

United States Department of the Interior
 National Park Service

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 1

NARRATIVE STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The civil engineers who laid out the Prospect Park plats, Samuel Harlan Baker and Joseph H. Gilmore, were influenced by the work of their contemporary, Horace William Shaler (H. W. S.) Cleveland, and the picturesque landscape designs that are a hallmark of the era. Upon the framework of these plats, the residents shaped Prospect Park’s character and appearance. The neighborhood is significant as the home of the first community association in the city of Minneapolis, the Prospect Park Improvement Association (PPIA). The PPIA quickly established itself as a major influence, effecting changes ranging from the removal of weeds to the construction of the neighborhood’s iconic water tower. The community’s culture was enriched by its proximity to the University of Minnesota, which drew many academics to Prospect Park.

The Prospect Park Historic District is one of three suburban-type developments that were established in Minneapolis in the late nineteenth century. While the architectural design in the other two, Kenwood and Washburn Park, is relatively homogeneous, following the pattern of many of the city’s neighborhoods, the houses in Prospect Park display a spectrum of the residential styles that appeared in Minneapolis during the late nineteenth century and the twentieth century. The inclusion of unique designs by Frank Lloyd Wright, Elizabeth and Winston Close, and other prominent local architects further diversifies the architectural range of the neighborhood. Many architects have chosen to live in Prospect Park.

The Prospect Park neighborhood is both representative and unique. Its cohesive sense of community was a pioneering model for Minneapolis neighborhoods, qualifying the district for the National Register under **Criterion A** in the area of **Social History**. The Prospect Park Water Tower and Tower Hill Park, which are important features in the historic district, are already listed in the National Register under **Criterion C**. The historic district’s period of significance begins when both divisions of Prospect Park were officially recognized by the City of Minneapolis in 1884. It ends in 1968 with the construction of Interstate 94, which decisively delineated the south boundary of the district.

Criteria Considerations

Prospect Park as a whole was laid out in the nineteenth century, and the majority of houses and other resources in the district are more than fifty years old. There are also houses less than fifty years of age that conform to the historic plan and continue the diverse architectural tradition of Prospect Park. As a result, these houses are contributing resources under **Criterion Consideration G**. For this reason, and because of the importance of Interstate 94 in further defining the community, the period of significance extends to the freeway’s construction in 1968.

LATE NINETEENTH-CENTURY SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT : THE NATIONAL AND LOCAL CONTEXT

A Time of Upheaval

In his classic study, *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870–1900*, Sam Bass Warner observed that during that era, “three sets of experiences and three associated ideas informed men’s life in the city: The increasing industrialization of work was accompanied by the idea of romantic capitalism; The experience of immigration gave rise to nostalgic nationalisms; The impact of ever more

United States Department of the Interior
 National Park Service

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 2

intensive urbanization called forth the emotional reaction of the rural ideal.” Warner wrote that the prosperity associated with industrialization “gave contemporary enterprise a romantic quality. For the majority of men prosperity and happiness in this capitalistic era required the acceptance of its three disciplines: hard work, thrift, and education.”¹

There were comparable sentiments in Minneapolis, where the population skyrocketed from 32,721 in 1875 to 129,200 in 1885, 202,718 in 1900, and 380,582 in 1920. The city boomed as lumber milling and, to an even greater extent, flour milling, went from being small-scale, local operations to international industries that demanded massive facilities and legions of workers. At the same time, economic and political conditions in Europe compelled millions of people to leave their homelands and journey to the United States in search of a better life. Warner noted that “industrialization and immigration together fired the economy of nineteenth century Boston.” This was equally true in Minneapolis where foreign-born whites were 32 percent of the population in 1880 and peaked at 36.8 percent in 1890. That proportion had dropped to 23.1 percent by 1920, but the absolute number of foreign-born whites reached a record of 88,032 that year. There was also internal migration as young people, particularly women, were lured away from rural America to burgeoning urban centers. According to sociologist Calvin Schmid: “In an agricultural region like Minnesota, women have many more economic opportunities in large cities than on farms. . . . Women, especially young women, manifest a definite inclination to migrate urbanward.” This enormous influx of immigrants and youth, while necessary to sustain the industrial expansion, brought a sense of instability to urban communities.²

Norms were also challenged as the middle class, swelled by the professionals and managers associated with the new industrial order, became a prominent social and economic force. “For the average Boston family the formula of hard work, thrift, and education meant a 48- to 55-hour work week for the father, little vacation for the family, and emphasis on the education of the children and financial gain,” Warner explained. “The ultimate test of the family’s success and the key to its social standing rested within the capitalist framework—how much money did the family have, how much property did it control? To have such goals, and to live such a life, was, in the nineteenth century, to be a middle class American.” Warner added: “Such goals were generally shared in the society, as can be seen by the rapid multiplication of stores and businesses; the increase in home ownership; the frequent use of the words ‘middle class’ as a term of wide inclusiveness; the constant repetition of capitalist goals in popular literature; and, in family histories and reminiscences, the almost universal description of success by thrift, hard work, and education.”³

A similar pattern was seen in Minneapolis, where local industries helped to propel the rise of the middle class. Historian Lucille Kane noted that the mills at Saint Anthony Falls employed thousands of workers and produced millions of dollars of goods, but added: “Impressive as these statistics are, they do not measure the total importance of the water-power industries in the economic life of Minneapolis during

¹ Sam Bass Warner, Jr., *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870–1900* (New York: Atheneum, 1969), 5, 7.
² *Ibid.*, 5; Calvin F. Schmid, *Social Saga of Two Cities: An Ecological and Statistical Study of Social Trends in Minneapolis and St. Paul* (Minneapolis: Minneapolis Council of Social Agencies, Bureau of Social Research, 1937), 5–6, 105–106, 129–131.
³ Warner, *Streetcar Suburbs*, 8.

United States Department of the Interior
 National Park Service

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property Hennepin County, MN
County and State N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 3

this period. They do not reflect, for example, the main activities which were related to the mills at the falls—the manufacturing of water wheels, milling equipment, and flour barrels, the cutting, driving, and booming of logs, the outfitting of lumbermen, the trading and storage of wheat, and the transportation, sale, and marketing of raw materials and manufactured products. Nor do the figures take into account the hundreds of bankers, doctors, lawyers, teachers, merchants, millwrights, and others who were drawn to the community to provide the services needed by the growing population.”⁴

As the middle class grew, young people were no longer required to work at an early age and the concept of childhood blossomed. The greater availability of education led to a profound change in expectations for how the first decades of life would be spent. At the same time, more training was required to get ahead in the workplace. As Warner noted, “Education was both a tool and a source of status and pleasure. At the lowest level the new industrial society created jobs that needed workers who could read, write, and do arithmetic. The well-paid and rewarding jobs in law, engineering, finance, and business increasingly required educated men who could handle words, numbers, and ideas. With the elaboration of the society and its tools, high school, technical school, and even college and professional education became every year more necessary job criteria. In addition education brought social standing, for people tended to associate class with different levels of training and rising scales of financial reward.”⁵

Education was a priority even before Minnesota became a state. A law passed by the territorial legislature in 1849 required free schooling for anyone between the ages of four and twenty-one. This early interest, according to historian Theodore Blegen, was “evidence of the stalwart pioneer belief in education throughout its range from common schools to college and university. Land and the means of subsistence were essential, but not in themselves the end of the rainbow. Native-born and immigrants alike had dreams of opportunity for their children, and education was regarded as the road to their realization.” The public school infrastructure evolved in subsequent decades and became well-established in the early twentieth century. Writing in the late 1930s, Schmid commented that “the pronounced increase in the senior high school enrollment for Minneapolis since 1900 is especially noteworthy.”⁶

The foundation was also laid for the University of Minnesota in the mid-nineteenth century. It gained momentum in 1869 with the arrival of William Watts Folwell as president and the launch of a college curriculum. Only two students participated in the first graduation ceremony in 1873, but enrollment soon grew. A graduate school was founded in 1905 and specialized professional programs were added steadily, including the first collegiate School of Nursing in 1909. In addition to its substantial role in education, the university became an important economic influence, providing employment for a large cadre of academics, administrators, and other staff. Many looked for housing in the vicinity, influencing the development and character of a nearby neighborhood, Prospect Park.⁷

⁴ Lucille M. Kane, *The Falls of St. Anthony: The Waterfall that Built Minneapolis* (1966; updated edition, Saint Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1987), 98–99.

⁵ Warner, *Streetcar Suburbs*, 8.

⁶ Theodore C. Blegen, *Minnesota: A History of the State* (1963; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1975), 186; Schmid, *Social Saga of Two Cities*, 32.

⁷ Blegen, *Minnesota: A History of the State*, 420–424.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 4

Minneapolis's In-Town Suburbs

Given all of these social and economic changes, the nineteenth century was a time of upheaval and it is not surprising that nostalgia grew for an earlier era, before cities developed an insatiable appetite for people and land. The "rural ideal" was brought into the city by picturesque parks produced by the newly emerging profession of landscape architecture. The concept of the picturesque landscape that was the rage in Europe was embraced with open arms on this side of the Atlantic. Dramatic natural landscapes were exploited as settlement moved west—and naturalistic landscapes were created where they did not exist for those who had the money. Wealthy patrons supported not only the improvement of their own estates but often helped to established urban park systems in the nascent communities that were growing with great vigor across the country. This was enlightened self-interest: in addition to providing an amenity to attract and retain workers for their businesses, it raised the value of their speculative real estate investments. The economic motive was overtly discussed by the promoters behind the creation of Minneapolis's exceptional park system.

On a smaller scale, the rural ideal was sometimes applied to residential subdivisions. This was not common within the boundaries of the city of Minneapolis. More frequently, on the flat terrain that generally characterized the edge-of-prairie landscape, Minneapolis developers took the easy route and imposed a grid on the land.

