

# KAREN BODE BAXTER

*Private Consultant*

125 West First Street  
Pella, Iowa 50219  
Ph: 515-628-4659

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Waterloo Historic Preservation Commission, Community Development Board, Pertinent City Staff  
SUBJ: Draft Narrative Report to Accompany the Update of Architectural Survey of Historic Structures  
DATE: May 26, 1995

Attached is a rough draft of the Final Report narrative that will accompany the updated architectural survey of historic structures in Waterloo. Although the most important component of this project is the database of the individual evaluations of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places, this narrative is vital to you as a tool designed to help summarize the findings of this survey. Given the rapidly approaching fiscal year deadline, I am trying to crosscheck database entries and prepare all of the final documents for this project.

Please note that this is a very rough draft, but I wanted you to have time to make comments, corrections and requests for further explanation, before I go much further. As you will immediately note the last two sections (the development of additional historic contexts and the recommendations for historic preservation planning) have not been written, and for that I apologize, but they will be completed this weekend and sent to you by Tuesday, May 30th. Also, the tables, maps, and bibliography are not included in this draft, but I am especially concerned that you let me know if there are additional tables or maps you would like, other than those listed in the table of contents.

This version is not paged, a feature my word processing program does only upon completion of the document. Also, page breaks have not been forced since they will alter with revisions of the text. Other than that, please feel free to note any typographical, grammatical, or spelling problems that I may have overlooked. I am open to suggestions about my writing style since the primary purpose is to make this useful for you and I am sure that you will find areas where the meaning is perfectly clear to me, but it needs clarification or further explanation. I will be glad to pick up all copies, with you attached notes and corrections, when we review the material at the June 15 Historic Preservation Commission meeting and incorporate these stylistic comments into the final document.

Obviously your primary concern is the content of the document, not those mundane stylistic or format concerns and I am especially eager to hear whether or not the document is covering the material and issues as you expected, if it needs expansion, or if I have omitted issues that you want addressed. If you have substantive comments that you would like me to address, I would appreciate hearing from you directly, before the June 15 meeting so that I will have time to incorporate your comments. Please call me as soon as you have read through the document to let me know what substantive changes you want, if any.

Feel free to call me at the telephone number on this stationary's header and, if I am unavailable, leave a message where I can reach you (and when would be the best time to return the call). This number serves both my home and office and you are welcome to call anytime between 8 a.m. and 10 p.m., any day of the week, even on this holiday weekend. If you prefer long-distance charges be at my expense, just let me know and I will be glad to call you back.

In case you have not heard, this project more than doubled its scope since twice as many individually eligible structures were identified than had been projected. This, of course, is doubling the photography, evaluations, database work, and printed documents. This project has taken considerably longer than originally envisioned because of this increase and the loss of all of the database entries when the computer equipment failed (causing me to unknowingly corrupted all copies of the database so that I simply had to start over). Just to add more stress to my life, I am in the process of moving my family to St. Louis, a step that was not even under consideration when this project began. Even so, I am determined to fulfill the contract provisions by the end of the fiscal year and I have even delayed my move to complete this project (although that does not make my husband too happy as he stares at the walls of his St. Louis hotel room).

I am looking forward to the discussion at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting and the formal presentation of the final report before the Community Development Board. Thanks for your dedication and prompt critique of this draft report.



## *Table of Contents*

- I.     **Evolution of Historic Preservation during the Past Decade**
  - A.     Changes in Attitudes across the Nation
  - B.     Impact of Waterloo's Preservation Activity
- II.    **Current Status of Historic Preservation in Waterloo**
  - A.     Changes in Public Attitudes
  - B.     Confusion about Evaluation Procedures
- III.   **Current Survey Project**
  - A.     Purpose of the Current Survey Project
  - B.     Components of the Project
    - 1.     *On-site Evaluations and Photography*
    - 2.     *Archival Research*
    - 3.     *Property Data Collection*
    - 4.     *Database Development and Data Entry*
    - 5.     *Evaluation of Individual Eligibility and Architectural Trends*
    - 6.     *Final Documents*
- IV.    **Evaluation of Project Findings**
  - A.     Statistical Evaluation of Eligible Structures
  - B.     Property Types and Styles
    - 1.     *Property Types as Defined by Use*
    - 2.     *Property Types Identified by Basic Plans*
    - 3.     *Nineteenth Century Designs*
    - 4.     *Twentieth Century Styles*
  - C.     Impact of Renovations and Development Pressures upon Historic Structures
  - D.     Integrity Requirements for Individual and District Eligibility
  - E.     Potential for Historic Districts

- V. Historic Contexts for Architectural Developments, 1935-1950**
  - A. The Quest for the Modern Home**
  - B. Impact of Modern Technology on House Design and Suburban Development**
- VI. Recommendations for Historic Preservation Planning**
  - A. Revise Local Ordinances to Update Terminology and Provide Better Protection**
  - B. Target Neighborhoods to Encourage Historic Rehabilitations**
  - C. Incorporate Historic Preservation into City Planning Efforts**
  - D. Educate Landlords and Homeowners on Rehabilitation Practices and Financial Benefits**

## **Bibliography**

### **Maps**

1. Map of Potential District Boundary Change in Highland Neighborhood
2. Map of Potential Boundaries for the Walnut Street District
3. Map of the Study Area Boundaries for the West Side District
4. Map Enumerating Eligible Structures by Major Quadrants

### **Tables**

1. List of all Eligible Structures by Street Address
2. List of all Structures with Eligibility Status by Potential Districts
3. List of all Eligible Structures by Style
4. List of all Eligible Structures by Date of Construction
5. List of all Structures Evaluated as Eligible in 1985 with Current Eligibility Status
6. Lists of Significant Property Types

## **I. Evolution of Historic Preservation during the Past Decade**

### **A. Changes in Attitudes across the Nation**

No matter how you look at it, the historic preservation movement changed immensely during the last decade. At both the state and national level, attitudes evolved to recognize the importance of both the outstanding structures as well as the commonplace designs on the development of the visual landscape that makes each community unique. With Iowa's proud legacy of nineteenth century architecture, the architecture of the twentieth century has often been overlooked, but in recent years more efforts have been made to document the styles and traditions that characterized the first half of the twentieth century. Where the National Register of Historic Places used to be viewed as a roster of a few notable structures, now it is viewed as an important preservation planning tool designed to help local city officials and preservationists identify historic resources so that community planning can incorporate the preservation of these resources into the future development of the community.

