
NOMINATION APPLICATION

This application packet is used to file an application(s) for the nomination of a property as an individual landmark or for a group of properties as an historic district that requires approval by the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission. The packet is a tool for gathering information relevant to an application. It contains a checklist of the required items for the application.

599.210. Designation criteria. The following criteria shall be considered in determining whether a property is worthy of designation as a landmark or historic district because of its historical, cultural, architectural, archaeological or engineering significance:

- (1) The property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history.
- (2) The property is associated with the lives of significant persons or groups.
- (3) The property contains or is associated with distinctive elements of city or neighborhood identity.
- (4) The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of an architectural or engineering type or style, or method of construction.
- (5) The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.
- (6) The property exemplifies works of master builders, engineers, designers, artists, craftsmen or architects.
- (7) The property has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

599.220. Nomination of property. Nomination of a property to be considered for designation as a landmark or historic district shall be submitted to the planning director on a nomination application form approved by the planning director and shall be accompanied by all required supporting information. A nomination may be made by any of the following:

- (1) A member of the heritage preservation commission.
- (2) A member of the city council.
- (3) The mayor.
- (4) The planning director.
- (5) Any person with a legal or equitable interest in the subject property.

599.230. Commission decision on nomination. The commission shall review all complete nomination applications. If the commission determines that a nominated property appears to meet at least one (1) of the criteria for designation contained in section 599.210, the commission may direct the planning director to prepare or cause to be prepared a designation study of the property. In cases where an application for demolition is initiated by the property owner, the planning director may determine that the property owner bears the full financial responsibility of conducting the designation study. In all cases, the planning director shall

<p>For reasonable accommodations or alternative formats please contact 311 at 612-673-3000. People who are deaf or hard of hearing can use a relay service to call 311 at 612-673-3000. TTY users call 612-673-2157 or 612-673-2626. Para asistencia 612-673-2700 - Rau kev pab 612-673-2800 - Hadii aad Caawimaad u baahantahay 612-673-3500.</p>
--

define the scope of services for a designation study, review qualifications of agent conducting study and make a determination of what constitutes a final submission upon completion.

599.240. Interim protection.

- (a) *Purpose.* Interim protection is established to protect a nominated property from destruction or inappropriate alteration during the designation process.
- (b) *Effective date.* Interim protection shall be in effect from the date of the commission's decision to commence a designation study of a nominated property until the city council makes a decision regarding the designation of the property, or for one (1) year, whichever comes first. Interim protection may be extended for such additional periods as the commission may deem appropriate and necessary to protect the designation process, not exceeding a total period of eighteen (18) months. The commission shall hold a public hearing on a proposed extension of interim protection as provided in section 599.170.
- (c) *Scope of restrictions.* During the interim protection period, no alteration or minor alteration of a nominated property shall be allowed except where authorized by a certificate of appropriateness or a certificate of no change.

599.250. State historic preservation office review. The planning director shall submit all proposed designations to the state historic preservation officer for review and comment. The state historic preservation officer shall have sixty (60) days from said date of submittal to provide comments to the planning director.

599.260. City planning commission review. The planning director shall submit all proposed designations to the city planning commission for review and comment on the proposal within thirty (30) days. In its review, the city planning commission shall consider but not be limited to the following factors:

- (1) The relationship of the proposed designation to the city's comprehensive plan.
- (2) The effect of the proposed designation on the surrounding area.
- (3) The consistency of the proposed designation with applicable development plans or development objectives adopted by the city council.

599.270. Designation hearing. Following completion of the designation study the commission shall hold a public hearing to consider the proposed designation, as provided in section 599.170.

599.280. Commission recommendation. Following the public hearing, the commission shall make findings with respect to the proposed designation and shall submit the same together with its recommendation to the city council. In making its findings and recommendation, the commission shall consider the designation criteria contained in section 599.210, the information contained in the designation study, the state historic preservation officer's comments, the city planning commission's comments, the planning director's report and all testimony and evidence received at the public hearing relating to the designation.

599.290. City council decision. The city council shall make the final decision on all designations.

599.300. Design guidelines. The commission shall adopt design guidelines for landmarks and historic districts. Prior to adoption, the planning director shall submit all proposed design guidelines to the state historic preservation officer for review and comment. The state historic preservation officer shall have sixty (60) days from said date of submittal to provide comments to the planning director.

NOMINATION APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST

Staff will accept only complete applications that include all of the items listed below. If any of the items are missing at the time of submittal, the application will be deemed incomplete and staff will not accept the application.¹

	Pre-application meeting.
	Electronic copy of the application submittal. Please see our instructions for electronic submittal: http://www.minneapolismn.gov/hpc/WCMS1P-106443
	Completed Application Worksheet.
	Letter of support from the property owner, if applicable.
	Statement describing the applicant’s relationship to the property to be designated. This statement should indicate the applicant’s interest in or association with this property.
	Statement describing how the property meets at least one of the criteria for designation as a landmark or historic district contained in Section 599.210 of the Heritage Preservation Regulations.
	Statement describing the physical condition of the property and whether the property retains integrity (i.e. the ability to communicate its historical significance as evident in its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association).
	Map showing the location of the property.
	Photos of the property and existing structures. Must include the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Photos of all elevations of the structure(s) ▪ Photos of significant interior features

Statement describing the applicant’s relationship to the property to be designated. This statement should indicate the applicant’s interest in or association with this property.