There were a few noteworthy exceptions, though, where suburban-type developments were laid out in Minneapolis in the late nineteenth century: Kenwood, Washburn Park, and Prospect Park. The genesis of each shared several factors. The first was topography, thanks to the influences of glacial activity thousands of years ago. Kenwood had a ridge nicknamed the "Devil's Back Bone," Washburn Park had the gorge of Minnehaha Creek, and Prospect Park had a rugged hill, the highest point in Minneapolis. All were located at relatively high elevations. As a result, it was difficult to procure adequate water pressure from the existing municipal system, so each received a water tower. Kenwood, Washburn Park, and Prospect Park claimed the only three water towers in the city, and these structures quickly become emblematic for their respective neighborhoods. Residents also had access to natural water bodies: Lake of the Isles, Minnehaha Creek and Lake Harriet, and the Mississippi River, respectively. These amenities were promoted by boosters who shared endless enthusiasm and an unwavering belief in the superiority of the areas they promoted—until proven otherwise, in some cases, by a dearth of buyers.

This was not a problem for Kenwood, which was platted by 1880 on one of the highest elevations in the city, a "gently undulated plateau, which forms the bluffs westerly from [Loring] Park and Hennepin Avenue to Cedar Lake."⁸ The area was close to the city's burgeoning park system, which included the Chain of Lakes and Kenwood Parkway. The latter roadway was soon lined with substantial, architect-designed houses. Nearby Lake of the Isles underwent several dredging campaigns in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that transformed it from a mosquito-breeding marsh into a fashionable address.⁹

⁸ David A. Lanegran and Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Lake District of Minneapolis: A History of the Calhoun-Isles Community* (Saint Paul: Living Historical Museum, 1979), 33, 86.

⁹ *Ibid.*

United States Department of the Interior
 National Park Service

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 5

Even more than these amenities, though, Kenwood’s proximity to downtown Minneapolis stimulated its development. Early advertisements boasted that Kenwood was only a “five minute drive” to Hennepin Avenue and promised that city water pipes were being laid to the neighborhood. The promotion drew three dozen residences by 1892, and by the turn of the century, Kenwood was almost completely developed. Because of the rapidity of the build-out, the housing stock was very homogeneous, reflecting the stylistic preferences of the day. Most of the residences were large, frame Queen Anne-influenced residences.¹⁰

Washburn Park had a more unusual history and saw less success in attracting homeowners in its early years. Development began in the area in 1882 when Cadwaller C. Washburn, former Wisconsin governor and Minneapolis flour baron, passed away, leaving \$375,000 to found and endow an orphan’s home at Minneapolis. His will stipulated that the site be outside of the city limits, have plenty of shade, and be a convenient distance from downtown. Washburn’s brother, William, chose a “beautifully wooded tract” at Nicollet Avenue and Fiftieth Street for the Washburn Memorial Orphan Asylum, which opened in November 1886.¹¹

The orphanage was situated in the Washburn Park plat, which was included in a large area annexed by Minneapolis in 1887. At the same time, the Nicollet Line of the streetcar system was extended to Fiftieth Street, enabling easy access between Washburn Park and the rest of the metropolitan area. The plat had the cache of being designed by Horace Cleveland only a couple of years after the city’s park commissioners had retained him to lay out a comprehensive park and parkway system for Minneapolis. Whereas Kenwood was valued for its close proximity to the downtown, Washburn Park was advertised as a place “where the men of business can get away from the noise of the city and inconvenience of small lots and crowded neighborhoods.” None of these reasons, though, was a strong enough draw to bring the sort of quick-paced development seen in Kenwood. Its “large rustic lots” were slow to sell. Only twenty houses were constructed during the first three decades after its platting. The pace did not pick up until after 1910, when the Thorpe Brothers Realty Company purchased a large section of the undeveloped area, subdivided the lots into smaller parcels, and realigned some of the streets. The population soon boomed to nearly 150 households.¹²

Prospect Park faced a challenge similar to that of Washburn Park. It was located three miles from downtown Minneapolis, a substantial distance in the 1880s. After an initial period of slow growth, the pace picked up with the introduction of an interurban line between Minneapolis and Saint Paul in 1890 and, more importantly, the launch of streetcar service on University Avenue in 1896. A residential island edged by industrial and institutional land uses, including the University of Minnesota, Prospect Park was to have a unique evolution that distinguished it from the other in-town “suburbs” of Kenwood and Washburn Park.¹³

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Thomas W. Balcom, “A Tale of Two Towers: Washburn Park and Its Water Supply,” *Minnesota History* 49 (Spring 1984): 20.

¹² Ibid., 21, 23–24; Susan Granger and Scott Kelly, “Final Report of the I-35W Standing Structures Survey,” May 1994, prepared by Gemini Research for the Minnesota Department of Transportation, 29.

¹³ Curran and Roise, “Prospect Park Water Tower and Tower Hill Park,” 8-3.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 6

PROSPECT PARK, AN URBAN SUBURB

The "Park" Is Platted

Prospect Park is located at the eastern boundary of Minneapolis, adjacent to the city of Saint Paul. Originally part of Ramsey County, which was established in 1849, the area was transferred to Hennepin County in 1856 and became part of the town of Saint Anthony. The City of Minneapolis did not annex this section until 1883 during a period when the city's boundaries were substantially expanded. Real estate developer Louis F. Menage (1850–1924)¹⁴ had purchased a large undeveloped tract of land in the town of Saint Anthony in 1878 and subsequently hired the civil engineering team of S. Harlan Baker and J. H. Gilmore to survey and plat the area for development. Shortly after the area was annexed by Minneapolis, Menage petitioned the city council in 1883 and 1884 to accept two plats: Prospect Park, First Division, and Prospect Park, Second Division. By 1892, the two divisions were split into three, the First Division Revised, Second Division Revised, and Third Division. Menage's plats were bounded by Emerald Street (the city limit) on the east; a portion of Territorial Road (later Fourth Street Southeast) and University Avenue on the north; portions of Williams Avenue and Arthur Avenue to the line of Orlin Avenue on the west; Seymour Avenue between Orlin and Sharon on the west; and Sharon Avenue on the south. Both plats incorporated curvilinear street patterns and irregular lot sizes that accommodated the topography, although the four blocks in the Second Division between Franklin Avenue (originally called Hazel and later Hamline Avenue) and Sharon Avenue are rectilinear in form. The lots in the First Division (north of Orlin in the east section and a line extending west from Orlin) have wider frontages, usually fifty feet, while the lots in the Second Division are only twenty-five feet wide in front, except those at the ends of the blocks, which are thirty-five feet wide.¹⁵

Early Residential Construction

With the acceptance of the plats, Menage turned to the Minneapolis real estate company of Farnsworth and Wolcott to promote Prospect Park. The company took out advertisements in local periodicals extolling the area. One read:

¹⁴ Menage was born in Rhode Island and raised in Massachusetts. After coming to Minnesota in 1871, he began to buy land throughout much of Minneapolis for residential development during the decade. He extended his real estate empire to the Pacific Northwest, but his financial backing was shaky. As the head of Northwestern Guaranty Loan Company, he commissioned its home building. Better known as the Metropolitan Building, it was most famous skyscraper of the nineteenth century in downtown Minneapolis and was designed by E. Townsend Mix around a twelve-story central atrium. After the company defaulted on its many unsecured loans in the wake of the Panic of 1893, Menage fled to Guatemala with his wife and daughter, returning to stand trial in 1899. The charges were dismissed by the Hennepin County attorney due to lack of witnesses and the previous failure to convict William Streeter, the company vice president. Menage then relocated to New Brunswick, New Jersey, and carried on real estate development in New York and New Jersey until his death. For background on Menage, see Loring Staples, "The Decline and Fall of Louis Menage," *Hennepin County History* (1983): 3–16; Penny Jacobson, "Platting Prospect Park was a Tortuous Affair," *Southeast* (Minneapolis), October 1986. In his book, *Lost Twin Cities*, author Larry Millett discusses the Northwestern Guaranty Loan Company Building and Menage's real estate investments. Larry Millett, *Lost Twin Cities* (Saint Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1992), 223.

¹⁵ Menage's requests for his Prospect Park plats before the Minneapolis City Council are recorded in *City Council Proceedings* 9 (May 2, 1883): 45; (June 9, 1883): 97; 10 (October 1, 1884): 408; (October 15, 1884): 428; (October 22, 1884): 435. Jacobson reproduces a copy of the original plats signed by Menage, Baker, and Gilmore. The lot widths are depicted in G. M. Hopkins, *A Complete Set of Surveys and Plats of Properties in the City of Minneapolis* (Minneapolis: G. M. Hopkins, 1885), pl. 17. *City of Minneapolis* (Minneapolis: C. M. Foote and Company, 1892), pl. 32, shows the revised plats.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 7

Prospect Park is a high, finely wooded tract near the University of Minnesota, fronting on University Avenue—the main thoroughfare between Minneapolis and St. Paul. This is the finest residence property in Minneapolis, and commands a view of the entire city, of Hamline, Merriam Park, Minnesota Transfer, and a good share of St. Paul, with Fort Snelling in the distance. Arrangements have been recently made for the erection of \$40,000 of first-class residences the coming season. This property is offered on reasonable terms. . . . Plats, map of territory between Minneapolis and St. Paul, and all necessary information furnished on application.¹⁶

Construction began slowly, partly because of the topography and partly because of the relative isolation of Prospect Park from the rest of the city. The area was also bounded by two railroad lines, the Chicago, Milwaukee, and Saint Paul (also called the Short Line or Union Depot Line) with a spur line along the east bank of the river to the southwest, and the Saint Paul and Northern Pacific Railway from Saint Paul to Minneapolis (running over the Stone Arch Bridge) to the north. A depot was established at Eustis Street west of Malcolm Avenue.