Across the nation and across Iowa, community after community has begun to recognize both the tangible economic benefits and the less tangible emotional benefits of historic preservation. Heritage tourism is becoming an important economic development tool in towns across Iowa. Historic preservation has proven its value as an important component in the economic revitalization and long-term management of the central business districts of communities across the nation, a tenant proven successful by Iowa's own Main Street program which is recognized as one of the most successful economic development programs in Iowa. In many towns, neighborhoods ranging from the local "snob hill" to the row of working class cottages are being revitalized by homeowners and civic leaders who recognize the importance of historic preservation in preserving neighborhood pride, decreasing crime, and increasing property values.

Historic preservation is no longer viewed as the efforts of a few "hysterians;" no longer do people expect that historic structures are only found in other places, such as Charleston, Williamsburg, or San Francisco; no longer is progress equated with demolition and new construction. It is no longer rare to find local citizens who are proud of historic structures in their own town, who oppose the demolition of local landmarks as a waste of resources and loss for future generations, who are proud to live in older homes, or who recognize the value of maintaining historic neighborhoods. School children are learning about their own local history by visiting historic structures and other projects organized by local preservationists.

### **B. Impact of Waterloo's Preservation Activity**

These changes to the historic preservation movement are evident in developments in Waterloo during the past decade as well. In the last ten years, Waterloo's historic preservation efforts evolved from neighborhood and individual efforts to list properties on the National Register of Historic Places to utilizing historic preservation in community planning and economic development efforts. It was only ten years ago that the city contracted with a preservation professional, Barbara Long, to conduct the first city-wide survey of historic resources, the foundation for much of Waterloo's future preservation planning activity. In January 1986, the city council established the Historic Preservation Commission and adopted protective ordinances for historic structures. Today, Waterloo's citizens have begun recognizing the important role that historic preservation plays in neighborhood revitalization and community leaders have focused a massive effort on the potential economic benefit of heritage tourism by organizing Silos and Smokestacks to actively promote Waterloo's unique legacy in the agricultural development of Iowa.

The survey conducted by Barbara Long from 1984 through 1986 not only documented historically significant properties, it also provided individual evaluations about the architectural integrity of the 7800 extant structures built in Waterloo prior to 1935, photographed each structure, and assessed the eligibility of each structure for listing on the National Register of



Historic Places. Entitled "Waterloo, Factory City of Iowa; Survey of Architecture and History," the written report that accompanied this study became an invaluable overview of the historical development of Waterloo through the 1930s and has been used extensively by city staff, historic preservationists, homeowners, students, and other patrons at the public library.

While a few notable buildings had already been listed individually on the National Register of Historic Places, in September 1984, Waterloo received the announcement that years of efforts by Highland homeowners and other preservationists had paid off with the listing of Waterloo's first historic district, the city's oldest planned suburban development, Highland. Based upon the historic contexts and property types that Long developed in the 1986 narrative report that accompanied the completed survey documents, the State Historical Society of Iowa prepared the National Register Multiple Property Listing that was successfully filed in 1988 along with the individual nominations of four additional properties (A complete list of Waterloo properties listed on the National Register is included as Appendix \*). In 1992, PHR Associates (Rebecca Conard and Jan Nash) completed an intensive survey and evaluation of the proposed Walnut Street Historic District, one of the areas Long recommended for careful evaluation for possible historic district listing.

Since the preservation ordinance required design review and approval before a building permit or demolition permit could be issued on "A" rated structures (those evaluated as individually eligible or already listed on the National Register), city staff developed a simple database listing the structures by address and eligibility status. This has become an invaluable tool for quickly determining if the permit involved action on an historic property. In addition, the Community Development Board utilized this database to speed their compliance with federally mandated impact assessments for the federal funds they disburse on housing rehabilitation projects. Without this database, city officials would be dependent on the cumbersome paper files of all 7800 site forms prepared as part of Long's survey.

During the past decade, historic preservation efforts began having an visible impact on the neighborhood revitalization efforts in Highland, Walnut Street, and other small enclaves throughout the town. Ten years ago, many property owners resented the restrictions placed upon their efforts to renovate historic buildings, but attitudes have changed considerably and not only do Highland Historic District homeowners see the tangible benefits in protecting their property values and neighborhood integrity, but homeowners encountered during this current survey project were often enthusiastic about the potential of having their individual property or their neighborhood recognized as historically significant because they had seen the positive impact it has had on the Highland neighborhood.

## **II. Current Status of Historic Preservation in Waterloo**

### **A. Changes in Public Attitudes**

During the on-site survey phase of this current project, individual property owners throughout the city pointed with pride to their personal attempts to preserve historic properties, their own homes. There were several examples of homeowners and neighborhoods that were specifically utilizing historic preservation practices in renovating their homes. For example, property owners on Iowa Street and Courtland, east of downtown were utilizing multicolored paint schemes, removing aluminum siding and converting homes back to single family residences while maintaining the historic appearance of the houses. In the Walnut Street neighborhood, a bed and breakfast inn opened in a restored Queen Anne home and the neighborhood association is now seriously considering the nomination of their area to the National Register of Historic Places. In the area southwest of the Grout Museum, homeowners were seeking advice on the proper procedures to use in preserving their older homes while others had removed aluminum siding or painted their homes with multiple colors to enhance the architectural details. On West Fourth, Graceline, Campbell, and other streets around Prospect Hills and Kingbird Hill, several homeowners were enthusiastic about getting historic district designation in the neighborhood, seeing it as a means of protecting property values and neighborhood integrity. Tenants renting older homes were equally proud of the architectural features of their

residences and expressed the desire to encourage landlords to preserve these details. Throughout the community, homeowners asked for information about preservation technologies that they could apply to their own renovation efforts. Although city officials often get a slanted view of the public's attitudes since they are overwhelmed by those who have complaints and seldom hear from those who are satisfied with public policy, but it is evident that historic preservation is gaining the respect and support of a diversified segment of the community.