The applicant, Cam Gordon, is the City Council Member for the area, Minneapolis Ward 2. He represents the residents of the Glendale Townhomes as well as those of the larger community. A group of residents, Defend Glendale, and the local neighborhood association, the Prospect Park Association, have requested that the Council Member explore the possibility of local historic designation.

The Glendale Housing Development Project area consists of six tax parcels and some additional land located on 13 acres one block south of the intersection of 27th Avenue Southeast and University Avenue Southeast in the Prospect Park neighborhood of southeast Minneapolis.

Glendale Townhomes consists of 184 townhomes designed for families, spread across 28 buildings in Minneapolis’ Prospect Park neighborhood. Built in 1952 during the tenure of Mayor Hubert Humphrey, the townhomes are the oldest property the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority (MPHA) owns. It is the only medium density public housing project of its kind in the city.

Statement describing how the property meets at least one of the criteria for designation as a landmark or historic district contained in Section 599.210 of the Heritage Preservation Regulations.

The Glendale Housing Development Project meets criteria 1, 3 and 5 for local designation under Section 599.210 of the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Regulations.

- 1) The property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history;
- 3) The property contains or is associated with distinctive elements of city or neighborhood identity; and
- 5) The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.

In 2016, the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority (MPHA) hired the architectural and engineering firm LHB to do a condition and feasibility assessment on the Glendale Townhomes. There has been discussion at MPHA about potential demolition or radical renovation of the Glendale complex, which could harm its historic character and displace its residents. Because new improvements would involve federal funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, LHB retained historical consultants Hess, Roise and Company to evaluate Glendale’s eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. The initial report by Hess Roise found Glendale Townhomes to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A for its significance in the areas of Social History and Community Planning and Development, but also noted that the original appearance of the buildings was affected by exterior and interior renovations and alterations in the 1970s and 1980s. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) found that these alterations affected the historic integrity of the property to the degree that it did not meet National Register criteria, and did not concur with Hess Roise’s findings.

While Glendale lacked the high degree of historic integrity needed to qualify for National Register listing, Glendale meets the qualifications for local landmark designation. The report by Hess, Roise and Company found that despite the renovations of the 1970s and 1980s, Glendale “retains very good integrity.”¹ One of the most significant features of Glendale—its unique, pioneering design and layout—is entirely retained. Moreover, as the first property constructed by a public housing authority in Minneapolis, Glendale represents a crucial milestone in the history of public housing in Minneapolis, and is associated with the establishment of significant social, architectural, and organizational precedents that the MPHA adopted in the coming decades.

Description of Property

Opening in 1952, Glendale Townhomes contains 184 units, divided among 28 buildings which are mostly rectangular. The Minneapolis Housing Redevelopment Authority (MHRA), which later became the MPHA, hired the local architectural firm Larson and McLaren to design the project. Fleischer Engineering and Construction Company built Glendale Townhomes after receiving a contract from the city. Richard Evans and G. M. Orr served as mechanical engineers. The Park Construction Company carried out the site work. Landscape architect Hugh Vincent Feehan was responsible for the landscape plans. Feehan had designed the University of St. Thomas football stadium, the Virginia Golf Course in Virginia, Minnesota, and Sumner Field, Minneapolis’ first public housing project, which was funded by the Works Project Administration and completed in 1938.²

Site Description and Orientation

Glendale Townhomes was built at the edge of Prospect Park in an area known as Sand Hill or Morse Hill because it had previously been used as a gravel pit. Industrial uses helped level this uncommonly hilly area of Minneapolis, and facilitated building on the site, but the site still maintains a distinct topography with rolling hills.

Most of the streets in the Glendale development are lined with sidewalks and grass boulevards, and the layout and context

¹ Charlene Roise and Rachel Peterson, “Glendale Townhomes: An Assessment of National Register Eligibility,” August 2015, prepared by Hess, Roise and Company. Much of the following nomination form uses information gathered from this report.

² George Rice, “Dad, Mom, Children—All Like Glen-dale,” Minneapolis Star, October 10, 1952;

of Glendale largely reflects the character of the adjacent Prospect Park area. Prospect Park was originally developed by real estate speculator Louis Menage in the late 1870s. The surveyors incorporated the unique topography into their plan, following the approach of prominent landscape architect Andrew Jackson Downing, a proponent of curvilinear streets, rolling lawns, and natural gardens. The curvilinear streets that distinguished Prospect Park were continued in Glendale. Glendale also features large lawns, green spaces, and several playgrounds between the buildings. These recreational areas were part of the original plan and are all in their original locations, although the playground equipment has since been replaced.