Much of the early construction occurred on and close to University Avenue. One early investor was Benjamin D. Sprague, who purchased property in 1884 on Blocks 5 and 17 of the Prospect Park First Division (both blocks are in the east section) and built several houses during the next two years. He built a house for himself and his family in the middle of Lots 1 and 2 of Block 17 at the intersection of Seymour and Clarence that had the address of 11 Seymour. It was replaced in 1897 by the present house at 1 Seymour. Other surviving buildings by Sprague are at 15–17 Seymour Avenue (1885, Orff Brothers, altered to a duplex in 1914), 88 Orlin Avenue (1886, with additions in the 1950s and 1970s that have obscured its original appearance), and 52–54 Melbourne (1886, built as a barn, moved from 3314–3316 University in 1914 and converted into a duplex).¹⁷

The Reverend Thomas McClary, minister of the Thirteenth Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, built a house at 73 Seymour Avenue in 1885. Closer to the west section of the Prospect Park First Division were two houses built by Alfred Humphreys: 34 Arthur Avenue (1885) was designed by architect W. S. Hunt, and 70 Arthur Avenue (1889) was designed by Graff and Chamberlin. Sarah A. McGeough built a house in 1886 at 119 Bedford Street in the Prospect Park Second Division. Another early investor was the architect Lowell A. Lamoreaux, who purchased a large piece of property at the intersection of Seymour and Clarence and built his own house (39 Seymour Avenue) and barn in 1887–1888. Several other houses were constructed in 1887 along Clarence Avenue: 25–27 Clarence Avenue for E. L. Manson; 54–56 Clarence Avenue for Nels A. Akerson; 64 Clarence Avenue for W. A. Alden, designed

¹⁶ *The Northwest*, December 1884, 17. The company promoted the adjacent Meeker Island Land and Power Co. Addition to the west in the same ad, although that addition was oriented to manufacturing, as the Union Depot line of the Chicago, Milwaukee and Saint Paul Railroad ran through the property.

¹⁷ The railroad lines and the depot are illustrated in *Davison's Atlas of the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minnesota* (Minneapolis: C. Wright Davison, 1887), pl. 38. For expansion of the Northern Pacific line see Richard S. Prosser, *Rails to the North Star: A Minnesota Railroad Atlas* (1966; reprint, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 159. The depot is also discussed in J. P. S. La Sha, "The Secret History of Prospect Park's Depot," *Tower Talks* 6 (July 1979): 10. For Sprague, see Allen H. Gibas, "The History of Prospect Park," research paper, Macalester College, 1965, 6; Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 15–17; *The Dual City Blue Book 1893–1894* (Minneapolis: R. L. Polk and Company, 1894). The building dates and addresses are taken from Minneapolis building permit records.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 8

by architect Fred E. Hoover; and 79 Clarence Avenue for M. E. Hinshaw.¹⁸

A handful of houses with dates of 1889 and 1890 are scattered throughout the district, but development did not begin in earnest until after 1890, when the first interurban street railway began serving University Avenue. Operated by the Minneapolis Street Railway and Saint Paul City Railway, later part of the Twin City Rapid Transit Company, the line connected downtown Saint Paul and downtown Minneapolis, while passing south of the University of Minnesota campus. The introduction of such a transportation line was a key element in establishing and promoting a suburban-type neighborhood.¹⁹

Construction occurred in all the platted divisions of Prospect Park during the 1890s and the first decade of the twentieth century. The portion of the Prospect Park First Division north of University Avenue was split off as the Prospect Park Third Division by 1892. (None of the lots in the Third Division are included in the historic district.) At about the same time, a section along the west and north side of Arthur Avenue was split off as Andrus's Addition. A section of Arthur Avenue that extended through the block to Williams Avenue was included in Oakhurst's Addition, platted in about 1884 (later Nickel's First Addition). It includes the addresses 92 through 138 Arthur Avenue and 142 Arthur Place; the earliest house in this section dates from 1901.

The southern parts of the Prospect Park area were platted for development in about 1903, extending south of Sharon Avenue between Seymour Avenue and Emerald Street and south of Melbourne Avenue between Malcolm Avenue and Seymour Avenue to the Chicago, Milwaukee and Saint Paul railroad right-of-way. In these plats—Prospect Park Heights, Watson's Prospect Place Addition, and Carter and Stone's Addition—the streets were primarily laid out with the more familiar rectangular grid pattern that characterizes most of the city, with relatively narrow, rectilinear lots. The terrain slopes down gradually from north to south and east to west, towards the valley of the Mississippi River to the southwest. While Seymour and Warwick Streets have notable inclines, the elevation of Emerald Street is flat.²⁰

A Community Grows

In part because of what was initially an isolated location, Prospect Park quickly developed a strong sense of community, a position that was reinforced by its organizations and institutions. The first of

¹⁸ The addresses, dates, and owner names are taken from Minneapolis building permit records. Houses with two address numbers were later converted to duplexes. These are surviving houses; others built in the early years may have been moved or demolished. See also Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 15, 24.

¹⁹ For De Lancey and Eustis Park, see J. P. S. La Sha, "The De Lanceys," *Tower Talks* 6 (March 1979): 3, and Peter La Sha, "Emily Samantha Eustis, Building of Eustis Park (4th St.)," *Tower Talks* 6 (March 1979): 2. John W. Diers and Aaron Isaacs, *Twin Cities by Trolley: The Streetcar Era in Minneapolis and St. Paul* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 197–201, discusses the University Avenue streetcar line. On the importance of transportation lines for residential suburbs see Ames and McClelland, 16–20. The University of Minnesota campus was much smaller in 1890 than it is today and was concentrated in an area called the Knoll, just south of University Avenue near Fifteenth Avenue SE.

²⁰ The revised Prospect Park, First and Second Division, plats are shown on *City of Minneapolis* (1892), pl. 32, and *Atlas of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota* (Minneapolis: C. M. Foote Publishing Company, 1898), pl. 32. The newly platted divisions—Prospect Park Heights, Watson's Prospect Place Addition, and Carter and Stone's Addition—are hand-drawn on plate 35 of James E. Egan, *Atlas of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minnesota* (Minneapolis: Minneapolis Real Estate Board, 1903).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 9

these organizations was the Prospect Park Study Club, a women's group founded in 1896, under the leadership of Effie Lindsay, the wife of Frederick F. Lindsay, to promote intellectual activities for its members. The group was formed from the first twenty families to settle in the neighborhood, and the members were among the socially prominent, upper-middle-class women of the area.²¹ In 1899, a "Mothers' Circle of Prospect Park," also headed by Mrs. Lindsay, was founded for talks, readings, and discussions on child training and education. This was superseded by a Parent-Teachers Association (PTA) in 1916.²²

The population of Prospect Park had increased enough by the end of the nineteenth century that the residents petitioned the Minneapolis Board of Education to construct an elementary school in the neighborhood. Until that time, the children of Prospect Park had attended the Motley School at University Avenue and Oak Street. As a result of this initiative, the Sidney Pratt School was built at 66 Malcolm Avenue, between Sidney Place and Orlin Avenue, in 1898. Designed by Minneapolis school architect Edward S. Stebbins, the building was constructed by Peter W. De Lancey. The school's namesake, Sidney Pratt, was the first Minnesota casualty in the Spanish-American War and the son of Robert Pratt, a former president of the Board of Education, who was the mayor of Minneapolis when the school was built. The senior Pratt was married to Irene Lamoreaux. Her relative, architect Lowell A. Lamoreaux, a ten-year Prospect Park resident, served as master of ceremonies for the opening of the school. Cyrus Northrop, president of the University of Minnesota, gave the opening remarks.²³

Churches were another sign of the community's maturation, with three religious organizations established in the neighborhood by the early twentieth century. The Prospect Park Methodist Episcopal Church, now the Prospect Park United Methodist Church, was founded in 1902. The first church building was replaced by the present building at 22 Orlin Avenue in 1914 (Photograph 4). From its beginnings, the Methodist church members have played an active role in community affairs, and the building has been regularly used for local activities.²⁴ Saint Timothy's Episcopal Mission (an offshoot of Holy Trinity Episcopal Church located at Fourth Street and Fourth Avenue Southeast) was founded in 1910. Lamoreaux's architectural firm, by that time Long, Lamoreaux and Long, built the chapel at 21 Clarence Avenue in 1911 (Photograph 13). (It was later taken over by a New Apostolic Church

²¹ The number of members seems to have been limited from 24 to 31, with 8 to 10 associate members, according to a review of published membership lists. Similar clubs were founded throughout Minneapolis and other Minnesota cities in the late nineteenth century. The clubs in turn were organized into the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs, founded in 1895. The records of the Prospect Park Study Club and many other clubs are available in the Minneapolis Collection, Minneapolis Central Library. See also Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 72; Claire Aronson, "A Few Good Fights," *Hennepin History* 54 (Winter 1995): 5. Notices of the meetings of the Prospect Park Study Club, as well as other social news, regularly appeared under the heading of "Prospect Park" in the *Minneapolis Tribune*, one of the local newspapers.

²² Gibas, "The History of Prospect Park," 14; Prospect Park History Committee, 63.

²³ Sidney Pratt died in the Philippines of "typhoid malaria." Gibas, "The History of Prospect Park," 13-14; Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 62-64; "Honor to a Hero; Sidney Pratt School, in Prospect Park, Formally Opened," *Minneapolis Tribune*, November 26, 1898.

²⁴ Gibas, "The History of Prospect Park," 14-16; Wick, "Prospect Park One-of-a-Kind Neighborhood," 7; *Hudson's Dictionary of Minneapolis: A Guide and Handbook* (Minneapolis: Hudson Company, 1925), 102. For several years in the 1920s, the Men's Club of the Methodist Episcopal Church published a monthly Prospect Park Community Bulletin called the *Watchtower*, available at the Minnesota Historical Society. The addresses are taken from various editions of the *Dual City Blue Book* (Minneapolis: R. L. Polk and Company).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District

Name of Property

Hennepin County, MN

County and State

N/A

Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 10

congregation and now houses a Korean Seventh-day Adventist congregation.)²⁵ The third religious institution, the Prospect Park Norwegian Lutheran Church, was established in 1912 in a church building that had been moved from a site near the University of Minnesota and the Washington Avenue Bridge to 2210 Franklin Avenue, between Bedford Street and Emerald Street. The church was later occupied by the Prospect Park Community Baptist Church and is now Saint Panteleimon Russian Orthodox Church.²⁶

The presence of churches in Prospect Park was not unusual; most Minneapolis neighborhoods held at least one religious building by the early twentieth century. Neighborhood schools were also common. Kenwood had an elementary school by 1889. Prospect Park's community organization, though, is a more unique resource, a hallmark of the neighborhood's historical development that remains an active force today. Founded in 1901, the Prospect Park Improvement Association (PPIA), later renamed the Prospect Park East River Road Improvement Association (PPERRIA), is one of the earliest organizations of its kind in the Twin Cities and the oldest in Minneapolis.