#### **B. Confusion about Evaluation Procedures**

Unfortunately, over the years city officials using their database of the National Register eligibility status have found some quirks with the system. Some were inherent in the evolutionary nature of the surveys and evaluation procedures for historic structures. Some of these problems resulted from the completion of more than one Iowa Site Inventory form on a single property as part of several projects during the past decade. Additional surveys and evaluations were not entered into the database either for the Highland Historic District or for the PHR Associates evaluation of the potential Walnut Street district. Other problems became evident due to the multiple street addresses assigned to a single structure or site, usually apartment buildings or commercial sites. Also, the portion of the database most often referenced by city officials contained the properties that were evaluated as "A" (Key structures or individually eligible) or "B" (Contributing structures), but it was easy to forget that just because the structure was not listed as "A" or "B" did not automatically mean that it had been surveyed and evaluated as "C" (Not eligible).

The evaluations on the site forms prepared as part of the process for the nomination of the Highland Historic District were not included in the database and there apparently is not a complete list of these evaluations on file with the city (although a copy of the site forms was duplicated from Sue Pearson's private files for this current project and will be turned over to the city with other support materials used in this project). Long was well aware of the pending nomination of the Highland Historic District when she was conducting her survey of that area and knew that her preliminary evaluations would be superseded by the more thorough documentation completed as part of the National Register process. Sue Pearson, a member of the local Historic Preservation Commission but not a "certified" preservation professional at that time, provided the historical information and helped compile the individual Highland site forms while the actual determinations of eligibility were made by qualified professionals at the State Historical Society of Iowa. Some local officials mistakenly believed that Pearson had not only prepared the final version of the individual site forms but had also completed the determinations of eligibility. Since they knew the determinations of eligibility had to be made by a "certified" professional architectural historian, they opted to use Long's evaluation. Technically, the site form evaluations that were utilized to prepare the Highland Historic District nomination should have been utilized as the official eligibility status since it was based on a more thorough documentation of the individual properties.

During the past ten years, the terminology changed enough to alter the basic meaning of the term "contributing structure," and it was unclear to city officials whether these structures were eligible for the National Register or what significance that designation should have on local policy and design review. Many of the structures with this designation were actually outside any potential historic district and this "contributing" evaluation has no relevance, although this represents the state's current interpretation of the National Register's evaluation procedures rather than an error on Long's part. They were thus viewed as structures that were not of primary importance since they were not key structures. Given this vagueness, structures evaluated as "B" (contributing) received cursory attention in design reviews since they were perceived as less important. Without the benefit of the protection provided by the design review procedure, many of these same structures, which had been relatively unaltered ten years ago, now have been severely altered. As a consequence, the degree of architectural integrity decreased in many older neighborhoods that ultimately might have been listed on the National Register and in the National Register listed Highland Historic District which could ultimately threaten the eligibility status of this district.



Given the changing philosophy about the purpose of the National Register of Historic Places during the past decade as a planning tool and inventory of all local historic resources rather than a register of elite and unique resources, the evaluations of Waterloo's buildings completed ten years ago are now viewed as too exclusive. Structures are no longer considered to be eligible only if they are: one of a few remaining examples of a particular property type or style, the best example of a particular style or type, or the design of a noted architect. This changing attitude was just becoming evident during Long's survey ten years ago as evidenced by her efforts to characterize various vernacular house plans, especially the Commodious Box. In addition, scholarly documentation and terminology about various styles had not standardized enough ten years ago to include the application on the more commonplace or simple designs of working class and middle class housing, but this has now changed. Most of the extant architecture in Waterloo was built during the twentieth century, but ten years ago there was little appreciation in Iowa's preservation movement for the early twentieth century styles that dominate Waterloo's visual landscape, styles such as Craftsman, Tudor Revival and Colonial Revival. As these structures have gotten older and attitudes about their architectural merits changed, these styles are now receiving recognition around Iowa and needed to be re-evaluated in Waterloo as well.

### **III. Current Survey Project**

#### **A. Purpose of the Current Survey Project**

The Waterloo Community Development Board and the Waterloo Historic Preservation Commission recognized that the evaluation of historic resources completed in 1985 needed to be revised due to these philosophical changes in the evaluation criteria, physical changes in the structures during the last decade, and the potential eligibility of newer structures as they become 50 years old. Given the advancements in computer technology which could enhance the city staff's ability to quickly access information and the need to compile and consolidate all surveys and evaluations, the creation of a computerized database was intrinsic to their desire to update this survey. Since most of the potential changes to evaluations were likely to be based upon the architectural merit, rather than historical significance of individual properties, this current city-wide survey was designed to examine residential, commercial and industrial areas of the city to identify buildings with architectural merit. After reviewing competitive bids from interested architectural historians certified by the State Historical Society of Iowa as meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, the contract for this survey project was awarded to Karen Bode Baxter, a private consultant from Pella, Iowa.

Given the thorough nature of the 1985 survey, as well as limitations upon the funding being provided by the Waterloo Community Development Board, the current project focused on the re-evaluation of the properties previously identified in the 1985 survey as either eligible or contributing as well as updating the survey to cover properties that were not yet fifty years old in 1985 (a basic criterion for National Register Eligibility) to determine their current eligibility status. Recognizing how long this project would take, evaluations included properties that might be considered eligible by the year 2000, in other words, those constructed by 1950. In addition, the current project re-evaluated all properties within the Highland Historic District and consolidated survey information from the nomination process into this current inventory. PHR's evaluations for the potential Walnut Street district were incorporated into the database, but individual structures were re-evaluated only if major changes had occurred since PHR completed their evaluation two years ago.