Description of Buildings

There are six different plans of buildings, with exterior appearances and interior features that are largely similar.³

- Type A (six units; two and three bedrooms): The townhomes on either end have individual porticos, while the entries of the central units are paired and share porticos. Two pairs of aluminum-framed windows (four total) are between the porticos and share a stone sill.
- Type B (eight units; two and three bedrooms): The units on either end of the building have individual entrances and the six central units are paired, with shared porticos. Like Type A, two pairs of aluminum-framed windows are between the porticos.
- Type C (six units; one and four bedrooms): The end units have separate porticos, while the entries for the other units are paired with shared porticos. Groups of three one-over-one windows are between the outer porticos and two pairs of windows are in the center.
- Type D (four units; one and four bedrooms): While the smallest type, these buildings are similar to the others in having separate porticos for the units at the far ends, with the center two units sharing an entrance portico. Groups of three one-over-one windows are between the porticos.
- Type E (four units; one and four bedrooms): The single Type E building comprises a Type D building with a one-story office wing on the east side. The west half of the office wing was constructed in 1951. Its primary south facade has a central pair of one-over-one windows flanked by groups of three one-over-one aluminum windows. The center bay, which originally held the entrance to the office, has been filled with a darker shade of brick. The east half of the office wing was added in 2002. It has a large, tinted, storefront window and a doorway sheltered by orange awnings. The east wall has two one-over-one windows. The north wall holds an overhead door, a pedestrian door, and windows. The office wing holds several offices, a lobby, conference room, lounge, and storage spaces.
- Type F (one, two, and three bedrooms): Each Type F building holds eight units. It consists of a Type A building with a one-story unit on each end. The single-story units retain their historic flat roofs and do not have a projecting portico. Instead, the wide eave shelters the doorway.

The interior of each unit is divided by a central staircase, which runs parallel to the primary façade. The basements have an open plan. On the first floor, the front door opens into a living room; the kitchen and dining areas are located along the rear wall, and separated from the living room by the staircase. The second floor holds bedrooms and a bathroom, which are laid in different configurations depending on the number of bedrooms in the unit.

The first story exteriors of all these buildings are clad in the original brick veneer, while the second stories are clad in composite siding, which dates from a 1989 renovation. Originally, the buildings had flat roofs, but hipped roofs with wide eaves were installed in 1972 in order to address the difficulties of maintaining flat roofs during winters in Minnesota.

The original windows on all buildings have been replaced, but the historic openings remain. The original brushed-aluminum

³ The typology used here was developed by Charlene Roise and Rachel Peterson in "Glendale Townhomes: An Assessment of National Register Eligibility," August 2015.

exterior framework for the first-floor windows, which incorporates combination storm windows and wide spandrel panels between grouped windows, remains in place on the primary facades. The brushed-aluminum trim for the single and paired windows on the second floor was removed during the 1989 renovation. All windows on the first floor have historic, projecting stone sills; the sills on the second-floor windows do not project. While the front doors were originally sheltered by flat-roofed canopies, in 1989 the porticoes were enlarged and modified with gabled roofs supported by rectangular metal posts.

Table of Building Types

Type	Address
A	2700-2710 Delaware Street Southeast
B	2805-2819 Delaware Street Southeast
B	2806-2829 Delaware Street Southeast
F	2821-2835 Delaware Street Southeast
F	2822-2836 Delaware Street Southeast
B	2837-2851 Delaware Street Southeast
A	2838-2848 Delaware Street Southeast
D	2700-2705 Essex Street Southeast
E	2701-2709 Essex Street Southeast
B	28-42 Saint Mary’s Avenue Southeast
C	33-43 Saint Mary’s Avenue Southeast
B	44-58 Saint Mary’s Avenue Southeast
F	45-59 Saint Mary’s Avenue Southeast
F	60-74 Saint Mary’s Avenue Southeast
B	61-75 Saint Mary’s Avenue Southeast
B	76-90 Saint Mary’s Avenue Southeast
C	2801-2811 Saint Mary’s Place
D	100-106 Twenty-Seventh Avenue Southeast
D	108-114 Twenty-Seventh Avenue Southeast
C	116-126 Twenty-Seventh Avenue Southeast
B	128-142 Twenty-Seventh Avenue Southeast
A	166-176 Twenty-Seventh Avenue Southeast
A	10-20 Williams Avenue Southeast
A	22-32 Williams Avenue Southeast
D	34-40 Williams Avenue Southeast
A	42-52 Williams Avenue Southeast
B	66-80 Williams Avenue Southeast

Statement of Significance

Developing Glendale

Glendale Townhomes were constructed by the MHRA in response to a severe affordable housing crisis caused by returning servicemen after World War II. The MHRA’s mission upon its establishment in 1947 was to provide safe and affordable housing to veterans and low-income residents of Minneapolis. Glendale was its first project, completed in 1952. In constructing Glendale Townhomes, the MHRA dealt with limited options for sites, public controversies, and unprecedented decisions about the design of the units. The experience gained from building Glendale Townhomes established a blueprint for the MHRA—and later the MPHA—to construct and manage thousands of units throughout the city.

During World War II, housing construction slowed because of a limited availability of materials and labor. In 1942, the War Production Board prohibited unauthorized residential construction. Construction rates plummeted through the war years, which exacerbated the housing crisis: between 1942 and 1945, new families outpaced housing unit growth by 25 percent.⁴ After the restrictions were lifted in October 1945, construction began again, but contractors were not interested in building affordable housing, further intensifying the housing deficit. By the end of 1945, Minneapolis needed 80,000 low-rent units but lacked the funding to manage this gap.