Residents established the PPIA "for the mutual good of the district and themselves" and to "defend the area with its hills and trees, its nearness to the restless Mississippi and its view of the Minneapolis skyline from the encroachment of industry." Among the association's founding members were Wilbur J. Hartzell, Jacob Hafstad, Harry Benton, Charles Ramsdell, and George Luxton. Hartzell, the organization's first president, was an officer of the Crescent Elevator Company and built the large Colonial Revival house at 1 Seymour Avenue in 1897. Hafstad, a Norwegian immigrant, was a master carpenter by trade who, in 1894, built the picturesque Queen Anne style house at 159 Arthur Avenue. Benton was the assistant city clerk. Ramsdell, a landscape architect, was the local representative of Boston landscape architect Warren H. Manning, who was planning parks for the Minneapolis Board of Park Commissioners. Luxton was chief photographer for the *Minneapolis Journal*. All built their houses after the founding of the association. In the association's first year, it instituted prizes for the best front yards and gardens. It worked for the installation of electric lights in houses, and in 1904 it lobbied the local alderman and representatives of the Minneapolis Gas Light Company to get more gas lighting in houses and on the streets. In the summers of 1908 and 1909, the association "spent quite a sum of money in cutting all the weeds from the vacant lots throughout the park."²⁷

²⁵ Gibas, "The History of Prospect Park," 14–16; Wick, "Prospect Park One-of-a-Kind Neighborhood," 9; *Hudson's Dictionary*, 58.

²⁶ "First Service Tonight in New Lutheran Church"; *Hudson's Dictionary*, 98. A photograph dated 1935 shows the building as the Prospect Park Baptist Church; Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 70. Elvira Betlach, "Southeast History Told by Native Woman," *Minneapolis Argus*, October 3, 1963, October 10, 1963, includes a picture of the church, but gives an inaccurate account of its history.

²⁷ "To Improve Prospect Park," *Minneapolis Tribune*, November 4, 1901; Gibas, "The History of Prospect Park," 16–17. June Barnhill and J. P. S. La Sha, "Hafstad's House Now Historic," *Tower Talks* 9 (July–August 1982): 3, 11. Benton built a house at 112 Arthur Avenue in 1907, but the 1910 census shows him living at 92 Malcolm Avenue; 1910 United States Federal Census, Minnesota, Hennepin County, Minneapolis, Ward 2, Sheet 16A. "Community Notes," *Watchtower* 1 (March 1924): 4. Ramsdell built a house at 46 Barton Avenue in 1909. His association with Manning is noted in *Catalog of the First Annual Exhibition of the Minneapolis Architectural Club, 1909, in the Galleries of the Builders' Exchange, April 17 to May 3, 1909*. Luxton built his house at 138 Arthur Avenue in 1910, recording the process in a series of photographs. His photograph collection is now available at the Minnesota Historical Society. See Aronson, "A Few Good Fights," 5, for early association efforts. Many of the early houses built in the area had both gas piping and electric wiring. Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 9. For weed cutting: "Prospect Park Is Kept Spic and Span," *Minneapolis Tribune*, June 6, 1909.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 11

The PPIA enthusiastically supported the Minneapolis Board of Park Commissioners in the practice of planting trees along streets and boulevards, thus enhancing the attractiveness of the neighborhood. The trees lining University Avenue and the other streets of the neighborhood are very visible in historic views and aerial photographs. Charles M. Loring, the first president of the Board of Park Commissioners, is credited with implementing a tree-planting program that made Minneapolis “one of the most uniformly tree-adorned cities of the country.” The board was authorized to plant trees along the streets and assess the costs to adjacent property owners.²⁸

During the first two decades of its existence, the PPIA broadened its initiatives to improve the quality of life in the neighborhood. It defended the residential character of the neighborhood from threatened or suspected incursions from institutional and industrial land uses in surrounding areas. In 1910, a committee met with three telephone companies to discuss an overabundance of telephone poles cluttering streetscapes. The following year it made what the *Minneapolis Tribune* called “a declaration of war that it [would] not stand for leniency to persons found guilty of speeding.” During World War I, PPIA members were involved in canvassing their district for the Liberty Loan Drive.²⁹

After the war, the PPIA petitioned the city for a 75-foot- to 100-foot-wide, four-block-long mall along University Avenue that would “forestall industrial plans encroaching on Prospect Park and assure that section always remain a residence district.” The economic effects of the Roaring Twenties were destabilizing for many, and members voted unanimously in expressing their favor for a home rule charter to “meet the emergencies of our local government, caused by the excessively high prices of labor and commodities and the general extraordinary conditions produced by the World War.” The proposed charter called for increasing teachers’ salaries and addressing the problems of the streetcars and gas company. The “inadequate trolley service” prompted the PPIA to draft resolutions to the charter commission to consider city-owned bus lines. Another resolution by the association encouraged the adoption of a citywide daylight saving plan.³⁰

Its work to maintain the quality of life sometimes reflected contemporary prejudices that have been reproached by later generations. Such was the case in the early twentieth century when African Americans began moving into the neighborhood. The first was Madison Jackson, an African American railroad porter for the Soo Line, who built a substantial brick house in 1908 at 2003 Franklin Avenue. While Jackson was reluctantly tolerated, the atmosphere changed when W. H. Simpson, a friend of Jackson and fellow railroad porter, purchased a lot and started building a house near Jackson’s on Melbourne Avenue. In October 1909, 125 “aroused citizens,” including businessmen and professionals of Minneapolis, assembled at the Simpson home. A prepared paper was read to the family stating in

²⁸ Theodore Wirth, *Minneapolis Park System, 1883–1944* (Minneapolis: Minneapolis Board of Park Commissioners, 1945), 39, 207; Gibas, “The History of Prospect Park,” 12, 18.

²⁹ “Phone Co.’s Plan Is Held Up,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, April 23, 1910; “Mercy to Chauffeur Hit,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, April 22, 1911; “Street Opening Is Favored,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, August 19, 1911; “Prospect Park Body to Aid Liberty Campaign,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, October 16, 1917.

³⁰ “University Avenue Mall Is Requested: Prospect Park Residents Would Forestall Encroachment of Industrial Plants,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, September 11, 1919; “Prospect Park for Home Rule Charter,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, April 15, 1920; “Short Cuts in City’s News,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, January 14, 1921; “Prospect Park Residents Urge Daylight Saving Plan,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, April 21, 1921.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property Hennepin County, MN
County and State N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 12

part that “the white residents of this district do not want members of your race domiciled in our midst, if there is any way which men of judgment, prudence and determination can adopt to prevent it. . . . To wit: We do not want you.” At a meeting of the PPIA in January 1910, two committees presented the results of their legal research to oust the Simpsons from the neighborhood. By the end of the month, negotiations between Simpson and the PPIA had broken down.³¹

Residents were also opposed to the operation of a social welfare organization, the Norwegian Lutheran Rescue Home, in the neighborhood. Founded to help get unwed, pregnant young women “back into the fold,” the organization helped find families to adopt the newborns or homes for the mother and baby if they had no place to go. The organization had placed 167 children since opening and had spent more than \$3,000 during 1917. In November of that year, though, the health and hospitals committee of the city council bolstered the opposition of the Prospect Park residents, the PTA and the PPIA by voting to deny the home a license to operate at 64 Bedford Street. Although the city council granted the license, the home received a second round of resistance from the PPIA in 1919 when it went in for a license renewal. The opposition was again unsuccessful, and the home remained on the city’s roster of reputed social welfare organizations.³²

A Prospect Park Landmark: The Witch’s Hat Water Tower

Among the PPIA’s most visible and long-lasting initiatives are the park and water tower that are central to the neighborhood’s identity (Photograph 11). In the early twentieth century, the PPIA persuaded the Minneapolis Board of Park Commissioners to acquire the irregularly shaped block bounded by University, Clarence, Seymour, Orlin, and Malcolm Avenues (Block 6 of Prospect Park First Division Revised) as parkland. While that plat showed lots on this block (the lot divisions still appear on Hennepin County plat maps), the extreme slopes made residential construction highly unlikely. However, its geological formation made it potentially desirable as a gravel pit. Such a use would have been highly detrimental to the residential community. The park commissioners approved the purchase of the block in May 1906 for \$19,500, with the cost to be assessed against the property in the vicinity. The park was not actually named Tower Hill until 1909.³³

A few years later, the PPIA turned to the issue of water pressure, which was poor in the hilly neighborhood and grew worse as more people moved to the area. At a PPIA meeting in August 1911,

³¹ The *Minneapolis Tribune* covered the Simpson housing controversy over a period of months: “Race War Started in Prospect Park,” October 22, 1909; “Church Not to Figure in Midway Race Issue,” October 23, 1909; “Negro Willing to Settle Prospect Park Troubles,” October 24, 1909; “Color Line Issue Avoided,” October 25, 1909; “Negro Home Builders Defended by Minister,” October 25, 1909; “End of Both Race Wars Believed Near at Hand,” January 7, 1910; “Fairness to Negro Urged by Minister,” January 10, 1910; “Negro’s Demand Rejected,” January 26, 1910. Simpson, his wife, Daisy, and five-year old Kenneth Carter were recorded living at 17 Melbourne in the April 1910 U.S. census. Jackson, his wife, Amy, and three daughters were recorded living at 2003 Hamline (now Franklin). All members of both families are described as “mulatto.”

