and forms identified in the Survey Area and assigned to the properties follow the terminology and classifications accepted by the National Register of Historic Places program. This hierarchy and nomenclature relies heavily on the forms and styles discussed for residential buildings in *A Field Guide to American Houses* by Virginia McAlester and the Transportation Research Board’s report *A Model for Identifying and Evaluating the Historic Significance of Post-World War II Housing. A Field Guide to American Houses* includes common vernacular forms of architecture adapted throughout the country under the category of “National Folk Houses.”<sup>15</sup>

In 2012, the Transportation Research Board released the National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 723, titled *A Model for Identifying and Evaluating the Historic Significance of Post-World War II Housing*, (NCHRP Report 723). This report redefines Minimal Traditional, Ranch, and Split-Level dwellings as “forms” rather than “styles,” using massing, layout, and shape rather than applied ornament and materials to inform classification.<sup>16</sup> The NCHRP Report was used to identify post-war dwellings in the Survey Areas.

The 276 buildings<sup>17</sup> surveyed include fifty resources that represent a formal architectural style and 179 examples of building forms.<sup>18</sup> The majority of resources are classified by their form because stylistic ornament was never part of the original design or has since been removed. Figures 3 through 5 show the distribution of properties by building style and type.

**Figure 3: ARCHITECTURAL STYLES**

STYLE	TOTAL
COLONIAL REVIVAL/ NEO-COLONIAL	15
CRAFTSMAN	19
MISSION/SPANISH REVIVAL	3
MODERN MOVEMENT	5
QUEEN ANNE	2
TUDOR REVIVAL	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>50</b>

<sup>15</sup> The term “vernacular” is used in its broadest application and refers to common local and/or regional building forms and the use of materials specific to a particular period.

<sup>16</sup> Emily Pettis et al., *A Model for Identifying and Evaluating the Historic Significance of Post-World War II Housing*, National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 723, (Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board, 2012).

<sup>17</sup> There are 306 total primary resources. Landscape resources, public works structures, and vacant lots were not included in the architectural analysis.

<sup>18</sup> An additional 47 buildings were assigned the category “Other Vernacular” due to alterations which obscured the original form or other circumstances which precluded them from inclusion in the above forms and styles.

**Figure 4: ARCHITECTURAL FORMS-RESIDENTIAL**

<b>FORM</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
AMERICAN FOURSQUARE	7
BUNGALOW/BUNGALOID	40
CENTRAL PASSAGE- DOUBLE PILE	9
GABLED-ELL	9
HALL AND PARLOR <sup>19</sup>	7
I-HOUSE	1
MINIMAL TRADITIONAL	14
OPEN GABLE/GABLE FRONT <sup>20</sup>	16
PYRAMID SQUARE	18
RANCH	31
TRANSITIONAL RANCH	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>153</b>

**Figure 5: ARCHITECTURAL FORMS-NON-RESIDENTIAL**

<b>FORM</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
ONE-PART COMMERCIAL BLOCK	13
FREE-STANDING COMMERCIAL BLOCK	7
TWO-PART COMMERCIAL BLOCK	4
GAS STATION	1
STEEPLED-ELL	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26</b>

### **RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURAL STYLES**

Single-family residences were the dominant functional and architectural building type surveyed. The residential architecture of the Survey Areas represents a range of styles popular from the late-nineteenth-century to the mid-twentieth century, specifically Queen Anne, early-twentieth-century American styles (Craftsman) and twentieth-century revival styles with the full gamut of historical influences.

The earliest residences in the Survey Areas were constructed beginning in early 1900s as new additions were platted. While many of these early dwellings are small, vernacular interpretations of popular architectural styles, there are two high-style examples of early twentieth century dwellings in the Survey Area, both in the Queen Anne style.

---

<sup>19</sup> Includes two dwelling identified as a Stackhouse and a Saddlebag during the 2003 survey.

<sup>20</sup> Includes the single Shotgun dwelling identified in this survey.

## **Victorian Period Residential Architectural Styles**

The Victorian Era in America (roughly 1860 to 1900) occurred during a time of rapid industrialization when building components were mass produced and easily shipped via the seemingly ever-expanding network of railroads.<sup>21</sup> Mail-order catalogues, plan books, and builders' guides helped to spread these styles quickly to cities and towns throughout the country. The flexibility provided by the newly popularized balloon frame allowed irregular floor plans, which was a departure from the traditional arrangements of square or rectangular "pens."<sup>22</sup> The availability of standardized lumber, provided by the local lumber yard or shipped in by rail, and mail-order trims produced forms that moved beyond the basic cube with protruding bays, multiple gables and towers ornamented with shingles, friezes, spindles, ornamental windows, and wrap-around porches.

### *Queen Anne*

The Queen Anne style was extremely popular in the Midwest during the late 1800s to about 1910, and was often used in smaller, more-rural communities up to World War I. The style came to America from England during the 1880s, evolved from a style developed by a group of nineteenth century architects. The style was named for Britain's Queen Anne, who reigned between 1702 and 1714 when classical ornament was often applied to traditional medieval structures.<sup>23</sup> A Queen



*Figure 6. 13016 Grandview Road, 2018.*

Anne residence's most-character-defining feature is its overall form. The massing of Queen Anne homes features protruding cross-gables and turrets that contribute to an asymmetrical form. Additional exterior decoration was achieved through wall overhangs, voids, extensions and the application of a variety of materials. The Free Classic Queen Anne incorporates classical design elements such as the Palladian window, dentils, and classical columns. Two resources in the Survey Areas exhibit the Queen Anne style. A ca. 1910 example is located at 13016 Grandview Road (*Figure 6*).

---

<sup>21</sup> Virginia McAlester, *A Field Guide to American Houses* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 2014), 314.

<sup>22</sup> McAlester, 314.

<sup>23</sup> John C. Poppeliers, and S. Allen Chambers, Jr. *What Style Is This? A Guide to American Architecture*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2003, 72.