In the face of the growing housing crisis, Minneapolis Mayor Hubert Humphrey became a public housing advocate, using a three-pronged approach to navigate the steep housing challenges facing the city. He led a door-to-door campaign to ensure that every leasable room had been listed, required government and private agencies to obtain pre-fabricated emergency housing, and increased the amount of private housing units on the market. Humphrey also traveled around the country to New York, Chicago, Milwaukee, Louisville, and Cleveland to study other housing programs and visited Washington, D.C. to lobby for federal construction funds.⁵

In 1947, the Minnesota State Legislature adopted the Municipal Housing and Redevelopment Act, authorizing local jurisdictions to establish their own public housing agencies. Now having authorization from the state, Humphrey created the MHRA and appointed its first director and board of commissioners.⁶

When the MHRA opened in 1947, it spent its first year assessing the city's needs. It estimated that 23,000 families lived in substandard housing and 6,500 households were overcrowded (more than 1.5 people per room). In 1949, the MHRA received federal funding through the Housing Act of 1949, which authorized federal loans and grants to build over 800,000 low-rent housing units nationwide and to redevelop slums. Once the MHRA had the approval and funding to begin constructing permanent public housing, its next task was to find a suitable site.⁷

Because the ring of suburbs surrounding Minneapolis prevented the city from physically expanding, the MHRA looked to underdeveloped lots in the city for construction sites. Many of these parcels were formerly used for heavy industry, so the agency surveyed lots, tested soils, researched existing buildings, and hired architects and planners to assess the fitness of the site and develop preliminary site plans.⁸

By March of 1950, the MHRA had selected four potential sites, labeled A, B, F, and K, for its first affordable housing projects. The Minneapolis City Council voted for a moratorium on building permits on these sites while the MHRA conducted its analysis. Site F, located in Prospect Park, was eventually selected to be the site of the future housing project.⁹ Prospect Park had developed slowly relative to the rest of the city because of its isolation until the opening of the first inter-urban railway along University Avenue in 1890.¹⁰ Site F was located in an area that had previously been used as a gravel pit, which helped level this hilly area of Minneapolis. Although some houses had been built in the area, development was comparatively sparse.

Before construction could begin, the few homes in the area needed to be cleared, and their occupants removed. Many of these homeowners accepted the MHRA's buy-out offers, but several were unhappy with the MHRA's appraisal of their

⁴ Mason C. Doan, *American Housing Production, 1880-2000: A Concise History* (Lanham, Md.: University of America Press, 1997), 48-49.

⁵ Gary W. Reichart, "Mayor: Hubert H. Humphrey," *Minnesota History* 56 (Summer 1998), 56-57.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 59; MPHA, "MPHA History," www.mphaonline.org/about/history

⁷ Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority, *Three Decades, 1947-1977: Renewal in Minneapolis* (Minneapolis: MHRA, 1977), n.p.; Alexander von Hoffman, "A Study in Contradictions: The Origins and Legacy of the Housing Act of 1949," *Housing Policy Debate* 11 (2000): 309-310.

⁸ 9 Charlene Roise, Stephanie Atwood, and Marjorie Pearson, "Prospect Park Residential Historic District," National Register of Historic Places Nomination, August 2014, prepared by Hess, Roise and Company; MHRA, memorandum, November 30, 1950, City of Minneapolis.

⁹ Director Hoben Daily Log, March 6, 1950, City of Minneapolis; Director Hoben Daily Log, March 23, 1950, City of Minneapolis; Director Hoben Daily Log, June 1, 1950, City of Minneapolis.

¹⁰ Pearson, "Prospect Park, Minneapolis: An Historical Survey," 7, 9, 25-26; Penny Jacobson, "Platting Prospect Park Was a Torturous Affair," *Southeast*, October 1986

homes and refused the offers. Delays in the negotiation process forced the MHRA to begin condemning the remaining houses. The twenty-two families displaced by the construction were given priority in Glendale when it was finished being constructed.

The Prospect Park East River Road Improvement Association (PPERRIA), now known as the Prospect Park Association, was initially split over the construction of Glendale Townhomes. Many residents supported the project because they believed it would protect Prospect Park from the incursion of industrial uses by extending residential zoning. Those in favor also argued that it was crucial to give low-income and disadvantaged individuals an opportunity to have adequate housing. Those concerned believed that the area and its amenities could not support such a rapid population influx, and that it would bring in undesirable residents and lower property values.