³² K. A. Kasberg, ed., *Lutheran Almanac for 1919* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1919), 45; “Rescue Home Location on Bedford St. Denied,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, November 7, 1917; “Aasen Heads Twin City Lutheran Rescue Home,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, January 16, 1918; “Rescue Home to Have Annual Donation Day,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, September 29, 1918; “Prospect Park Against Home Is Heard,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, January 14, 1919. Prior to moving to the Prospect Park neighborhood, the rescue home was located at 602 Pierce in Northeast Minneapolis. The house at 64 Bedford Avenue is indicated as being the residence of Mrs. L. H. Lucker as late as January 1917. *Davison’s Minneapolis City Directory, 1916* (C. R. Davison: Minneapolis, 1916), 1594; “News of the Lodges,” *Minneapolis Tribune*, January 28, 1917.

³³ Curran and Roise, “Prospect Park Water Tower and Tower Hill Park,” 8-5.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 13

residents agreed that the construction of a tower would do much to improve Prospect Park's "water distribution conditions." After the meeting, the association approached the city waterworks committee and requested its help, but any assistance was deferred owing to the city's belief that a new water main would solve the water problem. The PPIA then sought cooperation of the Minneapolis park board to erect a water tower on Tower Hill Park. The park board had already envisioned an observation or lookout tower at that site; its 1912 annual report spoke of an "observation tower . . . [that] would offer a splendid view over a large part of this city and St. Paul."³⁴

Months later, the PPIA met again to discuss "ways and means of inducing the city waterworks department to erect a water tower" as it was now understood that the water main would not solve the water pressure issues. In May 1913, the Standing Committee on Water Works finally agreed that "on account of the water pressure in Prospect Park it will be necessary to build a water tower so that during the summer months residents may have sufficient supply of water in that part of the city." The committee recommended that the city engineer, Frederick William Cappelen, construct a "suitable" water tower for Tower Hill that would connect with the city's water system. His steel standpipe design was approved by the city council in June 1913, and the tower was dedicated on July 28 of the following year.³⁵

Cappelen's Romanesque Medieval structure is a product of contemporary water tower design as well as a thoughtful consideration of its surroundings. In 1890, the *Engineering Record* held a design competition for water towers and pumping stations. Among the winning designs was a medieval tower with windows in the shaft, a conical roof, and an arched belvedere. A similar design, published in the *Minneapolis Journal* on July 24, 1913, was indicated as the "water tower to be built on Tower Hill." During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, historical references in architecture were prevalent, borrowing particularly from the Classical and Gothic styles. This architectural nostalgia was tied to the fast pace of development and industrialization. Architectural historian Leland Roth explains: "As the pace of technological and cultural change quickened and intensified, so the need for security through historical associationalism in architecture became more insistent."³⁶

Additionally, such designs made water towers and pumping stations more attractive, integrating them into their residential settings. For neighborhoods like Prospect Park where many of the houses were designed in "picturesque interpretation" and traditional styles, Cappelen's romantic design for the water tower harmonized not only with the immediate, rolling park landscape but the neighborhood at large, with its curvilinear streets, wooded lots, and revival-style houses.³⁷

The construction of the Prospect Park water tower was motivated by the 1910 construction of the Kenwood water tower. The latter structure was part of a citywide improvement and expansion of the water system coming on the heels of a typhoid outbreak that had resulted in several deaths. Designed by Cappelen's predecessor Andrew Rinker, the Kenwood water tower's Gothic Revival design is rendered in red brick and calls to mind a medieval fortification. While the design connotes strength and

³⁴ Ibid., 8-7-8-8.

³⁵ Ibid., 8-9, 8-11-8-12.

³⁶ Ibid., 8-12-8-13.

³⁷ Ibid., 8-14-8-15.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 14

resistance against disease, it does not mesh stylistically with what are predominantly ornate, frame Queen Anne residences of the Kenwood neighborhood.³⁸

“Health” is also depicted in the design of the Washburn Park water tower. A predecessor water tower, built in 1893, was purchased by the city in 1915. Although its height was increased, its capacity proved inadequate for the swelling population. In 1931, it was torn down for a new tower designed by architect Harry Wild Jones in collaboration with engineer William S. Hewitt. Construction on the concrete tower was completed in the summer of 1932.³⁹

Like the towers in Kenwood and Prospect Park, the structure had a medieval theme but now rendered in the contemporary Streamline Moderne style. Sculptor John K. Daniels had designed eight sixteen-foot-tall “guardians of health,” images most likely inspired by scientific advances concerning waterborne disease. He also sculpted eight eight-foot-high eagles. One article describes the tower as “[resembling] a medieval fortress, sheltered within its forestlike setting in southwest Minneapolis.”⁴⁰

The three water towers constructed on three of Minneapolis’s highest points are all interpretations of the medieval style. The Prospect Park tower, however, was particularly designed to work as a landscape feature of the parkland that surrounds it. Additionally, its picturesque design compliments the revival and romantic styles of many of the houses in the neighborhood built in the early decades of the twentieth century. While the designs of the Kenwood and Washburn Park towers are impressive in their own rights, they are in stark contrast to the residential design of the neighborhoods in which they were placed. Additionally, the latter two towers were constructed at the behest of the city. The Prospect Park tower was constructed because of the grassroots efforts of the local residents and their improvement association.

Prospect Park in the 1920s

After World War I, rapid industrial and economic diversification created an expanding middle class that migrated toward American cities. Minneapolis saw its population increase by nearly 178,000 during the first two decades of the twentieth century, “a phenomenal growth spurt that reflected this burgeoning faction of middle-class professionals.”⁴¹

Equipped with more expendable income than the previous generation, this new middle class could afford better living conditions than the crowded, often unsanitary conditions found in the inner cities. The streetcar was again a key force in the city’s expansion. New neighborhoods developed along the city’s outer ring. Among these developments was Nokomis Knoll, platted by a realty and development company Dickinson and Gillespie in the early 1920s. In its early days, it benefitted from easy access to the streetcar system, the usage of which peaked in 1923 and remained high throughout the 1920s. During that decade, nearly one-third of the Nokomis Knoll’s housing stock was constructed.⁴²

³⁸ Ibid., 8-6-8-7.

³⁹ Balcom, “Tale of Two Towers,” 22-25.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 26-27.

⁴¹ Christine A. Curran and Charlene K. Roise, “Nokomis Knoll Residential Historic District,” August 1998, 8-2-8-3, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, available at the State Historic Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, Saint Paul.

⁴² Ibid., 8-2-8-3, 8-6, 8-8-8-9.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 15

Around 38 percent of the first wave of houses built in Nokomis Knoll was directly commissioned from architects. The majority of the building contractors in Nokomis Knoll, however, used “architect-designed house plans” available in newspapers, magazines, and pattern books. Known as stock plans, these designs were an important source of residential house designs in Minneapolis in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These houses were intended for middle-class families who might not think of hiring an architect. Not high style or intimidating, the designs were picturesque interpretations of styles with broad appeal, including American and Spanish Colonial, English Tudor and Cottage, Italian Renaissance, and French Provincial.⁴³

Stock plans were also used in Prospect Park, and one major source was the Architects Small House Service Bureau. Founded by a group of Minnesota architects and also headed by one, Edwin H. Brown, it promoted mail-order architect-designed house plans, providing working drawings and construction specifications. When the organization expanded nationally in 1920, the Minnesota group became the Northwestern Division. Two Colonial Revival style houses built in Prospect Park list the Architects’ Small House Service Bureau or Company as architect: 237 Bedford Street (1925) and 100 Orlin Avenue (1922).⁴⁴

An architect associated with the bureau, Robert Taylor Jones (1884–1963), lived in Prospect Park. A graduate of the University of Illinois, Jones had come to the University of Minnesota School of Architecture in 1919 as an assistant professor. In addition to teaching, Jones was a member of President Hoover’s Conference on Housing in 1928, the Minneapolis Mayor’s Housing Conference in the 1930s, and the Minneapolis City Planning Commission between 1945 and 1956. He served for a number of years as general manager of the Service Bureau and in that capacity wrote a newspaper column about small houses, edited the *Small Homes Magazine*, and published a book on small houses. Ironically, Jones lived in a house that had been designed by an earlier stock-plan promoter, the Keith Company. The Craftsman style house was erected at 44 Arthur Avenue in 1907. When interviewed in 1956, Jones described his house as “‘about 40 years old and of uncertain architectural character.’ He characterized most Prospect Park homes as ‘carpenter-esque,’ which came into being when a carpenter was told to ‘build me a house.’”⁴⁵

Contractors and carpenters, who also acted as developers, continued to be active throughout the

⁴³ The Keith Company, continuing as the Keith Corporation, published *Beautiful Homes: 200 Plans* (Minneapolis: Keith Corporation, 1925). Many of the 1920s plan books have been reprinted by Dover Publications, often in cooperation with the Athenaeum of Philadelphia. Examples include Henry Atterbury Smith, compiler, *500 Small Houses of the Twenties* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1990), first published by the Home Owners Service Institute, New York, 1923; and Gordon-Van Tine Company, *117 House Designs of the Twenties* (Philadelphia and New York: The Athenaeum and Dover Publications, Inc., 1992), originally published by the Gordon-Van Tine Company in 1923. For a succinct overview of pattern and plan books, see David Gebhard, “Pattern Books,” in *Master Builders: A Guide to Famous American Architects*, ed. Diane Maddex, 68–73 (Washington, D.C.: Preservation Press, 1985). Curran and Roise, “Nokomis Knoll Residential Historic District,” 8-8–8-9.

⁴⁴ See Dean, “It Is Here We Live,” 261; Thomas Harvey, “Mail-Order Architecture in the Twenties,” *Landscape* 25 (1991): 1–9.

⁴⁵ Robert T. Jones, ed., *Authentic Small Houses of the Twenties* (1929; reprint, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1987); “R. T. Jones Dies at 78,” *Northwest Architect* 27 (May–June 1963): 49; Abe Altowicz, “Prospect Park High and Haughty,” *Minneapolis Star*, February 16, 1956. Jones’s time at the University of Minnesota overlapped with that of the dean, Roy Child Jones, and they are sometimes confused with each other or their work is conflated.