#### **B. Components of the Project**

The project was divided into several phases, including survey and on-site evaluations, photography of eligible properties and all Highland District buildings, document research for the newly surveyed properties (those constructed between 1935 and 1950), development of a satisfactory database format that replicated the Iowa Site Inventory and Property Characteristic forms, data entry, and the preparation of this narrative report on the project's findings. The

survey conformed to standard procedures outlined in *National Register Bulletin 16*, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, and the state's *Survey Procedures and Guidelines Manual*. Evaluations utilized the criteria established by the National Register of Historic Places as published in the *Federal Register* of September 29, 1983, pages 44720 through 44726.

### 1. *On-site Evaluations and Photography*

Baxter, accompanied by her research assistant, Maxine McConnell, personally completed all of the on-site surveys and evaluations of each property to identify buildings with architectural merit and determine its eligibility to the National Register. To make the most efficient use of time, Baxter completed the on-site evaluations and photography while dictating field notes recorded by McConnell on blank Iowa Site Inventory forms attached to the city's copies of the existing Iowa Site Inventory Sheets or on the computer printouts provided by the County Assessor of properties they had listed with construction dates between 1935 and 1950 (These field notes will be returned to the City Planning Office for storage, in case they are needed for reference in the future). Public agencies (fire department, water department, parks department, general city properties, and the school system) were contacted to determine whether or not there were public structures built between 1935 and 1950 that were not on the property tax rolls that needed evaluation. These structures as well as any potentially eligible structures discovered during the field work that had not been included in the City's file copies or County Assessor's computer printouts were evaluated on-site and included in the database.

Baxter photographed structures that were tentatively evaluated as individually eligible to the National Register were photographed so that a black and white print could be attached to the paper copy of its Iowa Site Inventory form. Priority was given to photographing during the seasons when foliage would not obscure the structure since this photodocumentation was designed to provide visual evidence of the decorative details of the building. Surveying and field notes continued after the foliage emerged but photography was postponed until the late autumn of 1994 and the early spring of 1995 (since some tree and shrubbery species do not drop their old foliage until the buds swell in the spring). Since the number of eligible structures more than doubled the number of expected sites, this part of the project schedule had to be revised to accommodate the additional time needed to evaluate and photograph this increased work capacity.

### 2. *Archival Research*

Since this survey focused on architectural merits of previously surveyed structures as well as newer properties, identification, collection and review of archival materials was limited to those needed to evaluate architectural developments after 1935. Research focused on finding the various historic themes that impacted construction, identifying the important structures and documenting important dates and areas in the city's development between 1935 and 1950. In addition to literature and archival research, historic photographs and various maps helped visualize the changes occurring after 1935, useful in developing historic contexts, dating structural and stylistic developments, and identifying potential district boundaries.

While the records at the State Historical Society of Iowa (both in Des Moines and Iowa City) were examined, the most useful materials were found in the Waterloo Public Library, the Grout Museum the Water Department and the Blackhawk County Courthouse. There are few archival documents and only a few memoirs that cover this period in Waterloo's history, but some of the clipping files at both the Public Library and the Grout Museum were helpful. Of special note was the Grout Museum file on Lustron houses that not only identified those constructed in Waterloo but provided a promotional catalog, legal documents, and historical reviews of this unusual period piece in prefabricated housing. The map collection at the Grout Museum was especially helpful in visualizing the growth of the community and identifying major transportation routes that impacted the location of suburban developments. The microfilmed newspaper files at the Waterloo Public Library provided the most comprehensive archival resource for the 1935 to 1950 period in Waterloo's development.



Of all the official records on individual structures, the County Assessor's records and the Water Department's files provided the only official sources of information on construction during the period 1935 through 1950. Beginning in 1940, the assessor recorded the actual date of construction, rather than an estimated date of construction, but it must be remembered that their descriptive information has been updated over the years and does not reflect original construction information, although additions are often recorded by their date of construction. The Water Department's records of initial connections are the only extant city records of construction for this period since the city's building permit records were destroyed when the basement of city hall flooded a number of years ago. These records are organized by address and might be useful in determining when a building was completed and who was the initial resident, but such information is fallible since contractors or developers often applied for the initial water permits. Records were not organized in a manner that promoted easy summary for this survey, but they are noted for the benefit of anyone trying to document an individual property history.

For most of the years between 1935 and 1950, the *Waterloo Courier* published an annual "Progress" edition that reviewed construction, often photographing a wide variety of new homes and commercial construction projects as well as listing all building permits. These annual reviews provided the best documentation of construction during this period. They were utilized to identify stylistic developments, attitudes about construction, new products being introduced (such as asbestos siding), areas or subdivisions being developed, and the forces impacting construction (such as the Great Depression or World War II). Print copies were made of the pertinent information in these reviews and they were incorporated into the project files provided to the Historic Preservation Commission since they are also an invaluable resource for further research on specific property histories.

### 3. *Property Data Collection*

Once the on-site evaluations had been completed, the County Assessor provided computer time and a printer to collect the basic property data for all of the eligible sites. This included the information on each of the eligible properties such as the legal description, owner's name and address and the assigned date of construction which had to be entered into the database of Iowa Site Inventory forms. In some cases, the assessor's records provided additional descriptive information, such as dimensions of the building, uses of various structures on a commercial site, and current use characteristics. Because on-site inspections could not always disclose the foundation materials, the existence of a basement, or even the use of replacement materials, the descriptive information provided by the assessor's files played an important role in preparing the final inventory. Also, in some cases, these files helped identify a major addition to a potentially eligible structure, decreasing the National Register eligibility status of that structure since the proportions of the addition overpowered the original structure even though it was well integrated into the original design.

### 4. *Database Development and Data Entry*

After examining the existing database listing Long's evaluation of the properties surveyed in 1984-1986, discussing the computer capacity and the computer capabilities of the staff of the Community Development Office, identifying potential database search criteria, examining the format of the Iowa Site Inventory and Property Characteristic forms that had to be replicated visually in the database, Karen Baxter worked with Scott Baxter (who served as the computer consultant for this project) to develop a satisfactory database format for the use of the Community Development Office. The database was developed in a Microsoft Windows format utilizing the database development program known as Access since it was most forgiving of the long text fields needed on the Iowa Site Inventory forms. To best accommodate the needs of this project, the Iowa Site Inventory form became the basis of the database which was linked to two subsidiary databases by the individual site inventory numbers. These two subsidiary databases were necessary only for those properties determined individually eligible to the National Register which required a specific Property Characteristic form. Since there was only one bridge which did not readily fit onto a Residential or Commercial Property Characteristic

form, only these two forms were utilized for the subsidiary databases.