PPERRIA eventually gave approval for the project, especially if “recreational and school facilities were sufficiently developed to handle additional population.”¹¹ But other groups remained opposed, calling themselves the Sidney-Pratt-Motley Citizens Committee. This group prepared a strongly worded objection to the project, which they addressed to the director of the federal Housing and Development Authority, in addition to President Harry Truman, and Minnesota’s U.S. Senators and representatives. Their argument was that the site was selected without adequate public input; that the city council had voted to rescind its formal approval of the project and the mayor had voted to veto the project, and even after a new council took office after elections, the mayor’s veto had not been overturned; that the Housing and Redevelopment Authority “arbitrarily persisted in carrying on plans to force this unwanted project on the community”; that building in this residential area could not be considered a “slum-clearance project.” The opposition was not nearly as widespread as its detractors insisted. The opinion of neighborhood residents was monitored by social psychologists at the University of Minnesota, who countered the opposition’s allegations that “an overwhelming majority of the neighbors opposed [the site].”¹²

Despite rumblings of neighborhood dissent, the MHRA proceeded, selecting Hugh Vincent Feehan to serve as the landscape architect for the site. Feehan had previously designed several prominent buildings in the Twin Cities, including Minneapolis’ first public housing project, Sumner Field, completed in 1938. For these early public housing demonstration projects authorized by the Federal Housing Division, it was paramount to create a landscape design that dramatically differed from the slums.¹³ Feehan’s design of Sumner Field provided adequate light, ventilation, and spaces to play. A program from the ground-breaking of Sumner Field described it as such:

Every building will be surrounded by open spaces improved by plantings and lawns or devoted to individual family gardens or play spaces for the smaller children of the project. Only 25% of the total space is to be occupied by buildings and 75% of the total space will be open area, thus assuring a maximum of sunlight, breezes, and ventilation.¹⁴

Feehan and the architects sought to emulate this open design concept used at Sumner Field while integrating it within the setting of Prospect Park. Taking advantage of the site’s hilly topography and creating continuity with the adjacent Prospect Park area, they created irregularly shaped blocks and a curvilinear street plan that departed from the city’s grid. They incorporated communal and private spaces, such as the large front lawns and recreational spaces at the intersection of Saint Mary’s Avenue and Delaware Street. Behind each building were fenced patios and playgrounds. These open spaces, playgrounds, and access to nearby parks, such as Luxton Park, were distinctive amenities for affordable housing, and

¹¹ Claire Aronson, “A Few Good Fights,” *Hennepin History* 54 (Winter 1995): 6-12

¹² *Ibid.*, 12

¹³ “History of the Sumner Field Homes, unpublished report prepared by the City Planning Commission, 1936, 14, in Minneapolis History Collection, Minneapolis Public Library

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 14

remain entirely intact.

The developers also sought to ensure that the quality of the houses at Glendale matched that of private housing. Each building held four, six, or eight units, and each unit contained its own entry, basement, furnace, and yard. This layout was dramatically different from other affordable housing in the city. As the *Minneapolis Star* noted, “the change from the substandard houses and flats [Glendale residents] formerly occupied, with their shared baths, drainless washtubs, alley ‘playgrounds,’ to Glen-Dale’s neat, bright one-family units with wide, rolling lawns is dramatic.” One resident, Harry LaGrew, had had three attacks of rheumatic fever, and doctors refused to release him until he found better housing—which he did at Glendale.¹⁵

Construction of the \$2.1-million project took a year and finished three months ahead of schedule. In 1951, the site was officially named Glen-Dale after Glenn Wallace and Dale Staunchfield, the aldermen of Ward 2. Eventually, the name was shortened to “Glendale.” On October 12th, 1952, it opened with a ceremony attended by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Minneapolis mayor Eric Hoyer, as well as the new residents, including Robert McAnally, a 33-year-old disabled veteran. He, his wife, and two children had “formerly lived in a third floor flat . . . where they shared a second-floor bathroom with 10 other persons.” Glendale was a welcome and stark change for them and other families who moved into the project: “The men like it, the women love it, and the children are crazy about it.” The units filled quickly with veterans who were returning to school after the war and other low-income families. Residents never paid more than 20 percent of their income in rent, which amounted to twenty-five to fifty dollars per month.¹⁶

Many GI families initially lived at Glen-Dale, which prompted a University of Minnesota administrator to petition the city council to sell the property to the university. The petition failed, but the GIs eventually graduated and moved out. The expected four-year residency limit ultimately was not instituted. A changing population of low-income families and immigrants have kept the property operating at peak capacity since its opening.

Because of Glendale, local schools featured integrated classrooms well before government-mandated busing was instituted, and parents from Glendale and other communities collaborated on neighborhood improvement projects. A daycare was started to serve Glendale children, and it grew to become one of the city’s most highly regarded childcare programs.¹⁷ Additionally, a community center was constructed in Prospect Field, later renamed Luxton Park, which borders Glendale, intended to serve the whole community. Leaders from the Glendale Residents Action Council, activists in Prospect Park, and East Side Neighborhood Services tirelessly advocated for these services and others. Within a few short years, Glendale was entrenched within the community.

Just four years after the construction of Glendale in 1956, the route proposed for Interstate 94 threatened to destroy half of the project. The transportation department’s map still had the property designated by its former identity as a gravel pit and industrial area. The Pratt School PTA and Prospect Park residents intensely lobbied for the route to be changed. Their efforts, along with pressure from the Housing and Redevelopment Authority, the University of Minnesota, and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, helped reroute the project along the railroad right-of-way slightly to the south and west.¹⁸

Influence of Glendale

Glendale provided an important precedent that the MHRA could successfully construct and manage a public housing project. It inspired three more family-oriented developments throughout the 1950s, which, unlike Glendale, were not

¹⁵ Rice, “Dad, Mom, Children—All Like Glen-dale,” *Minneapolis Star*, October 10, 1952

¹⁶ Rice, “Dad, Mom, Children—All Like Glen-Dale”; “Public Housing Project Is Filled,” *East Minneapolis Argus*, October 13, 1955; A. C. Godward to William T. Middlebrook, March 8, 1951, City of Minneapolis; Aronson, “A Few Good Fights,” 13. v

¹⁷ “First Private Head Start Program Begins,” unidentified clipping from the James K. Hosmer Special Collections, Hennepin County Central Library.