United States Department of the Interior
 National Park Service

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 16

Prospect Park neighborhood from about 1905 until the late 1920s. Names that appear on many building permits during that era include Trygve Benson, I. C. Peek, C. O. Stocke, and A. H. and Rosa Selb. All lived and had their offices in the Prospect Park neighborhood. Sometimes they are also listed as the architects, even though they may have had no architectural training. The houses built by these developers were typically Colonial Revival or Craftsman in style. Other contractors constructed houses from plans that were available from local lumberyards or from magazines and newspapers. Like the architect plan books, such plans were in traditional revival styles that appealed to a wide range of tastes. Property owners often acted as their own contractors and hired day labor to do the construction work. The well-preserved houses in Prospect Park that date from the first four decades of the twentieth century represent the type and method of construction that appeared in many neighborhoods in Minneapolis, Saint Paul, and elsewhere in Minnesota during that period.

About half of the houses in the neighborhood were built between 1915 and 1930, many on sloping sites that must have challenged the ingenuity of their builders. Sites were developed a few houses at a time, often by builder-contractors who then sold the houses. Approximately thirty were constructed as duplexes, and in the years following World War I, other single-family houses were converted into duplexes. A number of multiple dwellings were built during this period; these buildings are usually two stories high with rectangular plans and incorporate four, six, or eight apartments. Also, many early houses were moved to their present sites from other locations in the area, and were often modified from single-family houses to duplexes in the process. Many were plucked from University Avenue as that street succumbed to the pressures of commercial development.⁴⁶

The pressure continued as automobiles began outnumbering streetcars on the University Avenue corridor. To house the growing automobile population, barns were converted to garages and garages were added to lots with early houses. For new construction, garages were a required accompaniment—whether freestanding, attached to the house, or incorporated into the house at basement level.

Minneapolis adopted its first comprehensive zoning ordinance in 1924, which largely codified existing uses. It created residence districts for one- and two-family homes; multiple-dwelling districts; commercial districts that largely followed the streetcar lines; light-industrial districts; and heavy-industrial districts, primarily around railroad yards. Prospect Park was largely classified as either a residence district, limited to one- and two-family residences in the blocks around Tower Hill Park, or a multiple-dwelling district, which could also hold individual houses. The improvement association succeeded in having Arthur Avenue classified as a residential district rather than an industrial district. Landscape architect Charles H. Ramsdell saw the new law as an important vehicle for enhancing and expanding the residential character of Prospect Park.⁴⁷

There was a small amount of commercial activity that was associated with the neighborhood. The

⁴⁶ Schmid, *Social Saga of the Twin Cities*, 190–191, compares the density of buildings in Minneapolis between 1892 and 1934 in two charts. Chart 100 shows only a sprinkling of buildings in 1892. Chart 101 shows that the Prospect Park area is very built up in 1934.

⁴⁷ Minnesota Works Progress Administration, *1940 Atlas of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota* (Minneapolis: City of Minneapolis, 1941), contains the language of the zoning ordinance and the zoning map. Charles H. Ramsdell, “The New Districting Law,” *Watchtower* 3 (April 1925): 1; Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch’s Hat*, 10.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 17

intersection of University and Bedford Avenues, a streetcar stop, attracted local services including the Prospect Park Pharmacy and flats at 3400 University Avenue (with a barbershop and a beauty shop in storefronts on Bedford), a shoe repair shop at 61 Bedford Street, and the grocery store at 50 Bedford Street (Photograph 14). The building at 130 Warwick Street housed the Pehoushek grocery store on the first floor and flats above. Constructed in 1922, two years before the zoning ordinance was adopted, it stands out because of its location in the middle of an otherwise residential block. Small buildings like this were constructed throughout the neighborhoods of Minneapolis and Saint Paul, but most occupied corner sites. The building at 146–148 Cecil Street at the corner of Sharon Avenue, now a duplex, was originally built as a store and flats building. Another commercial node, now largely cut off from the district by Interstate 94, was located at Franklin Avenue and Twenty-Seventh Avenue Southeast at the east end of the Cappelen Memorial (Franklin Avenue) Bridge.⁴⁸

Construction continued through the 1930s, but at a much slower pace given the economic constraints of the period. It was during this time, however, that modern design, which was to characterize the final phase of the architectural development of the neighborhood, began making an appearance. The dynamic contrast between the earlier and new traditions is illustrated by the east and west frontages of Bedford Street south of Sharon Avenue. Two exceptional examples of the modern movement are at the south end of the street. The house at 255 Bedford (Photograph 45) was designed by the internationally prominent architect Frank Lloyd Wright and built in 1934 for Malcolm Willey, academic vice president of the University of Minnesota, and his wife, Nancy. Across the street at 252 Bedford (Photograph 44) is the first modern International Style–inspired house in Minnesota, designed by the Closes, and built in 1938 for Willem Luyten, a University of Minnesota astronomer. It was enlarged in 1940 for B. E. Lippincott, a professor of political science at the university, and his wife, Gertrude. These are counterbalanced by neighboring residences from the same period: a pair of Tudor-English Cottage style houses at 247 and 251 Bedford Street, built in 1932–1933, and the Colonial Revival style house at 248 Bedford Street, built in 1939.⁴⁹

Development after World War II

After the Second World War, the great demand for housing for returning servicemen and their families led to an enormous building boom and the rapid expansion of the “first-tier” suburbs around the Twin Cities. Although most sections of Minneapolis, including Prospect Park, had been developed earlier, there were still a few tracts in Prospect Park available for new construction, as well as other scattered lots that had been too difficult or too expensive to build on earlier.

Outside influences, however, were to play a more major role in shaping Prospect Park in the decades following the Armistice. The City of Minneapolis took advantage of two major postwar federal

⁴⁸ Gibas, “History of Prospect Park,” 18–19; Wick, “Prospect Park One-of-a-Kind Neighborhood,” 9; Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch’s Hat*, 88–94, 97–101. Descriptions of local businesses are also in Fraser, “The Arthur Avenue Gang: Prospect Park, Minneapolis in the 1920s and 30s,” and Pudvan, “Memories of Prospect Park, Circa 1910–1950, Minneapolis, Minnesota.” Advertisements in local papers such as the *Watchtower* suggest that Prospect Park residents also shopped somewhat farther east in Saint Paul, at stores near the intersection of University and Raymond. These businesses were on the University Avenue streetcar line, and many of them provided local delivery.

⁴⁹ The Willey House is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (1984). David Gebhard and Tom Martinson, *A Guide to the Architecture of Minnesota* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977), 47; Larry Millett, *AIA Guide to the Twin Cities* (Saint Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2007), 142–143.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 18

programs, the Federal Housing Act of 1949 and the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which were intended to reshape and revitalize U.S. cities. The housing act provided funds for a project that transformed a gravel and sand pit west of William Avenue, just outside the boundary of the Prospect Park historic district. The land became the site of the city's first postwar public housing project, Glendale Homes. The project's scale and the type of housing it provided effectively eliminated the possibility of extending Prospect Park's development pattern to the west.⁵⁰

An even more definitive barrier was established to the south with the construction of Interstate 94, which was begun in 1960 to link the downtowns of Saint Paul and Minneapolis. Partially paralleling the Chicago, Milwaukee and Saint Paul railroad tracks, the interstate severed the residential neighborhood along the Mississippi River from Prospect Park much more starkly than the railroad tracks had done. An eleven-mile stretch of the highway officially opened on December 9, 1968. As originally proposed in 1956, the freeway route would have destroyed the Willey House and other houses at the south end of Bedford Street, obliterated parts of Arthur and Franklin Avenues, gone through the Prospect Field playground, and removed about half of the Glendale Homes complex. A community effort spearheaded by the Pratt School PTA demanded changes to the route. Appeals to Governor Orville Freeman, a former Prospect Park resident, intense lobbying by Prospect Park residents, and pressure from the Housing and Redevelopment Authority and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board ultimately led to a solution that followed the line of the railroad right-of-way and saved many of the threatened houses—although the Willey House and others lost their previously unimpeded views down the slope toward the river. The successful effort of the community to modify the interstate route helped reinforce the sense of neighborhood identity.⁵¹

Unattractive dead-end streets and the roar of traffic, however, remained as issues. Not content to let the scar of Interstate 94 mar the neighborhood, residents pressed to make the freeway a good neighbor. Community activists eventually convinced the state highway department to address the issue of noise, and sound walls were installed by 1970. To make lots partially occupied by the right-of-way more attractive, small park areas were created. One, now known as Chergosky Park (Photograph 39) at the foot of Seymour Avenue, was on land given by the state to the City of Minneapolis in 1942, apparently for the extension of Arthur Avenue. This never occurred and the land was used informally as open space until 1982 when Andrew Hargen, as part of an Eagle Scout public service project, worked with a landscape architect to convert the triangle into a small neighborhood park. It became part of the Minneapolis park system ten years later.⁵²

⁵⁰ Aronson, "A Few Good Fights," 10–14; Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 107.

⁵¹ "Central Corridor Hennepin and Ramsey Counties, Phase I and II Cultural Resources Investigations of the Central Corridor, Minneapolis, Hennepin County, and Saint Paul, Ramsey County, Minnesota," 1995–1996, prepared by BRW with Hess, Roise and Company and submitted to the Minnesota Department of Transportation, 8-12-8-13; "Freeway to Make Cities Truly Twins," *Minneapolis Tribune*, December 8, 1968; Aronson, "A Few Good Fights," 14–17; Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 110–117. Alan A. Altshuler, *The City Planning Process: A Political Analysis* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965), 40–48, 71–72, discusses the freeway project and its impact on residential communities. Over 100 houses in the Prospect Park-East River Road community were destroyed. Copies of correspondence between Prospect Park residents and Minnesota Highway officials can be found in Minnesota Department of Transportation Archives: Box P26B 23805 and Box H090 6170, Minnesota Historical Society Collections, Saint Paul.