As the Queen Anne style evolved, the emphasis on patterned wood walls became more pronounced. The one-story partial, full, or wrap-around porches that extended across the façades of these houses typically feature turned or jigsawed ornamental trim. Extensive one-story porches are common and accentuate the asymmetry of the façade. They always address the front entrance area and cover part or all of the front façade. It is not uncommon for these porches to extend along one or both sides of the houses. The most common configuration is the one- to one-and-one-half-story hipped roof with lower cross gables. One example of this roof type in the Survey Area includes **12912 Grandview Road**. (Figure 7). While larger examples of this shape subtype commonly incorporate towers or turrets in their compact footprints, this example of the hipped-roof-with-lower-cross-gable dwelling in the Survey Area has a more rambling, linear footprint.



Figure 7. 12912 Grandview Road, 2018.

### **Eclectic Period Residential Architectural Styles**

McAlester divides the Eclectic Period of American residential architecture into three sub-periods: Anglo-American, English, and French Period Houses; Mediterranean Period Houses; and Modern Houses. The Eclectic Movement drew inspiration from American Colonial-era architecture as well as the architecture of Europe. Designs emphasized strict adherence to stylistic traditions and minimal variation and innovation. During the same time period, and in contrast to the European and Colonial American-influenced designs, Modern houses also appeared. Dwellings in this subcategory represent the burgeoning impact of the Arts and Crafts Movement, Frank Lloyd Wright’s Prairie School, and European modernism in the early twentieth century.<sup>24</sup> The National Register of Historic Places differentiates between the Revival styles of European and Colonial American antecedents and the distinctly American styles reflecting influences emanating from Chicago (Prairie School) and California (Arts and Crafts). Under the National Register classification of “Late 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Revivals,” McAlester’s Anglo-American, English, and French Period Houses are synonymous with Colonial Revival, Classical Revival, Tudor Revival, Late Gothic Revival, Italian Renaissance, and French Renaissance styles while Mission and Spanish Revival fall under the Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival subcategory. The National Park Service general category of “Late 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century American Movements” includes residential architecture in the Prairie School and Bungalow/Craftsman styles.

---

<sup>24</sup> McAlester, *A Field Guide to American Houses* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014) 458-49.

## Anglo-American, English, and French Period Houses

### *Colonial Revival*

The term “Colonial Revival” refers to the rebirth of interest in the styles of early English and Dutch houses on the Atlantic Seaboard. The Georgian and Adams styles, often combined, form the backbone of the revival styles. Those built in the late nineteenth century were interpretations of the earlier colonial style, while those built from about 1915 to 1930 were more exact copies of the earlier adaptations. As their use continued into the mid-twentieth century, the style became more simplified.<sup>25</sup> Fifteen total resources express the Colonial Revival style in some way, though form or ornament may vary. The two-story dwelling constructed for Dr. Robert and Maude Haire ca. 1928 at **13008 10<sup>th</sup> Street** is an excellent example of the Colonial Revival style (*Figure 8*). One resource, **12902 Grandview Road**, expresses the Dutch Colonial subtype of the Colonial Revival Style (*Figure 9*). Character-defining features include the gambrel roof and symmetrical façade.



*Figure 8. 13008 10<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.*



*Figure 9 12902 Grandview Road, 2018.*



*Figure 10. 1101 Highgrove Road, 2018.*

### *Tudor Revival*

Six residences in the Survey Area exhibit the Tudor Revival style. The Tudor Revival became immensely popular after World War I when new technologies made it easier to apply a brick or stone veneer to frame construction and returning veterans sought to recreate the architecture they had seen overseas. A steeply pitched roof defines Tudor revival. Cross-gables, decorative half-timbering, arched doors and openings, and prominent chimneys are also common. The residence at **1101 Highgrove Road**, built ca. 1925 is an excellent example of a small Tudor Revival style residence. (*Figure 10*).

<sup>25</sup> McAlester, 234-36.

## Medditerranean Period Houses

### *Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival*

The Spanish Revival dwelling is most common in the southwest, however vernacular examples of the style are found throughout the United States in suburban developments. Spanish Revival dwellings are typically one-to-two stories with low-pitched or flat roofs and an asymmetrical façade. Additional characteristic features include stucco walls, red tile roofs, and arched doorways. The 1915 Panama-California Exposition popularized the syle, which experienced its peak constuction period from 1920 through 1930. The three examples were identified in the Survey Area date to the end of this period (*Figures 11 through 13*).



*Figure 11. 12813 Grandview Road, 2018.*



*Figure 12. 13019 Grandview Road, 2018.*



*Figure 13. 12914 10<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.*

## Modern Houses

### *Craftsman*

Craftsman houses date from circa 1905 through 1930. Most evolved from the early designs of Charles Sumner Greene and Henry Mather Greene who practiced architecture in California from 1893 to 1914. The Greene's designed both elaborate and simple bungalow houses that incorporated designs inspired from the English Arts and Crafts movement and from Asian architecture. Popularized by architectural magazines and builder pattern books, the one-story Craftsman house became popular nationwide during the early decades of the twentieth century as the most fashionable style for a smaller house. Identifying features include low-pitched roofs; wide eave overhangs, often with exposed roof rafters; decorative beams or braces under gables; and full- or partial-width porches supported by square piers.<sup>26</sup> Nineteen resources in the Survey Area are Craftsman dwellings. The low-pitched roof tapered square columns with piers and three-over-one double-hung windows with vertical muntins on the house at **903 Highgrove Road** clearly exemplify Craftsman design. (*Figure 14*). The house at **13014 10<sup>th</sup> Street** is an excellent example of a home that references the Craftsman style through its open eaves and overall massing (*Figure 15*).



Figure 14. 903 Highgrove Road, 2018.



Figure 15. 13014 10<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.

## RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURAL FORMS

Throughout the nation's history, its citizens erected modest dwellings constructed of locally available materials without stylistic embellishments. The early colonists brought with them the building traditions of Europe and, using locally available materials, adapted them to their new communities. Frame buildings constructed of hewn timbers and covered with thin wood siding dominated the early folk building in New England, where massed plans more than one room deep became the norm. In the early settlements of the Tidewater South, frame houses that were one room deep became common. As settlement expanded to the West, the Midland tradition of log buildings evolved from blending the two Eastern traditions.

---

<sup>26</sup> McAlester, 453-54.