After completing data collection, all properties were entered into the database. Baxter personally entered the evaluations for all potentially eligible sites and properties within the boundaries of potential or existing districts. Clerical assistants and student interns entered the information for properties determined not eligible during Baxter's survey update as well as for the 7000 estimated structures previously surveyed by Long and evaluated as not eligible (but not re-evaluated in this current project). Previous evaluations of eligibility, location within potential or existing district boundaries, and pertinent comments from previous surveys were included in the text area of the inventory forms so that the current database should track all previous evaluations as well as Baxter's evaluation. Clerical assistants transcribed the recent survey of the Walnut Street neighborhood into the database since it was generally excluded from the survey update by Baxter and noted Long's previous evaluations. This consolidation of information onto one survey form should help clarify the current eligibility status and the record of evaluations for all surveyed properties in Waterloo.

##### 5. *Evaluation of Individual Eligibility and Architectural Trends*

Based upon the on-site evaluations, photographs, document research, and property data, Baxter completed an extensive analysis to determine the National Register eligibility of each property surveyed, to develop additional historic contexts, define property types and identify boundaries of potential districts. Each property received a rating based upon the information about the building's integrity, architectural merits and historic significance. She cross-checked similar structures to ensure consistency in the evaluations of eligibility and established general parameters for determinations of eligibility. Next, she analyzed eligible properties built between 1935 and 1950 for potential districts and additional historic contexts based upon historic themes, places, people and styles for the post 1935 period.

##### 6. *Final Documents*

This final report presents a summary of the methods, findings and documentation of the research, explaining the analysis techniques utilized in evaluating individual sites. It develops additional historic contexts for structures completed between 1935 and 1950, describes the variety of styles during that era and giving local examples of each style. The report also describes the boundaries of potential districts and the changes that have occurred to the historic resources of Waterloo since the 1985 survey. Other materials, ranging from lists of sites and various maps have been incorporated into the report to aid in planning and use of the survey documents. The report concludes with recommendations for historic preservation planning for Waterloo, including the defined or redefined boundaries of potential districts, integrity requirements utilized in analyzing structures so that design review procedures ensure the continued eligibility of these sites, recommendations for which nominations to the National Register should be pursued by the City of Waterloo, suggestions for alterations to local ordinances and Historic Preservation Commission activities relative to the results of this survey.

The final documents included:

- 1) Printed Iowa Site Inventory forms on all National Register eligible properties and all Highland Historic District properties, one original set with photographs and two photocopied sets (originally estimating 420-500 properties, but now totally 927 sites)
- 2) One set of contact sheets and negatives for each roll of black and white film filed in "Print File" negative preservers, accompanied by a typed "Photographic/Catalog Field Sheet" for each roll of film (originally estimating 14 rolls of film but actually utilizing 33 rolls of film)
- 3) Ten copies of this final project report
- 4) Project files, including previous survey materials, Baxter's field notes and



photocopied research materials.

#### IV. Evaluation of Project Findings

##### A. Statistical Evaluation of Eligible Structures

Specifications for the survey project provided for the evaluation of:

1. Approximately 152 properties previous identified in the 1985 survey as eligible, which included Highland Historic District sites, with Iowa Site Inventory Sheets completed for each that is still eligible, originally estimated at 150 property forms;
2. 1616 properties identified in the 1985 survey as contributing with Iowa Site Inventory Sheets completed for those determined to be individually eligible, originally estimating 100 property forms
3. 69 structures in the Highland Historic District evaluated as contributing in the 1985 survey with completed Iowa Site Inventory Sheets for each structure; and
4. Approximately 4500 structures completed between 1935 and 1950, with Iowa Site Inventory Sheets completed for those properties determined individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, originally estimating 100 - 180 property forms.

When Baxter began the on-site evaluations, it quickly became evident that these estimates were very accurate for the number of total addresses to be surveyed, but drastically underestimated the total number of property forms, or in other words the number determined individually eligible. Given the changes in the historic preservation movement, especially the concepts of eligibility discussed earlier, this is understandable, but city officials may be surprised to find that there are 927 addresses in Waterloo now considered individually eligible to the National Register of Historic Places, although 98 of this total represents multiple addresses assigned to the 14 apartment buildings and 16 Double Houses determined individually eligible. In other words, 829 separate sites are currently eligible for National Register listing, although it should be noted that these evaluations were based solely upon the exterior appearance of the structure, which is a primary factor in determining architectural significance, but actual nominations and listings on the National Register would also consider the integrity of major interior features and characteristics.

The vast majority of these eligible structures, 608 in all, were constructed prior to 1935. This actually represents more than one third of the 1837 structures previously evaluated architecturally in Long's survey as either a "A" structure (key structure or individually eligible) or as a "B" structure (contributing to the neighborhood). This 1837 figure counts each address number separately, approximately 107 more numbers than actual structures, mostly due to the extensive apartment complexes and the Double Houses that helped characterize Waterloo's residential construction prior to 1935. For some, this may seem surprising, but given the changes in the philosophy of the National Register it is understandable.

Of the 4500 structures evaluated as part of this survey that had been built in the period between 1935 and 1950, only 205 of the residential structures and 10 non-residential properties are considered eligible for the National Register at this time. This is due in part to the lack of scholarly documentation on more recent stylistic developments, especially those that were mass produced by local contractors rather than designed individually by architects. Alterations to the original designs represents the major factor in determining only 5 percent of the potential structures eligible. This is a logical result of the construction philosophy of the era, building small for affordability with the ability to make alterations as the owners could afford to pay for such improvements. Because of the frequent use of inferior materials, these structures also had

a higher incidence of replacement siding and windows.