¹⁸ Charlene Roise, Stephanie K. Atwood, and Marjorie Pearson. “Prospect Park Residential Historic District National Register of Historic Places Registration Form,” August 2014, prepared by Hess, Roise and Company

specifically intended for veterans.¹⁹ By the 1960s, MHRA transitioned to high-density projects because lower-density projects could not meet the demand for affordable housing in Minneapolis. During the 1960s, the MHRA constructed 4,200 units across two dozen high-rise public housing projects.

The quality of these larger, high-rise projects was often compromised to cut costs. This meant smaller units, limited amenities, and an inadequate number of elevators, resulting in buildings unsuited for families. The high-rises were often unconnected from the surrounding neighborhoods too, which created rifts detrimental to the projects and the local community.²⁰ Accordingly, these larger projects failed to address the housing crisis as intended.

Due to the problems associated with high-density public housing, MHRA's focus returned to low-density projects in the 1970s, including upgrading earlier properties. In 1970, the agency won a federal grant to improve five existing public housing developments. The money was used to modernize the Sumner Field, Lyndale, Olson, Glenwood, and Glendale developments. At Glendale, kitchens were updated and new hipped roofs, better suited for Minnesota's climate, replaced the original flat roofs.²¹ Only the office wing of 2701-2709 Essex Street and the one-story units in the Type F buildings retained flat roofs (of which there are four).

The community input was typical of Glendale, which exemplified family-friendly, community-oriented public housing—especially in contrast to the larger high rises the MHRA constructed in the 1960s. Its layout, designed to promote a sense of community, achieved its desired effect. The majority of residents were children, who had easy access to Glendale's playgrounds and the nearby park. In March of 1969, Glendale began offering the city's first privately funded Head Start classes. A few years later, the Glendale Child Development Center opened and provided daycare for children living throughout the Prospect Park neighborhood.²²

In 1968, approximately 60 residents of Glendale voted to pressure the city to place low-income people on the Housing and Redevelopment Authority board. The residents wrote Mayor Arthur Naftalin, asking that three of the five commissioners be from housing projects or other low-income areas.²³ The following year, a residents' council was given almost complete control over how to allocate a \$303,000 federal grant. The *Minneapolis Tribune* noted that "many of the residents and almost all the community's leaders are mothers receiving aid-to-dependent-children payments."²⁴

Further exemplifying the community spirit of Glendale, a co-operative store was established in the basement of the unit at 57 Saint Mary's in 1967. Most of its forty-five stockholders were Glendale residents, and the store offered "groceries at lower prices than other nearby stores," according to a newspaper account. "It is the first such store in the Minneapolis area started with the aid of the federal antipoverty program." Its duration is not known.²⁵

In 1981, the Glendale Remodeling and Youth Training program began, which taught Glendale youths between 14 and 21 the basics of construction and building maintenance over the summer. The participants then "used their knowledge to remodel apartments at the Glendale housing project." The program was developed by Oscar Reed, former Minnesota Vikings player and director of the Glendale Youth Program; his assistant, Steve Chirpich; Motley neighborhood Strategy Area staffer Pat Steiger Richardson; and the Glendale community. According to the *Minneapolis Star*, "the response among the teens...was unguardedly enthusiastic," and that Glendale residents also appreciated the work of the kids."²⁶

¹⁹ MHRA, *Three Decades*, n.p.; MPHA, *Twenty Years of Firsts, 1991-2011*, 14.

²⁰ J. A. Stoloff, "A Brief History of Public Housing," accessed June 1, 2015, http://reengageinc.org/research/brief_history_public_housing.pdf.

²¹ MHRA, "MPHA History," accessed April 28, 2015, www.mphaonline.org/about/history; Fred Johnson, "U.S. Grants \$819,000 for Housing Repair," *Minneapolis Tribune*, October 16, 1970; Minneapolis Building Permit Nos. B416646 (July 24, 1969) and B433148 (January 10, 1972), City of Minneapolis.

²² A. C. Godward, "Report to Commissioners," December 5, 1952, City of Minneapolis; "First Private Head Start Program Begins," unidentified clipping from the James K. Hosmer Special Collections, Hennepin County Central Library.

²³ "Poor People Want Places on Board," *Minneapolis Tribune*, August 1st, 1968.

²⁴ "Organizer of Poor Works to Build Power Base," *Minneapolis Tribune*, September 3rd, 1969.

²⁵ Maurcie Hobbs, "Little Co-op Store Planning to Expand," *Minneapolis Star*, November 6, 1967.

²⁶ "Teens learn skills, remodel housing units," *Minneapolis Star*, August 22, 1981.