Simplified vernacular interpretations of Victorian forms (Folk Victorian) were popular throughout the country in the late nineteenth century. These were closely related to and often based on National Folk forms, representing more elaborate, high-style designs applied to the same forms. The character of American folk housing changed significantly as the nation's railroad network expanded in the decades from 1850 to 1890. Builders of modest dwellings no longer relied on local materials. Instead, railcars could rapidly and cheaply move mass manufactured construction materials (pre-cut lumber, nails, window and door frames, and ornamental details) from distant plants. It was not long until vernacular houses of light balloon or braced framing replaced hewn log dwellings. Despite the change in building technique and materials, the older folk house shapes persisted. The resulting houses were simple dwellings defined by their form and massing but lacking identifiable stylistic characteristics. Even after communities became established, folk house designs remained popular as an affordable alternative to more ornate and complex architectural styles.<sup>27</sup> These traditional prototypes and new innovative plans comprise distinctive families of residential forms that dominated American folk building through the first half of the twentieth century.

Housing forms nationwide evolved once again following the lean building years of the Great Depression and World War II. While people flocked to metropolitan areas for employment opportunities, not all of them wanted the full urban living experience. Suburban development offered an appealing solution. Together, a general sense of prosperity, a housing shortage bolstered by high demand, and both government and private support for home ownership produced exponential growth of suburban areas. A surge in automobile ownership and the development of the federal highway system made an abundance of undeveloped land accessible for development.<sup>28</sup> As in previous decades, the modest size of the new housing forms and the use of mass-produced and/or prefabricated components made them affordable. Minimal Traditional dwellings evolved from earlier historical revival styles, while the Ranch house was a new form that reflected changes in attitude and aesthetics. Variations and iterations of these forms include Transitional Ranch, Raised Ranch, Split-Level, and Split-Foyer.

Aside from the resources that are clearly identifiable as one of the postwar forms, the resources not associated with a specific architectural style have simple forms and little or no ornament. Roof form and function are the primary characteristic used to identify these resources in the Survey Areas. These resources were widely distributed throughout the Survey Area.

---

<sup>27</sup> McAlester, 89-90.

<sup>28</sup> Emily Pettis et al., *A Model for Identifying and Evaluating the Historic Significance of Post-World War II Housing*, National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 723, (Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board, 2012), 50.

### **Gable-Front/Open Gable**

Gable-Front or Open Gable houses represent sixteen total resources in the Survey Area. The Gable-Front sub-type was popularized in two separate waves. The form initially grew from the Greek Revival movement of the 1830s-1850s and were reminiscent of temple forms. These houses were typically narrow, one- to two-story houses with steep roofs, well-suited for narrow city lots. Between 1910 and 1930, the Gable-Front form evolved to reflect influences of the popular Craftsman style. These houses



*Figure 16. 704 Highgrove Road, 2018.*

were one- to one-and-one-half-stories with shallow-pitched roofs, wide eaves and a wide front porch, as illustrated by the residence at **704 Highgrove Road** (*Figure 16*).

### **Gable Front and Wing/ Gabelled- Ell House**

The Gable Front and Wing or Gabelled-Ell house gained popularity in small towns and rural areas as settlers brought with them earlier stylistic influences such as Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, and Victorian. In this form, a secondary side-gable block placed perpendicular to the main gable-



*Figure 17. 12906 8<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.*

front gives the house its distinctive L-shaped massing. Architectural ornament is minimal. Both the one-story and two-story forms became common in the Midwest in the late nineteenth century. The residence at **12906 8<sup>th</sup> Street** is a good example of one of the nine Gable Front and Wing houses identified in the survey, with its steep cross-gable roof, narrow windows, and minimal ornament. (*Figure 17*).

## **Bungaloid**

The Bungaloid dwelling shares many features with the Craftsman Bungalow, however it lacks the formal characteristics associated with the style. They possess side-gable, cross-gable, or front-gable roofs and one to one-and-one half stories in height. Architectural ornament is minimal, however modestly references Craftsman elements. Bungaloid dwellings are common in the Survey Area and account for eighteen percent of the residential resources. The residences at **12904 8<sup>th</sup> Street** and **12916 10<sup>th</sup> Street** are good examples of the forty bungaloid houses identified in the survey, with their front-gable roofs, open eaves and porches, and minimal ornament (*Figures 18 and 19*).



Figure 18. 12904 8<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.



Figure 19. 12916 10<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.

## **Pyramidal/Hipped Roof**

While side-gabled roofs normally cover massed-plan folk houses of rectangular shape, those with more nearly square plans commonly have pyramidal roofs. The pyramidal roof form (an equilateral hipped roof) has a more complex roof framing system but requires fewer long-spanning rafters and is therefore less expensive to build. This Folk House form often appeared in small towns concurrent with the arrival of the railroad and became a favored replacement for the smaller Hall-and-Parlor house and the narrow two-story I-house during the early twentieth century.



Figure 20. 13124 4<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.

Like most folk house forms, the roof pitch and the size and location of the porches vary. The survey identified eighteen resources solely by roof type with a hipped roof and square or nearly-square massing.

### *Pyramid Square*

The Pyramid Square house at **13124 4<sup>th</sup> Street** is a compact one-story dwelling with low pitched roof and recessed partial-width porch and is representative of the one-story pyramidal roof houses within the Survey Area (*Figure 20*).

### *American Foursquare*

Seven Pyramidal/Hipped Roof resources in the Survey Area have the form and massing commonly referred to as the American Foursquare. Such resources are square in plan and have full-width porches with gabled roofs with eave returns or shallow hipped roofs with center dormers (*Figure 21, 13008 Grandview Road*). The square plan, massing, shallow hip roof with dormer, and overhanging eaves identify the dwelling at **13012 Grandview Road** as an American Foursquare house. (*Figure 22*).



*Figure 21. 13008 Grandview Road, 2018.*



*Figure 22. 13012 Grandview Road, 2018.*

### **I-House and Hall & Parlor**

The I-house and Hall & Parlor forms are late-nineteenth century residential forms found in rural areas throughout the country. These simple forms have a center entry hall flanked by single rooms on either side. The entire house is one-room deep and capped with a side-gable roof. While the Hall & Parlor house is a single story, the I-house is two stories, with the second-story floor plan identical to the first. These wood frame houses were often built in areas with access to mass-produced materials distributed by rail. They were the upgraded farmhouses and early houses constructed in new towns. The I-house often employed the balloon frame, a light-weight wood frame whose vertical members rose the entire



*Figure 23. 506 Pinkston Avenue, 2018.*

height of the house. The railroad increased the accessibility of the primary components of the balloon frame, primarily longer pieces of lumber and mass-produced metal nails. Alterations and additions were often constructed on the rear elevation. The Survey identified one example of the I-house form and seven examples of the Hall & Parlor family. The dwelling at **506 Pinkston Avenue** is a simple example of the I-house form, with its narrow, rectangular plan and center entrance. (*Figure 23*).