The remaining 104 eligible structures were properties that had been previously evaluated as "C" or not eligible, but they are now old enough, their stylistic influences better recognized by architectural historians, and their integrity is still intact. These were properties that just happened to fall within potential districts or were noted while on-site work was underway and they do not represent a thorough re-evaluation of the 7000 structures evaluated as not eligible during the 1985 survey.

In addition, 485 sites are considered to contributing to potential or existing historic districts, although alterations to the structures or the simplicity of the more recent designs meant that these structures are not considered individually eligible. Of the individually eligible sites, over one-fourth (255 structures) are within potential or existing historic district boundaries. This makes a total of 680 structures that are within historic districts in Waterloo, with Highland's neighborhood representing 196 of these eligible and contributing structures.

As the one district currently listed on the National Register, the Highland neighborhood contains a total of 250 properties, but only 142 are within the current historic district boundaries. Of the total 250 properties, 53 are individually eligible, 143 are contributing and 54 are not eligible nor contributing to the district's architectural integrity. Of the 142 sites within the historic district, 48 are individually eligible, 71 are contributing and 23 are not eligible nor contributing to the district's architectural integrity. Since 80 percent of the properties within the original neighborhood are now considered eligible or contributing to the architectural integrity of Highland, there is a strong potential for increasing this district's National Register boundaries.

## **B. Property Types and Styles**

### *1. Property Types as Defined by Use*

Of the 927 eligible sites, the vast majority are residential properties. 620 structures of these eligible sites were originally used as private residences for a single household, but there are an additional 128 site numbers assigned to the individual addresses of the 30 eligible multiple household structures, representing 14 apartment complexes and 16 Double Houses. In fact, only 53 commercial structures, public facilities, or industrial sites retained enough of their original architectural integrity to be considered individually eligible for the National Register. This includes 10 commercial structures, 7 schools, 1 bridge, 2 waterworks sites, 6 other public or social service structures, the Rath complex and 6 other manufacturing facilities, 2 gasoline stations, 2 railroad properties, 1 office building, 2 construction businesses, and 13 churches. The railroad sites, the Rath complex, and Waterworks Park represent numerous individual structures, but only one street address, but the other non-residential sites are single structures.

### *2. Property Types Identified by Basic Plans*

Unlike Long's survey, this current evaluation concentrated on identifying stylistic influences rather than the plans or roof shapes that dominated the earlier survey. While the descriptive information provided for each site still continues to note the basic shapes, stylistic influences are now accepted as a basic method of identifying structures given the development of a standard stylistic vocabulary, especially since the publication of Virginia and Lee McAlester's *A Field Guide to American Houses*.

Three specific plans identified in Long's survey are still important to the evaluation of architectural developments in Waterloo (the Double House, the Four Square, and the Commodious Box) and some of these vernacular plans defy association with particular styles even though there are examples of each of these plans executed in various styles. There are now only 16 Double Houses that retain enough of the architectural integrity to be individually eligible for the National Register, 1 is a Colonial Revival design, 3 utilize Craftsman stylistic details, 1 is an Italianate structure, and 5 are good examples of Prairie School influence. 112 Four



Square plan houses that are individually eligible, over 40 reveal little stylistic influence and the remaining structures are nearly equally divided between Colonial Revival, Craftsman, and Prairie School designs. Of the 32 individually eligible structures that are Commodious Box types, the vast majority utilize Colonial Revival stylistic details, although 2 reveal Craftsman stylistic influences, 1 utilizes Prairie School details, and 5 are best classified as Folk Victorian. While some plans can be readily associated with twentieth century residential construction, such as the bungalow, more recent designs are more easily identified by style.

### 3. *Nineteenth Century Designs*

Only 39 eligible structures represent pre-1900 construction and all but two are residential structures. Long had noted the dearth of nineteenth century structures ten years ago and there are fewer of the structures representative of Waterloo's early history extant today. Given the rapid growth of the town during the twentieth century, the population was five times larger in 1950 than it had been at the turn of the century, this is not surprising since newer industrial and commercial expansion consumed some of the oldest neighborhoods. Also, most nineteenth century residential construction utilized wood rather than masonry walls, a less durable material. Of these 39 eligible structures, the oldest extant building was constructed in 1861. Six of these are Italianate designs, 9 are classified as Folk Victorian structures, 9 are Queen Anne houses, 3 are Shingle Style, and 2 are early Colonial Revival structures while the remaining 11 structures are more commonplace vernacular designs.

A few twentieth century structures reveal the continued popularity of Victorian styles during the early years of the new century (5 more Folk Victorian structures, 2 Richardsonian Romanesque designs, 5 more Shingle Style houses, and 2 Stick houses).

### 4. *Twentieth Century Styles*

Since most of the eligible properties in Waterloo were constructed during the first half of the twentieth century, the styles popular during this period dominate the visual landscape of Waterloo, especially the Colonial Revival, Craftsman designs, Prairie School, and Tudor Revival style.

Over 180 structures utilize variations of Colonial Revival styling which remained popular in Waterloo through the 1950s, evolving to adapt to more modern house plans as the century progressed. Earlier examples utilized the application of Colonial Revival features on vernacular plans with such details as pedimented dormers, round classical porch columns, pedimented roof over the steps on the porch roof, and in the Palladian windows utilized as a decorative detail. Later Colonial Revival houses were mostly revivals of the Georgian style popular during the American colonial era and were characterized as a two story, side gabled house with a symmetrical facade, multipaned windows, shutters, and classical entry details with a small stoop rather than the full width porch that dominated earlier housing styles. These later Colonial Revival examples often have one story wings on one or both sides to accommodate screened porches, sunrooms, and attached garages. Other variations of the Colonial Revival style evident in the eligible structures include 4 Neoclassical designs, 20 Dutch Colonial Revival structures, 8 Garrison Colonial Revivals (noted for their second floor overhangs), and 10 Cape Cod designs. The consistent popularity of this style is partially a result of its adaptability to a wide variety of plans and its success both as a modest design, like the Cape Cod, and for exclusive homes to the wealthy. Its psychological association with tradition made it an excellent choice for homeowners facing the uncertainty of modern life.