In the 1970s, the federal government changed its approach to affordable housing when Congress passed the Section 8 Program, which allowed families to seek rental assistance for units in the private market. In the midst of these changes, a report from the Mayor’s Task Force on Public Housing concluded that the city’s public housing stock was beset with “neglected maintenance, unchecked crime, [and] delinquent residents.”²⁷ To address some of these issues at Glendale in particular, the MHRA renovated the interior and exterior of the townhomes in 1988. Interior updates included replacing the majority of the fixtures and finishes in the kitchens and bathrooms, installing new interior doors, and laying new flooring. On the exterior, the renovations were more extensive. The existing flat-roofed porticos were modified into gabled canopies supported by box columns. The cement-asbestos siding on the second floor was replaced with composite siding. All of the windows and exterior doors were also replaced at this time, although the brushed-aluminum framing at the first-floor windows was retained.²⁸

Glendale Townhomes meets criteria 1, 3, and 5 for local designation

To be eligible for designation as a Minneapolis Landmark, the property must meet at least one of the criteria for designation as a landmark or historic district contained in Section 599.210 of the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Regulations. The Glendale Townhomes appear to meet three of the criteria for historic district designation.

- 1) The property is associated with significant events or with periods that exemplify broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history

- 3) The property contains or is associated with distinctive elements of city or neighborhood identity; and

- 5) The property exemplifies a landscape design or development pattern distinguished by innovation, rarity, uniqueness or quality of design or detail.

Glendale Townhomes meets Criteria 1 because it represents the first attempt by the city to directly provide affordable housing to its residents. In particular, it reflects the strategy taken by both Minneapolis and the nation as a whole following the housing shortage after World War II. Glendale Townhomes was the first public housing project developed and built by the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority.

Following World War II, the country experienced a housing crisis as low-income families and returning veterans failed to find housing in cities across the country. The MHRA was created in 1947, two years after the end of World War II, to address this crisis in Minneapolis by clearing slums and providing affordable housing to these veterans and low-income residents. After years of planning, Glendale opened in 1952, signifying the first completed project since MHRA’s establishment five years prior.

Glendale was an important first project for the MHRA that established a precedent for the agency’s subsequent developments. It proved that the organization could plan, construct, and manage a public housing project. In 1959 and 1960, the MHRA used its experience gained from Glendale to construct three more family-oriented developments in north Minneapolis, near Sumner Field. During the 1960s, the MHRA moved away from the low-density model pioneered by Glendale towards the construction of high-rises. This initiative emerged out of the new “202 Program,” which allowed HUD to make loans to nonprofit developers to construct housing for senior citizens.

The MHRA encountered rampant issues in managing and constructing these high-rises, though. The clustered, crowded

²⁷ MPHA, *Twenty Years of Firsts, 1991-2011*, 16; Charles L. Edson, “Affordable Housing—An Intimate History,” *Journal of Affordable Housing* 20 (Winter 2011): 196

²⁸ Meyer Scherer and Rockcastle, “Glendale Modernization Project,” 1988, MPHA; Soon-Har Tan, “Task Force Fault MCDA for Deterioration of Public Housing,” *Southeast*, February 1985.

housing, and concentration of low-income individuals, created challenges for the MHRA. In response to this issue, and to a housing discrimination lawsuit, city and federal officials began to take a different approach that more closely resembled its early projects.²⁹

In 1966 and 1967, Minneapolis began two new programs for housing low-income families based on family-oriented concepts established by Glendale and the other housing projects that followed its model. The MHRA noted, “the basic objective is to offer private homes or apartments to these families in sound or improving neighborhoods throughout the city. A socially and economically typical neighborhood can better help these families than a ‘project’ can.”³⁰ MHRA was one of the first housing authorities in the nation to take up this model of scattered-site development with a focus on families.³¹

Glendale meets Criteria 5 because it illustrates a unique and precedent-setting approach to public housing in its development and landscape design. These elements, which are the most intact original features of the Glendale Townhomes complex and indicate a high degree of historic integrity, continue to influence public housing to this day. The designers of Glendale envisioned that the city’s first public housing project would represent a stark departure from the urban slums that characterized other parts of the city, and instead mirror both the quality and design of private developments, particularly the picturesque, middle-class neighborhood of Prospect Park. In doing so, for the first time, the city provided low-income families with an unprecedented opportunity to occupy high-quality housing and take advantage of family-friendly community spaces on par with private developments in well-established neighborhoods.

Unlike the crowded slums found elsewhere in the city, Glendale provided quality, low-density homes that offered adequate light, space, ventilation, and safe places for children to play. Larson and McLaren, the local architectural firm that designed Glendale, appears to have been influenced by the work of the civil engineers, Samuel Harlan Baker and Joseph H. Gilmore, who laid out much of Prospect Park before Glendale was constructed. Each individual townhome at Glendale has access to a variety of communal spaces integrated throughout the site. There are nine greenspaces, including the triangular side yards in between buildings and large communal greenspaces, some of which are furnished with playground equipment and picnic benches.