Figure 24. 12910 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.

The residence at **12910 5<sup>th</sup> Street** is an example of the Hall & Parlor form (*Figure 24*). Although alterations to the porch compromises its integrity, the dwelling otherwise retains good integrity.

### **Post-World War II Housing Types**

Following World War II, there was a distinct shift in American residential architecture. Modern styling and simplicity replaced the period architecture popular in the pre-war era. The 2012 NCHRP Report 723 outlines the national context for postwar housing and a process for identifying and evaluating the various property types that were constructed in great numbers during this time period.<sup>29</sup> The most common property types constructed between 1940 and 1975 in the Survey Area include Minimal Traditional and the Ranch. Some designs reflected regional preferences; others resulted from new technologies and/or energy conservation parameters. Many examples of these housing types are found in the Survey Area.

---

<sup>29</sup> Pettis, 1-2.

### *Minimal Traditional*

Minimal Traditional dwellings evolved in the 1940s from the Tudor Revival and Colonial Revival styles of the 1920s and 30s. The simplified version that evolved after the Depression typically retained the dominant side gable form and the dormered roof while compacting the massing, tightening the eaves, and removing most of the decorative ornament. The resources have symmetrical façades with small side additions, as can be seen at **901 Highgrove Road**. (Figure 25).



Figure 25. 901 Highgrove Road, 2018.

Minimal Traditional resources often exhibit overt Tudor Revival details, such as wood and stucco false half-timbering, that highlight this architectural influence. While compact in plan, these dwellings often incorporate an attached garage. The survey identified fourteen dwellings that express the Minimal Traditional form.

### *Ranch House*

The basic Ranch House is a low, wide one-story building with moderate to wide eaves. The low-pitched roof may be gabled or hipped; the façade may be symmetrical or asymmetrical, with the latter being far more common; and the plan may or may not include an integrated garage. The survey identified thirty-one examples of the Ranch form including one split-level Ranch. As illustrated by **13103 13th Street**, these simple dwellings have shallow roofs, asymmetrical facades; aluminum, vinyl, or asbestos shingle siding with brick or stone veneer, a variety of window types and sizes, and an attached garage. (Figure 26).



Figure 26. 13103 13<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.

## COMMERCIAL PROPERTY TYPES

Commercial architecture is distinguished first by building form and second by its architectural style. In *The Buildings of Main Street: A Guide to American Commercial Architecture*, Richard Longstreth identifies and categorizes buildings common to central and neighborhood commercial areas according to the composition of their façades. Despite intricate detailing and stylistic treatments or the lack thereof, the organization of the commercial façade can be reduced to simple patterns that reveal major divisions or zones. Due to their functional nature, many commercial buildings exhibit restrained architectural details. In addition to the storefront, cornice, and parapet, important character-defining elements of commercial buildings include corner posts, bulkheads, transoms, signs, and doors.

The Survey Area includes 54 commercial resources. These small buildings typically occupy narrow city lots at prominent intersections or along commercial corridors. Early- to mid-twentieth century one and two-story masonry buildings line Main Street while mid-to-late twentieth century commercial resources are unconcentrated in the northwest section of the Survey Area on 5<sup>th</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup> Streets and in the southwest corner near 4<sup>th</sup> Street and Pinkston Avenue. The commercial resources are concentrated on the east side of the railroad tracks, although there are a few such resources in the two blocks of Main Street west of the tracks. Most of the surveyed commercial buildings are simple, one or two-story forms. The traditional building material is brick, while mid-century commercial buildings were often constructed of concrete block. The Survey Area also includes free-standing mid-twentieth through early twenty-first century resources that break the traditional pattern of setbacks, size, massing, and materials.

The most conspicuous alterations to commercial buildings in the Survey Area reflect the modernization or infill of first-story display windows and entrances. Many of these alterations have left the original openings and spatial relationships of the storefront intact but obscured. Other changes are more easily reversible, such as the addition of awnings and applications of wood or metal sheathing over original openings or transoms. Utilizing Longstreth's basic commercial building property types, the historic commercial buildings identified by the survey include One- and Two-Part Commercial Blocks, as well as later Free-Standing Commercial Block forms.

### One-Part Commercial Block




Figure 27. 504 Main Street, 2018.

The One-Part Commercial Block building has only a single story and is a simple cube with a decorated façade. In several examples, the street frontage is narrow, and the façade comprises little more than plate glass windows and an entrance with a cornice or parapet spanning the width of the façade. The storefront of **504 Main Street** was altered, but the commercial function remains clear. (Figure 27).

### Two-Part Commercial Block

Slightly more complex than their one-story cousins, Two-Part Commercial Block buildings are typically two to four stories in height, although the Survey Area contains buildings no taller than two stories. They have a clear visual separation of use between the first-story customer service/retail space and the upper-story office, meeting room, or residential uses. Similar to One-Part Commercial Block buildings, the styling of the first story focuses on the storefront glazing and entrance(s). The design of the upper stories identifies the building’s architectural influences. Good examples of Two-Part Commercial Blocks in the Survey Area include the Guckert Building at **822-824 Main Street** and **702 Main Street**. (Figures 28 and 29). Alterations include the infill of the storefront openings and the replacement of the second story windows. Patterned brickwork and stone lintels contribute to the modest ornament on both buildings.



Figure 28. 822-824 Main Street, 2018.



Figure 29. 702 Main Street, 2018.