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the Prairie style became one of the first popular forms of modern suburban design to be adopted for residential designs in Waterloo. Given the Midwest origins of the style by such Chicago architects as Frank Lloyd Wright, it is reasonable to see both examples of this style and the use of major Prairie style features on more vernacular designs. In all, 65 structures reflect some Prairie School influence, most often by utilizing the lower pitched hipped roof and the wide enclosed eaves, although horizontal design details, corner windows or distinctive geometric decorations on columns or on the front entry

also distinguished these designs. Often the designs minimized the height of the second floor level and utilized smooth stucco walls.

Although the Prairie style is commonly confused with Craftsman designs, partly because they were both popular during the early decades of the century and partly because both styles utilized horizontal lines and the low pitched roofs with wide eaves, Craftsman designs utilized several distinctive features and are most easily identified by the visible roof supports (rafters, beams and knee braces). Craftsman stylistic influences often included wide eaves with exposed rafters, tapered square porch columns or battered piers on raised pedestals, clapboard halfwalls or railings on the porches, vertical divisions in the upper window sashes, and contrasting wall materials (especially to distinguish chimneys and porch supports or to distinguish different elevations). The 299 eligible structures utilizing Craftsman stylistic details provide evidence of the popularity of the Craftsman tradition in Waterloo, which ranged from a stylistic influence on vernacular plans such as the Four Square to classic bungalows, as well as all became the standard style for Waterloo's apartment buildings with all but 4 of the eligible apartment buildings utilizing Craftsman details. Craftsman designs are generally utilized on middle-class and working class homes, but Waterloo has several elaborate examples in the Highland Historic District and the Craftsman style helped characterize that district. One of the reasons that one third of all individually eligible structures are Craftsman designs is the fact that many of Waterloo's Craftsman houses were constructed with brick walls, a feature that usually limits the major alterations to the house, especially the application of replacement siding that eliminates most buildings from individual eligibility.

Several eclectic house styles that drew upon European antecedents had varying degrees of popularity in Waterloo. 12 structures reveal the influence of the style identified as Italian Renaissance due to its low-pitched hipped roof with wide overhanging eaves supported by decorative brackets, multipaned windows, tile roofs, arched openings on the first floor, and classical columns at the entrance. Only 1 Waterloo house utilizes Mission styling, which was easily distinguished by the smooth stucco walls and the shaped Mission dormer. While the French Eclectic style was a relatively uncommon style throughout the United States, it had its most popularity after World War I when Americans serving in France had contact with the prototypes and in Waterloo there were 4 examples constructed during the late 1930s and one in 1949. This style is often confused with the very popular Tudor Revival style due to the similarities of distinguishing features, but the French Eclectic examples in Waterloo are easily identified by their round towered entry nestled within the interior corner of the house. By far, the most popular of these eclectic styles was the Tudor Revival represented in 89 individually eligible structures.

Tudor Revival designs in Waterloo are concentrated in the area south of Campbell and west of Kimball, although examples can be found in most areas of town. The style is loosely based on early English building traditions that ranged from small cottages to medieval castles and Waterloo examples also ranged from the most simple adaptations of this style to the elaborate homes that dominate Columbia Circle. The style is known for its steeply pitched roof with multiple cross gables and dormers, a variety of wall materials combined to provide textural interest (including stucco, brick, stone, wood shingles, and fake half-timbering), massive end wall chimneys (often elaborately detailed), multipaned windows, round arched doorways and doors, wing walls, and gabled vestibules that often incorporated a curved, or belcast, side on the vestibule gable or had one side of the gable extending down as a longer roof line. Even on the most modest examples this vestibule treatment was still evident in some form. Relatively uncommon during the early years of the twentieth century, this style grew immensely in popularity during the 1920s, coinciding with the development of the exclusive neighborhoods in west Waterloo near Byrnes Park.

Several new styles became popular at the end of the Great Depression and in Waterloo four different styles experienced varying degrees of success, but all are characterized by the low horizontal profiles and one story designs. Most Waterloo residents were not very adventuresome when it came to residential designs, but 2 eligible houses constructed prior to 1950 utilized Art Deco styling, a bold modern design noted for its smooth wall surface and use

of geometric motifs as decorative elements. Only 2 eligible structures in Waterloo can be identified as American International which is distinguished by its contemporary styling that featured flat roofs with wide eave overhangs, no decorative detailing, and exposed support beams and other structural members. Neither of these styles ever became popular in Waterloo, probably in part due to their radical departure for past styles, but likely more closely associated with the impracticality of flat roofs in an area that has heavy snowfalls.

In Waterloo, post-World War II construction would be dominated by other two styles, one known to architectural historians as Minimal Traditional and the other known even to the general public as the Ranch style. Minimal Traditional houses revealed the legacy of both Colonial Revival and Tudor Revival styles that had become increasingly simplified, often utilizing multipaned windows and tiered gabled bays and vestibules as the last vestiges of these styles. The wide eave overhangs of most Ranch house designs was its major distinguishing feature. Both styles gained in popularity during the late 1930s, but the lack of adequate scholarly documentation of these styles, the plethora of mundane examples, and the common use of replacement siding equates to only 5 individually eligible Minimal Traditional designs and an equal number of Ranch houses. Just as has happened to the Craftsman, Colonial Revival and Tudor styles that preceded them, both Minimal Traditional and Ranch style houses will increase in significance with the passage of time, the loss of unaltered examples, and the increase of scholarly evaluations of these styles, but for now, most examples in Waterloo cannot be evaluated as individually eligible, even if they are unaltered.

### **C. Impact of Renovations and Development Pressures upon Historic Structures**

While the current total of 927 individually eligible addresses is considerably more than the previous total of 162 addresses, there has actually been considerable erosion of the historic building integrity in Waterloo during the past ten years. For example, of the 162 addresses previously listed as individually eligible, 7 structures have been demolished and 21 more are no longer eligible due to alterations, this despite protective ordinances and design review. Most of the 1837 addresses previously surveyed actually retained a high degree of architectural integrity when Long evaluated these structures, but were simply evaluated as "contributing" due to the less inclusive nature of the National Register ten years ago. That means that 900 of these properties have been seriously altered during the past decade. While this may not be that unusual for an Iowa community given the size of Waterloo, it does raise questions and concerns for the historic preservation movement in Waterloo.