Glendale’s focus on a community-centered design with open lawns and shared public spaces was an innovative approach to housing low-income individuals. This design supported the various programs, innovations, and successes that were implemented at Glendale over the decades. The site plan and arrangement of the townhouse complex is intact, demonstrating a high degree of historic integrity, and the design of the property continues to have an effect on the residents of Glendale and a larger influence on public housing in Minneapolis.

Glendale meets Criteria 3 because it exemplifies and continues the distinct setting and features of the adjacent Prospect Park National Historic District but within the context of a public housing project. The developers of Glendale took care to reproduce Prospect Park’s curvilinear street design, irregular blocks, low-scale homes, and communal green spaces to ensure that Glendale integrated seamlessly with the surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, there are a significant number of mature oak trees which define the character of the development. There is also a large rock in one of the communal greenspaces that is often decorated by children who live at Glendale.

Both Prospect Park and Glendale respond to the area’s unique topography, with a curvilinear street plan and irregularly shaped blocks that differ dramatically from the city’s typical grid layout. This distinct design, coupled with the low-density, family-oriented townhouses, allowed for communal and private spaces that were noteworthy amenities for affordable housing at the time. Glendale features nine communal greenspace areas, some of which are furnished with playground

²⁹50 Years: Forging New Traditions in Community Building,” (Minneapolis Community Development Agency, MPHA); 1997.

³⁰ MHRA, Three Decades, 1947-1977: Renewal in Minneapolis (Minneapolis: MHRA, 1977), n.p.

³¹ *Ibid.*

equipment and picnic benches. Many units have direct rear access to these spaces. One landscape feature, evident in the older portion of the neighborhood, is the insertion of a landscaped triangle bounded by concrete curbs at St. Mary's Avenue SE and Williams Avenue SE, similar in scale and character to the triangular medians that have been determined to be contributing resources to the neighboring Prospect Park National Historic District.

Most of the alterations to Glendale have been to the exteriors of the townhomes. The interior alterations are largely cosmetic, consisting of replacement light switches and fixtures, floor tiles, kitchen cabinetry and appliances, and bathroom fixtures, etc. Character-defining features, such as two-panel hinged doors, flat-panel veneer sliding closet doors, and small decorative details such as half-walls and cut-outs at the stair landings, are intact and are clues to the buildings' history and original construction. While alterations to the exterior of the Glendale Townhomes has changed its original external appearance, approximately fifty percent of the historic exterior materials remain intact and sufficiently convey the original design intent of the complex. Alterations to the building roofs, upper story cladding, and portico designs reflect the necessity of changes driven primarily by maintenance and safety concerns, two primary considerations in public housing property management. The overall design of the project, including its site plan and arrangement of buildings, open landscape with front, side, and rear yards, and community-centric layout, remains intact.

Glendale is significant not only because it was the first public housing project undertaken by the MHRA, but also because it provided a blueprint for family-oriented living that the MHRA replicated and eventually revisited in later years after high-rise developments proved less successful. The design of Glendale—its greenspaces, the orientation and style of the structures, and its relationship to the surrounding community—fostered a sense of community and helped catalyze the various programs that emerged out of Glendale over the decades. Glendale retains the integrity of this design and continues to communicate the pioneering and family- and community-focused vision for public housing.

NOMINATION APPLICATION WORKSHEET

Applicant <i>This person will be the primary contact for staff</i>	Name	Cam Gordon
	Mailing Address Including City, State and Zip Code	Minneapolis City Hall 350 South 5th Street, Room 307 Minneapolis, MN 55414
	Phone Number	612 673-2202
	Fax	
	Email	Cam.gordon@minneapolismn.gov
Property Owner	Name	Minneapolis Public Housing Authority
	Mailing Address Including City, State and Zip Code	1001 Washington Ave. N Minneapolis, MN 55401
	Phone Number	612 342-1402 (Jeff Horwich, Communications Manager)
	Fax	
	Email	jhorwich@mplsmpha.org
Property Information	Address(es)	See below *
	Identification Number(s)	30-029-23-13-0034, 30-029-23-24-0019, 30-029-23-24-0020, 30-029-23-31-0003, 30-029-23-31-0004, 30-029-23-42-0029
	Legal Description	Part of the Oakhurst Addition
Historic or Current Name of Property <i>(If applicable)</i>		

NOMINATION APPLICATION

I understand that I must file the nomination application with the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development and obtain approval of this application by the Heritage Preservation Commission in order to conform with the heritage preservation regulations of the City of Minneapolis. I certify that the information which I have supplied in submitting this application is correct and accurate to the best of my knowledge. When I submit this application, I authorize the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development to process the nomination application.

Applicant's name and signature

Date

- ❖ Must be signed and dated by the applicant before the application(s) will be processed.
- ❖ Applications received after 3:30 p.m. will be processed as received on the following business day.
- ❖ Development Services staff may identify additional applications upon further analysis of the proposed project.

***PID Addresses**

30-029-23-13-0034 34 Williams Avenue; 30-029-23-24-0019 2701 Essex Street SE
 30-029-23-24-0020 44 St. Marys Avenue; 30-029-23-31-0003 96 St. Marys Avenue*
 30-029-23-31-0004 2838 Delaware Street; SE30-029-23-42-0029 42 Williams Avenue