### **Free-Standing Commercial Block**

The years following World War II witnessed a general shift in American commercial architecture away from the densely packed commercial blocks that lined W Main Street. Adapting to the widespread ownership of the automobile, developers erected individual buildings on large lots of land, following the model begun by roadside development in the 1920s. In front of the building was a large area of open space. Initially this might be landscaped green space or filling station gas pumps, although it was soon put to use for parking. The Modern Movement also ushered in new ways of thinking about buildings. Rather than structures that enclosed space, architects began to think of commercial buildings as three-dimensional objects that defined space. Parking lots on one or all four sides of a building became dominant defining features of the commercial landscape, relegating the building to the role of back drop.<sup>30</sup>

**1002-06 Main Street** is an excellent example of a mid-twentieth century Free-Standing Commercial Block. (Figure 30).



Figure 30. 1002-06 Street, 2018.

### **OTHER PROPERTY TYPES**

#### **Industrial**

Four resources relating to industry or processing were recorded. These resources are located near the railroad tracks in the west end of the Survey Area and were designed to serve specific functions. Except for a ca. 1970 steel radio antenna tower at the west end of Main Street, they are one-story concrete block buildings with rectangular plans. The fenestration, door openings, and loading areas of each resource reflect the original use. Two resources, **12800 5<sup>th</sup> Street** and **12921 5<sup>th</sup> Street** retain good integrity (Figures 31 and 32).

---

<sup>30</sup> Richard Longstreth, *The Buildings of Main Street*, (Washington, DC: The Preservation Press, 1987), 126-131.



Figure 31. 12800 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.



Figure 32. 12921 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.

### Religious Buildings

Religious buildings are often more architecturally expressive than commercial buildings, although they are generally conservative in their selection of an architectural idiom. Classical motifs and traditional styling with historical antecedents are the most common stylistic treatments.

The survey included two churches. Constructed in 1908, the steepled-ell church at **12908 8<sup>th</sup> Street** has been significantly altered (*Figure 33*). Alterations include a modern rear addition with a gabled roof, application of non-historic cladding, and the removal or covering of the original block's fenestration. A ca. 1970 two-story Modern Movement church with a rectangular plan is located at **13011 Grandview Road**. The windows have been replaced and a full-height aluminum-framed system of colored glass and a pair of doors at the church's north entrance has been removed. This ca. 1970 resource is nearly fifty years of age (*Figure 34*).



Figure 33. 12908 8<sup>th</sup> Street, 2018.



Figure 34. 13011 Grandview Road, 2018.

**Education**

One school complex was identified in this survey. It occupies a large parcel near the eastern boundary of the Survey Area. The lot is bound by Main Street to the north, 12<sup>th</sup> Street to the west, Highgrove Road to the south, and 10<sup>th</sup> Street to the east. The complex includes a ca. 1922 two-story original block with brick walls, rectangular footprint, and stone beltcourses and sills (*Figure 35*). The school was expanded in 1949 and again in 1952. Both additional blocks feature brick walls and bands of metal windows characteristic of their mid-twentieth century construction (*Figures 36 and 37*).



*Figure 35. 1001 Main Street, 2018.*



*Figure 36. 1001 Main Street, 2018.*



*Figure 37. 1001 Main Street, 2018.*

One ca. 1960 modern movement library (1121 Main Street) and one ca. 1910 vernacular school building (710 Rhodes Avenue) were also identified. The ca. 1910 building now functions as a single-family dwelling and has been altered, resulting in poor integrity.

### **Landscape Properties**

#### *Plaza*

One public plaza was identified. This space is located at the northeast corner of Main and 8<sup>th</sup> Street (*Figure 38*). A water feature is surrounded by red and buff pavers. Landscaping beds and public benches are positioned throughout the plaza. Constructed in 2013, this resource has not yet attained fifty years of age.



*Figure 38. 12908 8th Street, 2018.*

#### *Parking Lots*

Nine parking lots were identified. The lots are either gravel or paved. They are located adjacent to commercial and industrial resources within the Survey Area. These lots primarily date to the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.



*Figure 39. 12912 8th Street, 2018.c*

### **Vacant Lots**



*Figure 40. 803 Highgrove Road, 2018.*

A total of nineteen vacant lots was identified. These lots are primarily located between the two sets of Kansas City Southern Railroad tracks at the west end of the Survey Area. These lots are characterized by open grassy areas. Three lots have become vacant since the 2003 survey. These lots are located at 13002 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 13019 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and 803 Highgrove Road (*Figure 40*)

## DATES OF CONSTRUCTION

Using the extensive information compiled by the previous survey, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, and historic aerial imagery the consultants analyzed estimated dates of construction for the surveyed buildings. Dates of building additions, alterations, outbuildings, and vacant lots were not considered in the analysis. Figure 41 presents the distribution of buildings by dates of construction.

**Figure 41: ESTIMATED DATES OF CONSTRUCTION**

ERA	TOTAL	PERCENT
PRE-1900	1	<1
EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY (1900 – 1918)	121	42
POST WWI (1919-1929)	35	12
WAR YEARS AND DEPRESSION (1930 – 1945)	39	14
POST WWII (1946-1959)	42	15
MODERN ERA (1960-PRESENT)	49	17
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>100</b>

\*Includes resources less than fifty years of age.

The construction dates for secondary structures, such as garages and sheds, were estimated when possible.

## ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY

All properties eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places must retain sufficient architectural integrity to convey the period of time for which they are significant. As described above in the Methodology, each building received an integrity rating of Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor. Figures 42 through 43 illustrate the results of the Integrity Analysis.

**Figure 42: ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY<sup>31</sup>**

INTEGRITY	TOTAL	PERCENT
EXCELLENT	36	12
GOOD	60	20
FAIR	68	22
POOR	111	36
<FIFTY YEARS OF AGE	31	10
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>100</b>

---


<sup>31</sup> Figure 42 represents integrity values for primary resources only. Secondary structure integrity values are noted in Figure 43.

Integrity ratings represent a sliding scale of alterations to the historic fabric and the features of individual buildings. Both the quantity of changes and the reversibility of changes affected the ranking each building received. Buildings rated “Excellent” and some rated “Good” may be individually eligible for register listing if they also have significant associations that meet one or more of the National Register Criteria. Buildings that received an integrity rating of “Good” and some rated as “Fair” could be listed as contributing resources to a historic district. While the application of non-historic siding, specifically vinyl siding, compromises the integrity of a resource because it changes the relationship between siding trim and often obscures subtle historic ornament, if that resource continues to communicate its historic function and period of construction through its form, porch, and windows, the resource is rated as “Fair.” An integrity rating of “Poor” and in some cases “Fair” reflects the presence of numerous alterations that significantly diminish architectural integrity, regardless of historical significance. It is possible that many of the surveyed buildings rated “Fair” may retain some or all of their original historic fabric behind later alterations, such as non-historic siding, and if these changes were reversed they may improve their integrity ranking and register eligibility.