⁵² Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 117–118; Hennepin County Deeds Book 1519, Page 411 (recorded March 18, 1942); Linda Levitt, "Two Scouts from Prospect Park Achieve Eagle Rank," *Southeast* (Minneapolis), March 1983; David C. Smith, *Parks, Lakes, Trails and So Much More: An Overview of the Histories of MPRB Properties*,

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 19

A PROFILE OF THE PEOPLE

Many of the early residents of Prospect Park were typical of the newly prospering businessmen, attorneys, industrialists, and similar professionals found in other developing Minneapolis neighborhoods with scenic or landscape features. An examination of city directories suggests these associations. Accounts by local residents, as well as an examination of U.S. census enumeration records, depict the neighborhood as economically and ethnically diverse. The early residents were largely of the Yankee background—from New England, upstate New York, Pennsylvania, and older Midwest states—as was typical of the early settlement of Minneapolis. An influx of Scandinavian immigrants, however, soon made its mark. Many of them were skilled carpenters and masons who worked actively in the neighborhood and elsewhere in the city. The Cappelen Memorial Bridge, which opened in 1923, provided a connection to some of the earlier Scandinavian communities on the west side of the river. German immigrants, as well as immigrants from Czechoslovakia and other areas of Middle Europe, also moved into the neighborhood.⁵³

Because of its proximity to both Twin Cities campuses, Prospect Park has long had associations with faculty and staff members at the University of Minnesota, as exemplified by the participation of university President Cyrus Northrop in the dedication of the Pratt School. By the early twentieth century, under the leadership of President George Edgar Vincent (1911–1917) and his successor, Lotus D. Coffman (1920–1938), the university began to expand, adding buildings, students, programs, and faculty. Marian Foster Fraser, the daughter of two University of Minnesota faculty members, describes growing up at 60 Arthur Avenue and her friendships with the children of faculty in the neighborhood. The 1900 and 1910 census enumeration records show a scattering of residents who are listed as professors or teachers at the University of Minnesota. The number increased by the time of the 1920 census, and the trend is very noticeable in the 1930 census. Prospect Park resident Dr. Richard Scammon, dean of medical sciences in the 1930s, exclaimed: “You ask me if there are a lot of professors living around here? Why . . . it’s getting so I can’t spit out of my upstairs window without hitting a Ph.D.!”⁵⁴

available at http://www.minneapolisparcs.org/documents/parks/Parks_Lakes_Trails_Much_More.pdf, 31–32, City of Minneapolis, Petition No. 255507 (dated January 10, 1992); Richard L. Straub, letter to Tony Scallon, December 24, 1991; Sybil L. McMillan, email message to Penny Petersen, May 18, 2012. The land now occupied by Chergosky Park was historically Lots 14 and 15 of Block 2 of Carter and Stone’s Addition to Minneapolis. Lots south of it were absorbed by the construction of the interstate. Don Chergosky, who lived at 105 Warwick Street, opened the Prospect Park Food Market at 130 Warwick Street in 1949 after serving as a navy radioman in the South Pacific and receiving a political science degree from the University of Minnesota. Called the “watering hole, the focal point” of the neighborhood, the store was a favorite of children and adults alike. Chergosky died during heart surgery in 1975. His wife ran the store for a while before it became the Tulip Cafe in the early 1980s. See Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch’s Hat*, 97–99; Neal Gendler, “Customers Mourn ‘Mr. Prospect Park,’” *Minneapolis Tribune*, July 12, 1975; and “Campus-Area Food Market Owner Dies,” *Minneapolis Star*, July 12, 1975.

⁵³ Marion Foster Fraser, “The Arthur Avenue Gang: Prospect Park, Minneapolis in the 1920s and 30s,” 1992, typescript, Minnesota Historical Society Collections, Saint Paul, and Joan Hunter Pudvan, compiler, “Memories of Prospect Park, Circa 1910–1950, Minneapolis, Minnesota,” 2001, typescript, Minnesota Historical Society Collections, Saint Paul. Both Fraser and Pudvan have written about the residents of the neighborhood as they were growing up.

⁵⁴ For the development and growth of the University of Minnesota see James Gray, *The University of Minnesota, 1851–1951* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951), esp. books Four and Six. Scammon quote in Gibas, *History of Prospect*

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District

Name of Property

Hennepin County, MN

County and State

N/A

Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 20

Other prominent neighborhood residents affiliated with the university were poet John Berryman, who taught at the university between 1955 and 1972 and lived at 33 Arthur Avenue; Dr. Owen Wangensteen, surgeon in chief at the university who lived at 145 Melbourne Avenue; Magnus Olson, a renowned zoologist who lived at 103 Arthur Avenue; and Frank A. Rarig, head of the speech department, who lived at 111 Orlin Avenue.⁵⁵

There was also a strong connection between Prospect Park and architects associated with the university, as is discussed in the following section.

PROSPECT PARK'S LANDSCAPE AND ARCHITECTURE

A Picturesque Landscape

When Menage hired S. H. Baker and J. H. Gilmore to plat Prospect Park in 1883–1884, he was following a tradition of romantic suburban landscape design that had been advocated by Andrew Jackson Downing in the mid-nineteenth century and refined by Frederick Law Olmsted in Riverside, Illinois, in the late 1860s. In 1872, Horace Cleveland, who was based in Chicago at the time, had devised a similar plan for Saint Anthony Park, at the northwest corner of what would become part of the city of Saint Paul. That same year Cleveland gave his influential talk in Minneapolis and Saint Paul, "Landscape Architecture as Applied to the Wants of the West." Cleveland also created a curvilinear, romantic plan in his design of the suburban Washburn Park neighborhood in 1886. Three years earlier, on June 2, 1883, Cleveland presented *Suggestions for a System of Parks and Parkways for the City of Minneapolis* to the newly created Minneapolis Board of Park Commissioners and was subsequently retained to plan the city park system. At the conclusion of *Suggestions*, Cleveland expressed his appreciation of the efforts of S. H. Baker, "who by his thorough familiarity with the topography of the country and his knowledge of metes and bounds, has greatly facilitated my labors."⁵⁶

Prior to Prospect Park, Menage had acquired other large tracts in Minneapolis and hired Baker and Gilmore, as well as other civil engineers, to plat suburban subdivisions. George Cooley and Andrew Rinker (later the Minneapolis city engineer and a Prospect Park resident) laid out Lakeside Park, west of Lake Calhoun, for Menage in 1874. This area seems to have been incorporated into the Minnekahda Club. The First Addition of Remington Park, west of Lake Harriet, was platted by Baker and Gilmore for

Park, 9. Under the Witch's Hat describes many neighborhood residents with University of Minnesota affiliations. Mrs. Olson was one of the local leaders in the fight against Interstate 94. Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 50–57, 112–113.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ David Schuyler, *Apostle of Taste: Andrew Jackson Downing, 1815–1852* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 204–208; Balcom, "Tale of Two Towers," 19–23; Carole Zellie, "The Romantic Landscape and Twin Cities Residence Parks," *Architecture Minnesota* 5 (February 1980): 39–40. Cleveland's 1872 talk was published as a book in 1873: H. W. S. Cleveland, *Landscape Architecture as Applied to the Wants of the West; with an Essay on Forest Planting in the Great Plains* (1873; repr., Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002). H. W. S. Cleveland, *Suggestions for a System of Parks and Parkways for the City of Minneapolis* (Minneapolis: Johnson, Smith, and Harrison, 1883), 15. In his excursions around the city of Minneapolis and its newly annexed sections, Cleveland focused on the river, the lakes, and the surrounding areas, so he would have seen the First Addition of Remington Park, west of Lake Harriet, as well as the Prospect Park area, east of the river. Prospect Park is also a continuation of the geological features that form Saint Anthony Park in Saint Paul.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 21

Menage in 1883.⁵⁷

Samuel Harlan Baker (1846–1923?) was born in Pennsylvania and studied at the State Normal School (predecessor to Pennsylvania State), moving to Minnesota for his health in 1869. He spent about three years working as a surveyor for railroad lines, then returned to Minneapolis, where he opened up his own company. He was elected Hennepin County surveyor in 1876, serving two terms. Joseph H. Gilmore (1848–1915?) was born in Ohio and studied law in Illinois. He moved to Minneapolis in 1872 and was in the printing trade before joining Baker's civil engineering firm. He also acquired several farms. He became a Second Ward alderman and later a Hennepin County commissioner. Such an eclectic background was not unusual in residents of rapidly expanding cities of the west like Minneapolis. Clearly their engineering and surveying talents were sufficient to take advantage of the hilly topography of Prospect Park, and it is likely that they benefited from Baker's interactions with Cleveland earlier in 1883 as Cleveland was devising recommendations for the Minneapolis park system.⁵⁸

Architects Add to the Neighborhood

While unnamed architects designed the stock-plan houses built in the early twentieth century, the Prospect Park neighborhood also contains a significant number of houses designed by prominent local architects, although some of them were contractors or carpenters turned architect. Additionally, a number of notable architects have lived in the community, often designing their own residences. Since the establishment of the architecture school at the University of Minnesota in 1913, under the leadership of Frederick M. Mann, a number of neighborhood architects have been affiliated with that institution.

One of the first architects to practice in Prospect Park and one of the pioneers in the community was Lowell A. Lamoreaux (1861–1922) who designed for himself in 1887 one of the first houses constructed in Prospect Park. Prominently sited on a peninsular lot at the intersection of Seymour Avenue and Orlin Avenue, the house is a notable example of the Queen Anne style with a boldly scaled granite porch with carved columns. In addition to the wood shingles covering the wall surfaces, the house has unusual carved and rounded roof dormers. Lamoreaux had attended the University of Minnesota and worked in the family business, Lamoreaux Brothers, purveyors of wood and coal, before he began to list himself as an architect in the Minneapolis city directory in 1888–1889. He is said to have worked as a draftsman in the office of Cass Gilbert and James Knox Taylor (Gilbert and Taylor). By 1895, he had joined forces with James A. MacLeod (1869–1912) and set up offices in the

⁵⁷ Zellie, "Romantic Landscape and Twin Cities Residence Parks," 40, identifies, but does not discuss, these two residence parks. The First Addition of Remington Park is located in today's Linden Hills neighborhood. The Second Addition of Remington Park is east of Lake Calhoun on land that was part of the estate of Colonel William S. King. These holdings were included in a complex series of land transactions that resulted in several lawsuits involving Frederick Remington, the Kings, and Menage. See Loring Staples, "The Decline and Fall of Louis Menage," *Hennepin County History* (1983): 3–16. The area of Lakeside Park and the Remington Park additions are shown in the *1940 Atlas of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota*, pls. 12A, 13B, 14B, 17A, 17B, 18B.