In general, three factors impacted the historic building stock in Waterloo during the past decade: renovations undertaken by property owners that alter or cover original design features, the road construction, and the perception among those responsible for commercial development that new is better. Most residential renovations continued to focus on methods of trying to make homes more energy efficient or maintenance free by utilizing replacement siding and windows. While it was expected that the construction of Highway 218 which had initiated the original survey ten years ago would have an impact on historic structures and their continued viability along a major highway, the local efforts to develop additional thoroughfares, especially along West Fourth and West Fifth and just north of the downtown have had a devastating effort on the integrity of these older neighborhoods. Despite national trends that are concentrating on the redevelopment of older commercial properties, Waterloo still focuses on new commercial construction, demolishing historic structures such as the Kleinfelter Livery to make room for a new office building although there are numerous underutilized spaces already available.

This continues a pattern already evident when Long completed the initial survey of Waterloo ten years ago. The local developments in the historic preservation movement during this past decade have just positioned Waterloo's Historic Preservation Commission to impact this pattern in the future through the incorporation of historic preservation into city planning and development strategies and by educating property owners about historic rehabilitation techniques and the financial benefits of historic preservation.

### **D. Integrity Requirements for Individual and District Eligibility**

Individual properties were evaluated for eligibility utilizing a sliding scale for architectural integrity, with alterations on the rarer nineteenth century examples being more acceptable and a high degree of integrity required for more recent construction partly due to the preponderance of twentieth century structures in Waterloo. In other words, when there were more extant examples of a particular period of construction, stricter the application of standards on determining the integrity of the original design features. In general, the enclosure of porches, especially those that dominate the front facade, meant that the basic balance and massing of the original design had altered and such structures were not evaluated as either eligible or contributing, unless the enclosure consisted of removal storm panels and the porch still "read" as open. Replacement wall coverings were not tolerated on individually eligible structures, although contributing structures could have replacement siding as long as it did not cover other distinguishing features, such as lintels and sills, and it did not drastically change the lines of the building (such as applying a smooth stucco coating over a wall previously lined due to the use of clapboard or brick). Alterations to elements that are characteristic of the style, such as enclosing the eaves or wrapping the knee braces of a Craftsman house, were unacceptable on individually eligible buildings.

Changes to the other distinguishing elements often combined to alter the basic architectural integrity of the structure, such changes as new or missing muntin patterns in windows, replacement porch columns or railings, removal of a distinctive roof material (such as clay tile replaced with composition shingles), painting masonry surfaces which disguises the original color(s), coating foundations which disguises original materials, replacement of front steps with different materials or designs, or the use of a newer style entry door. While one or two alterations to less noticeable features might be acceptable on an individually eligible structure, the combination of alterations could even exclude a building for contributing to a potential district.

Additions which were not visible or overbearing from the street view did not necessarily impact individual eligibility, but any addition attached to a structure that alters the original balance and proportions made that structure not eligible and in most cases noncontributing. This did not change no matter how well the addition blended and matched the original design, since such alterations changed actually mislead the viewer into believing that a structure had been much larger than it had actually been when constructed.

While replacement garages or missing garages did not often negatively impact the eligibility of particular properties, the existence of an original garage, whether attached or detached, helped bolster the individual eligibility of many designs, especially those from modest designs where the garage made a major visual impact on the property. Since most of the newly evaluated structures were part of automobile suburbs, it could be argued that the garage was a distinguishing feature, although modest utilitarian design on newer garages and replacement doors were expected. However, garages that were intrusive due to their size, location or appearance constituted major alterations to the property and in some cases eliminated the site from eligibility. It should be noted that visibility was a factor in this determination. Whenever possible, garages of historical significance were included in the photograph attached to the site form, or at a minimum noted under "Surveyor's Comments" on the Residential form.

Neighborhoods being evaluated for eligibility as a historic district had to retain a visual cohesion that helped characterize it originally. Setback lines, outlines of structures, stylistic continuity and general visual integrity provided by the prevalence of individually eligible and contributing structures are basic requirements for the district. Areas with too many missing structures or infill structures can not be considered historic districts. Isolated clusters of eligible buildings in what was one a larger neighborhood do not constitute historic districts. The defining elements of the original development period, street layouts and tree canopies or distinguishing landscaping are important considerations in determining the integrity of a historic district.

#### E. Potential for Historic Districts



While some neighborhoods have experienced a renaissance during the last decade, most do not yet meet the basic standards of eligibility for historic district status, although several should be actively encouraged with the historic rehabilitation efforts on individual properties if the neighborhood residents want to pursue National Register listing in the future. For now, there are still three areas that contain historic districts. The Walnut Street area is quickly losing its potential for National Register district eligibility due to the demolition of historic structures and the encroachment of commercial construction, but residents should be encouraged to quickly pursue this nomination to better protect the remaining properties. The Highland neighborhood's National Register boundaries could be expanded to include the vast majority of the original neighborhood now the the properties on the fringes of the neighborhood are fifty years old, but only if a majority of the property owners agree to the listing, something that does not appear likely at the present. The third area is a large tract extending south and west from Campbell and Kimball, around the Byrnes Park neighborhoods. This area needs to be evaluated for the potential of one large district or several smaller districts and there is increasing support in the neighborhood for district status. To aid in preparing specifications for a study area, a map outlining the boundaries of the proposed study area is included with this report (Map \*) and every address was entered into the database with a tentative evaluation of its eligibility relative to a potential district.

**V. Historic Contexts for Architectural Developments, 1935-1950**

- A. The Quest for the Modern Home
- B. Impact of Modern Technology on House Design and Suburban Development

**VI. Recommendations for Historic Preservation Planning**

- A. Revise Local Ordinances to Update Terminology and Provide Better Protection
- B. Target Neighborhoods to Encourage Historic Rehabilitations
- C. Incorporate Historic Preservation into City Planning Efforts
- D. Educate Landlords and Homeowners on Rehabilitation Practices and Financial Benefits