The Survey Area contains thirty-six primary resources identified as “Excellent” and sixty identified as “Good.” Thus, these resources could be contributing to potential historic districts. Of these primary resources, twenty-three are currently listed as part of the Grandview Residential Historic District. Over one-half of the total primary resources, fifty-eight percent, received integrity ratings of “fair” or “poor.” Of these 179 resources, sixty-eight received a “fair” rating while 111 were considered to have poor integrity. It is interesting to note that one resource, 714 Main Street, has improved in integrity since the 2003 survey. This resource is located within the Downtown Main Street Conservation District.

FIGURE 43 – ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY

“Town of Grand View”  
Survey Area



## COMPARISON OF INTEGRITY DATA

Comparisons between the 2003 and recent survey data revealed much of the Survey Area has not experienced a significant change in integrity since the previous survey. Approximately fifty-eight percent of primary resources experienced no change in integrity. Roughly forty percent of primary resources exhibit a reduction in integrity between survey periods. The replacement of windows and cladding were widespread and the most commonly observed alterations which contributed to these changes in integrity. One resource exhibited improved integrity. Alterations to the storefront of 714 Main removed previous non-historic alterations, restoring the historic storefront openings (*Figure 44*). Five resources within the Survey Area were constructed after the 2003 survey period.



*Figure 44. 714 Main Street, 2018.*

### FIGURE 45 – CHANGES IN ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY

INTEGRITY STATUS	TOTAL	PERCENT
NO CHANGE	178	58
CHANGE- LESSENERED	122	40
CHANGE- IMPROVED	1	<1
POST-2003 CONSTRUCTION	5	2
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>100</b>

# **SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS**

As documented in the Historic Context and in the Survey Findings, the resources in the “Town of Grandview” Historic Resources Re-Survey represent the development of the city beginning in the early 1900s. The built environment testifies to the rapid residential and commercial development that occurred at the beginning of the twentieth century, when the entire city of Grandview was expanding, as well as later post-World War II suburban expansion to the north and east. While this development was substantially complete by the mid-twentieth century, increased commercial development near Main Street has begun to encroach upon the historic commercial core. Similarly, residential development within the Survey Area has resulted in the demolition, replacement, or modification of historic residential resources. Rosin Preservation offers the following recommendations for future preservation action.

## **NATIONAL REGISTER LISTED AND INDIVIDUALLY ELIGIBLE RESOURCES**

One district in the survey area was listed in the National Register of Historic Places, based on the recommendations from the 2003 survey. The Grandview Residential Historic District was listed on November 5, 20015 under Criterion C and Criterion A for the areas of Architecture and Community Planning and Development, respectively. Rosin Preservation identified one resource potentially eligible for addition to the existing district and one resource potentially eligible for individual listing in the National Register.

**13012 Grandview Road:** This ca. 1905 American Foursquare house is potentially eligible for addition to the existing Grandview Residential Historic District. The dwelling’s construction date falls within the district’s Period of Significance and it is associated with the early twentieth century residential development of Grandview. The house at 13012 Grandview Road demonstrates the same architectural style and development patterns exhibited by the district resources. It retains good integrity and is continuous to the north edge of existing district boundary on Grandview Road. It would require a boundary expansion to include this resource in the existing historic district. There have not been any substantial changes to listed resources that would change their status and there is no proposed change to the period of significance or areas of significance identified in the nomination.

**1001 Main Street:** This complex of connected school buildings consists of three significant buildings that are attached. The original 1922 block is two stories tall, stands at the southwest corner of the lot and has load-bearing brick walls and a rectangular footprint. The 1946 block forms an irregular footprint and features intersecting one- and two-story wings, as well as a gymnasium wing with a barrel-shaped roof. The 1952 block is a one-story elementary school that stands at the southeast corner of the school property lot. The school complex is potentially eligible

for individual listing under Criterion A for the area of Education. If this nomination is pursued, an assessment of interior integrity along with an investigation into its history within the context of education in Grandview would be necessary to determine whether it is feasible to pursue a National Register nomination.

## **NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

A historic district is a grouping of resources that shares significant associations of history or architecture. These resources must be located in a concentrated geographical area to create a unified entity that is clearly distinct from the resources outside the district boundaries. Resources within a historic district can include individually distinctive resources (resources that might also qualify for individual register listing) as well as resources that lack the qualities of design or association to merit individual listing. District boundaries can encompass resources that lack integrity or association with the historic context and are considered “non-contributing,” although resources of this type must be a minority within the district. Two potential historic districts were identified.

### **Potential North Historic District**

This potential historic district was identified in the northeast section of the Survey Area (*Figure 46*). It consists of residential resources constructed during the early-to-mid-twentieth century. It is irregularly bound by Goode Avenue to the south and 8<sup>th</sup> Street to the west. The potential period of significance would be 1900-1955, capturing the estimated resource construction dates. Alterations to the proposed period of significance may be made as the area is further investigated. The potential areas of significance would be Architecture and Community Planning and Development in association with the expansion of Grandview and increased suburban development during the twentieth century. Observations made of residential resources appearing to retain good integrity during the field survey indicate additional resources may lie to the north and east of the Survey Area. Rosin Preservation recommends additional survey of the surrounding area north of the commercial center to identify additional resources and further refine the potential boundaries of the district to determine the feasibility of a National Register District.

### **Potential East Historic District**

This potential historic district was identified in the southeast portion of the Survey Area (*Figure 46*). It consists of residential resources constructed during the early-to-mid-twentieth century. It is irregularly bound by Main Street to the north and 12<sup>th</sup> Street to the west. The potential period of significance would be 1905-1955 and the potential areas of significance would be Architecture and Community Planning and Development in association with increased suburban development and the expansion of Grandview’s boundaries during the twentieth century. The proposed period of significance captures the estimated resource construction dates and may change upon further investigation of the area. Several resources within the current Survey Area exhibit poor integrity,

however observations made during the field survey indicate additional resources possessing good integrity may lie to the east of the Survey Area, likely terminating at the west side of 15<sup>th</sup> Street. Residential resources located to the south may also merit inclusion in the potential historic district, however this cannot be determined without further investigation. Rosin Preservation recommends a broader survey of this area to identify additional resources and further refine the potential boundaries of the district to determine the feasibility of a National Register District.


Based on the date of construction, architectural integrity, and historical associations, the survey data identified a total of seventy primary resources that appear eligible for listing in the National Register, 213 primary resources that do not appear to be register-eligible, and twenty-three that are register-listed.<sup>32</sup> With the possible exception of 1001 Main Street, the resources lack the distinction necessary for individual listing. However, there are concentrations of resources with excellent or good integrity that could form National Register Historic Districts. Resources with fair or poor integrity are scattered throughout the survey areas.

Figure 46 identifies resources by their potential for register listing.

---

<sup>32</sup> Of the seventy resources identified as eligible for listing, one is potentially eligible for individual listing while forty-five would be considered contributing to a potential historic district should one be formed. The remaining twenty-four primary resources are considered non-contributing due to age or integrity.

**FIGURE 46 – NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY**



## **MULTIPLE PROPERTY SUBMISSIONS**

Multiple Property Submissions (MPS) allow for the nomination of significant properties which, while not contiguous, are thematically related.<sup>33</sup> It may be used to nominate multiple properties at once, as well as to establish registration requirements for properties that may be nominated at a later date. Each multiple property submission requires a Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF), which establishes the basis for the identification, evaluation, and nomination of future properties. This document communicates characteristics shared by a group of properties and provides comparisons to others with similar contexts and physical characteristics. Individual properties nominated within the grouping require individual Registration Forms which provide information about the specific property. The individual Registration Forms join the MPDF to create an MPS. The 2003 survey identified four potential National Register Multiple Property Submissions:<sup>34</sup>

### **Buildings Associated with Harry S. Truman**

This potential MPS identified four properties which share historic contexts relating to Harry S. Truman and the time he and his family spent in the City of Grandview. The four identified buildings include the Dyer & Long Grocery (719-23 Main Street), which housed Grandview Masonic Lodge 618, as well as three residences occupied by members of the Truman family (1003 and 602 Highgrove Road; 13106<sup>th</sup> 13th Street).<sup>35</sup>

Although it is located within Grandview's Main Street Conservation District, the Dyer & Long Building possesses poor integrity due to alterations to the storefront. It has been determined not eligible for listing. Since 2003, 1003 Highgrove Road was listed as a contributing resource in the Grandview Residential Historic District (2005). It maintains excellent integrity. The house at 13106 13<sup>th</sup> Street retains good integrity and would be a contributing property within the potential East Historic District discussed in the previous section. The final resource, 602 Highgrove Road, retains good integrity however was determined not eligible due to a lack of concentrated resources forming a district. None of the resources included in 2003 proposed MPS were determined to be individually eligible during the 2018 survey.

To pursue this MPS, the development of historic contexts and criteria for the evaluation and identification of resources through the creation of an MPDF would be required.

---

<sup>33</sup> National Park Service. *National Register Bulletin: How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

<sup>34</sup> Davis and Schwenk, 100-102.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, 101.

### **Pyramidal Folk Houses**

Eighteen resources were identified in association with this potential MPS. All remain extant with varying degrees of integrity. One resource (13007 8<sup>th</sup> Street) retains excellent integrity and four possess good integrity. The remaining resources exhibit fair or poor integrity. Consequently, less than half of the identified eighteen resources currently possess sufficient integrity for listing. Two Pyramidal Folk House resources are located within the potential North Historic District identified by this survey. The house at 12903 8<sup>th</sup> Street would contribute to this potential district while 12905 8<sup>th</sup> Street would not. No Pyramidal Folk House resources identified in this survey were determined to be individually eligible for listing.

To pursue this MPS, the development of evaluation and identification criteria in addition to historic contexts through the creation of an MPDF would be required.

### **Spanish Eclectic Style Houses**

This proposed MPS identified three resources in Grandview which demonstrate the Spanish Eclectic Style. The houses at 13019 Grandview Road, 12813 Grandview Road, and 12914 10<sup>th</sup> Street were built ca. 1930 and are a rare style in the city. Two resources, 12813 and 13019 Grandview Road retain excellent integrity while 12914 10<sup>th</sup> Street possesses fair integrity. The house at 13019 Grandview Road is currently listed as a contributing resource in the Grandview Residential Historic District (2005) and 12813 Grandview Road is within the potential North Historic District discussed above. While these resources retain excellent integrity, neither was determined to be individually eligible during this survey because not enough is known about its significance in comparison to other Spanish Eclectic style houses in the city. The house at 12914 10<sup>th</sup> Street is also located within the potential North Historic District and would be contributing to the district but is not individually eligible.

If the City decides to pursue this MPS, a survey of Grandview as a whole would be required to identify additional examples of the style, develop historic contexts, and to establish evaluation criteria.

### **Buildings Constructed by the Powell Brothers**

The Powell Brothers MPS proposed in 2003 includes resources constructed by brothers George, Vernon, and Rodney Powell during the early-twentieth century in Grandview.<sup>36</sup> Eighteen primary resources were identified in 2003, fourteen of which were determined to retain sufficient integrity for listing.<sup>37</sup> All are extant. Thirteen resources are single-family dwellings while one resource (12915 7<sup>th</sup> Street) is a commercial building. The commercial building now possesses poor integrity and has been determined ineligible for listing. Eight of the remaining resources retain excellent

---

<sup>36</sup> Davis and Schwenk, 102.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

integrity while one (12914 10<sup>th</sup> Street) retains good integrity. Four resources possess fair integrity. Nine resources are already listed as contributing resources within the Grandview Residential Historic District. The houses at 12823 8<sup>th</sup> Street and 12914 10<sup>th</sup> Street are located within the potential North Historic District and would be contributing should this district be formed. None of the fourteen resources were determined to be individually eligible during this survey.

The Grandview Residential Historic District nomination clearly highlights the significance of the Powell Brothers in Grandview's early twentieth century residential development. Given that a significant portion of intact resources identified in association with this proposed MPS have been previously listed and that few additional resources have currently been identified as eligible for listing, the pursuit of the Powell Brothers MPS proposed in 2003 is not recommended at this time. Should the City ultimately choose to pursue this MPS, a city-wide survey to identify other Powell Brothers properties would be necessary to facilitate the development of evaluation criteria. In addition, historic contexts, outlined through the creation of an MPDF, would be required.

The scope of this survey did not include the development of historic contexts. Consequently, additional potential Multiple Property Submissions were not identified within the Survey Area. It is possible that further survey of the surrounding area may result in the identification of one or more future MPS's, however that is beyond the scope of the current project.

## CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

The previous survey identified three potential Conservation Districts within the Survey Area.: The Railroad-Related Conservation District, “Old Town” Conservation District, and the Main Street Conservation District.<sup>38</sup> Of these, only the Main Street Conservation District has been created. The Main Street Conservation District was approved by the Grandview Board of Alderman on November 25, 2008.<sup>39</sup> It extends east-west along Main Street from 5<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> Street and north-south between Goode and Rhodes avenues (*Figure 47*). This Conservation District includes resources related to Grandview’s commercial development spanning from its original settlement through the post-World War II period.

### **Railroad-Related Conservation District**

This Conservation District proposed by the 2003 survey encompasses a large area between both sets of railroad tracks roughly bound by Jones Avenue to the north and Highgrove Road to the south (*Figure 48*). Resources within this proposed district include residential and commercial properties associated with railroad development in Grandview. After examining resources within the boundaries proposed in 2003, it is recommended that the proposed Conservation District boundaries be altered to include only those resources bound by both sets of railroad tracks to the east and west, Jones Avenue to the north, and Goode Avenue to the south (*Figure 47, #1*). This boundary captures those historic resources concentrated in the north end of the district proposed in 2003 that continue to convey their associations with the railroad in Grandview. Resources bound by 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Rhodes Avenue, Goode Avenue, and the east set of railroad tracks, south of the new proposed boundary, are included in the existing Main Street Conservation District. Resources at the south boundary edge are now recommended for inclusion in the Old Town Conservation District.

Resources in this area are endangered by demolition, alteration, and modern development. Common alterations include the replacement of windows or cladding and porch alterations. The variety of resources within this proposed Conservation District presents a challenge to the development of design guidelines, however it is recommended that the Conservation District be pursued. These resources continue to communicate their association with railroad development and its impact on the city of Grandview. Additionally, the Railroad-Related Conservation District would provide a buffer to the potential North Historic District (*Figure 47, #1*).

The “Old Town” Conservation District proposed in 2003 encompasses resources associated Grandview’s early residential development. The current recommended boundaries are slightly different from the 2003 recommendation to include resources located between the railroad tracks,


---

<sup>38</sup> Davis and Schwenk, 104-105

<sup>39</sup> City of Grandview Community Development Department. “Grandview Main Street Conservation District.” City of Grandview. December 2016.

bound approximately by Rhodes Avenue to the north and 133<sup>rd</sup> Street to the south, and between the east tracks and the east side of 8<sup>th</sup> Street, roughly bound by Main Street and Highgrove Road (*Figure 47, #2*). Ninety-five primary resources are located within this proposed Conservation District. Six resources retain excellent integrity, fifteen good, twenty-nine fair, and thirty-five poor. The remaining ten resources are less than fifty years of age. Approximately 80 percent of primary resources exhibit alterations of some kind. Porch enclosures, additions, and the replacement of historic windows or cladding are the most common form of alteration. Although most resources exhibit alterations, the area retains a distinctive character associated with residential development in early Grandview. Modern development, demolition, and alterations endanger the retention of this character. The “Old Town” Conservation District represents the largest concentration of early-twentieth century residential resources identified during the current survey. To better preserve these resources, it is recommended that a Conservation District encompassing this area be created.


FIGURE 47 – POTENTIAL AND EXISTING CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOUNDARIES



Potential Conservation Districts  
 1. Railroad-Related Conservation District  
 2. "Old Town" Conservation District

Existing Conservation District  
 3. Main Street Conservation District (2008)

FIGURE 48 – POTENTIAL CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOUNDARIES PROPOSED IN 2003. Source: Davis and Schwenk, 2003.



# **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- City of Grandview Community Development Department. "Grandview Main Street Conservation District." City of Grandview. December 2016.  
<http://www.grandview.org/home/showdocument?id=6554>. Accessed August 10, 2018.
- Google Earth, 1990-2018.
- Longstreth, Richard. *The Buildings of Main Street*. Washington, DC: The Preservation Press, 1987.
- McAlester, Virginia. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1988 [First Edition].
- McAlester, Virginia. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 2014 [Second Edition].
- National Park Service. *National Register Bulletin: How to Complete the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.
- NETRonline "Grandview, 1948-2014." [www.historicaerials.com](http://www.historicaerials.com)
- Pettis, Emily, et al. *A Model for Identifying and Evaluating the Historic Significance of Post-World War II Housing*. National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 723. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board, 2012.
- Poppeliers, John C. and S. Allen Chambers, Jr. *What Style Is This? A Guide to American Architecture*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2003.
- "Property Report for 13128 5th St, Grandview, MO, 64030." Jackson County, MO GIS. Accessed April 24, 2018.
- Sanborn Map Company. Grandview, Jackson County, Missouri, November 1916. New York: The Sanborn Map Company, 1916. "Sanborn Maps, 1867-1970"  
<http://sanborn.umi.com.kclibrary.idm.oclc.org/mo/4681/dateid-000001.htm?CCSI=121n>. Accessed May 9, 2018.
- Schwenk, Sally, and Kerry Davis. *Survey No. JA-AS-042-001*. Historic Preservation Services, LLC. 2003. Prepared for the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.
- Schwenk, Sally F. "Grandview Residential Historic District." National Register of Historic Places Inventory/Nomination Form. Historic Preservation Services, LLC., Kansas City, November 5, 2005.

Schwenk, Sally, and Kerry Davis. "The Town of Grand View." Historic Preservation Services, LLC. 2003.

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places, *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Washington, DC: National Register Publications, 1998.