⁵⁸ George Warner and Charles M. Foote, eds., *History of Hennepin County and the City of Minneapolis* (Minneapolis: North Star Publishing Company, 1881), 506, 550, and Penny Jacobson, "Platting Prospect Park Was a Tortuous Affair," *Southeast* (Minneapolis), October 1986, give background on Baker and Gilmore. The assigned death dates are derived from a review of the Death Certificate Index at the Minnesota Historical Society.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District

Name of Property

Hennepin County, MN

County and State

N/A

Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 22

Lumber Exchange.⁵⁹ In Prospect Park, the pair designed a Dutch Colonial Revival house (1897) for Mrs. A. T. Iverson at 51 Clarence Avenue; a Colonial Revival style house (1897) for Wilbur J. Hartzell at 1 Seymour Avenue; a Colonial Revival style house (1899) for Frank Dooley at 96 Clarence Avenue that was soon occupied by Justus L. Gable and his family. (By the 1920s, Justus's brother John F. Gable and his family were living in the house.) The Colonial Revival house at 25 Seymour Avenue, on a portion of the lot originally owned by Lamoreaux, was built in 1899 for Frederick F. Lindsay, one of the founders of the Prospect Park Methodist Church and a businessman who later rebuilt the store and flats building at 3400 University Avenue. (Effie G. Lindsay is listed as the owner of the house on the building permit.) Lamoreaux practiced by himself between 1900 and 1908. During this period he designed several other houses in Prospect Park: the Dutch Colonial Revival house (1904) for Mary E. Morgan at 2115 Franklin Avenue; the Swiss Chalet-style house (1906) commissioned by Justus L. Gable (apparently for a daughter since Gable and his wife continued to live at 15 Seymour Avenue) at 44 Clarence Avenue; and the Craftsman style house (1907) for W. J. Bowen at 60 Seymour Avenue. Following his solo stint, Lamoreaux joined the firm of Long and Long, successor firm to Long and Kees. When he became a partner in 1909, the firm became Long, Lamoreaux, and Long. MacLeod joined the firm at about the same time, after leaving his father-in-law's business. Under that name, the firm designed Saint Timothy's Mission Church (1911) at 21 Clarence Avenue (Photograph 13).⁶⁰

In 1920 Olaf Thorshov (d. 1928), a Norwegian immigrant architect (who initially spelled his name Thorshaug), became a partner, and the firm was renamed Long, Lamoreaux and Thorshov. Thorshov also lived in Prospect Park, designing his own Swiss Chalet-inspired house at 208 Cecil Street (Photograph 37), built in 1912.⁶¹ Thorshov and his family moved to Lamoreaux's house at 39 Seymour Avenue sometime after Lamoreaux's death. His son Roy Norman Thorshov (1905–1992) graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1928 and joined his father's firm. While still in school in 1925, he designed the garage at the rear of 39 Seymour Avenue. He and his widowed mother were living in the house when the 1930 census was taken. In 1941, Roy Thorshov designed the house at 104 Seymour Avenue for himself.

⁵⁹ MacLeod's name also appears in various records spelled as "McLeod," and his middle name appears as both "Alan" and "Allen."

⁶⁰ Lamoreaux also did work for the Minneapolis park system. His designs included service buildings at Lyndale Farmstead (1908); a sketch for Gateway Park (1908); the park building at Powderhorn Park (1908); and the design of the pavilion at Camden (Webber) Park (1908). He promoted the construction of the Prospect Park Water Tower and sketched a design that was the basis for Cappelen's work. Lamoreaux, working independently and in the firm of Long, Lamoreaux, and Long, achieved success in the design of large institutional and commercial buildings in Minneapolis, including the Dyckman (1909), Radisson (1908–1909), and Curtis (1910, 1919) Hotels; the Central YMCA (1917; listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1995); the Syndicate Building (1911); the Palace Building (1910), Plymouth Building (1909, 1910); additions to Dayton's Department Store (1910, 1915, 1916, 1919, 1920); the City (1911–1913), Swedish (1907, 1914), and Eitel (1911) Hospitals; the Boyd Transfer Company Warehouse (1902); and the Twin City Telephone Exchange (1901), as well as the Main Building of Concordia College, Saint Paul (1917). Wirth, *Minneapolis Park System*, 169, 186; Curran and Roise, "Prospect Park Water Tower," 8-7; Cerny Associates Papers (N29), Northwest Architectural Archives, Elmer L. Andersen Library, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; "L. A. Lamoreaux, Resident Half Century, Dead," *Minneapolis Tribune*, February 2, 1922; Marjorie Pearson, "Prospect Park, Minneapolis: An Historical Survey," October 2000, prepared by Hess, Roise and Company for the Prospect Park and East River Road Improvement Association, 21–22; Jack El-Hai, *Lost Minnesota: Stories of Vanished Places* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); Millett, *Lost Twin Cities*, 30, 254, 288–289; "James Alan MacLeod Dies," *Minneapolis Journal*, July 17, 1912.

⁶¹ Paul Clifford Larson, "Olaf Thorshov House," 1984, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, available at the State Historical Preservation Office, Minnesota Historical Society, Saint Paul.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District

Name of Property

Hennepin County, MN

County and State

N/A

Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 23

In 1942 Robert G. Cerny (1908–1985), another graduate of the University of Minnesota (B. Arch.), as well as Harvard University (M. Arch.), joined the firm, which became Thorshov and Cerny. Cerny also taught at the University of Minnesota between about 1936 and 1976 and was active in the design and construction of many residences, including 75–77 Barton Avenue (1940); the group at 125, 129, 133, and 137 Warwick Avenue (1946) acting as part of the contracting firm of Noble, Jensen, Tracy and Cerny; the group at 221, 225, 229, 233, 237, and 241 Arthur Avenue (1948); and the house at 33–35 Melbourne Avenue (1952).⁶²

Menno S. Detweiler was responsible for the design of two large houses on Orlin Avenue. He built the first at 32 Orlin Avenue, in 1903, for himself and his family when he was in partnership with Frank W. Kinney. The second at 36 Orlin Avenue, built two years later for C. H. Crouse, was done in partnership with Charles H. Bell and is a picturesque Spanish Colonial Revival design. While in partnership with Bell, Detweiler also designed the picturesque group of Spanish Colonial Revival style duplexes and flats building (1905, 1908) at 23, 25, and 29 Sidney Place (Photograph 1).⁶³

Edward Roy Ludwig (1886–1956) was active in the Prospect Park area, designing the Prospect Park Methodist Episcopal (now United Methodist) Church at 22 Orlin Avenue (Photograph 2). The cornerstone of the present building was laid on June 20, 1914. He also designed the D. R. Howell House at 66 Seymour Avenue (1916) and the Blessley House at 73 Arthur Avenue (1921). His wife, Mary Gable Ludwig, was the daughter of Justus L. Gable, one of the founders of the Methodist church. The Ludwigs lived at 147 Cecil Avenue in a house built in 1905.⁶⁴

Perry E. Crosier (1890–1953), born in Minneapolis, began his career as a draftsman for Minneapolis architect Harry W. Jones. Between 1914 and 1916 Crosier headed a firm of architects and contractors, the Crosier Construction Company. During this period, the firm built several Craftsman and Prairie School-inspired residences in Prospect Park, 240–242 and 244–246 Bedford Street (1915) and 148 Malcolm Avenue (1916). He remodeled the house at 39–41 Clarence Avenue into a duplex in 1920. The Dutch Colonial Revival style house Crosier designed at 209 Bedford Street dates from 1925. His son Paul joined his architectural practice and designed the modern house (1946) at 124 Warwick Street.⁶⁵

⁶² See Cerny Associates Papers for more background on both Thorshovs and Cerny. Subsequently, the firm became the Cerny Associates Inc., Architecture Engineering Planning, and shifted its emphasis from residential to civic, religious, and commercial architecture. See *The Cerny Associates Inc.: Architecture, Engineering, Planning Minneapolis and St. Paul*, [1965], promotional brochure, Minnesota Historical Society Collections, Saint Paul.

⁶³ Around 1900, Frank W. Kinney joined with Menno S. Detwiler, and this firm designed several buildings such as a courthouse in Crookston, Minnesota (1900); a Methodist church in Cresco, Iowa (1900); the Clay County Courthouse, Spencer, Iowa (1900); a Presbyterian church in Brookings, South Dakota (1900); the Winnishiek County Courthouse, Decorah, Iowa (1902); the Beltrami County Courthouse, Bemidji, Minnesota (1902); and the Langlade County Courthouse, Antigo, Wisconsin (1904). Both Kinney and Detwiler relocated to Minneapolis around 1902, and the partnership with Detwiler apparently ended in 1904. Biographical material on Kinney was taken from files in the Buechner and Orth Papers (N 58), Northwest Architectural Archives, Elmer L. Andersen Library, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

⁶⁴ Both Minneapolis city directories and the index of Minnesota Death certificates, available at the Minnesota Historical Society, give Ludwig's first name as Edward, although it appears in some sources as Edwin.

⁶⁵ See Perry E. Crosier Papers (N121), Northwest Architectural Archives, Elmer L. Andersen Library, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District

Name of Property

Hennepin County, MN

County and State

N/A

Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 24

Prospect Park became a haven for modern architecture early on, beginning in the 1930s with a work by the man who is arguably America's most famous architect, Frank Lloyd Wright (1867–1959). The neighborhood claims one of the ten buildings in Minnesota that Wright is credited with designing during the course of his long career. When Nancy Willey, wife of Malcolm Willey, a dean at the University of Minnesota, approached Wright about designing an artistic house in 1932, Wright was devoting most of his time to developing the Taliesin Fellowship because he received few commissions in the depths of the Depression. The Willey house (Photograph 44) is Wright's second Minnesota work, which was completed in 1934. It is a precursor to the so-called Usonian house type, first executed two years later in Madison, Wisconsin. At the time the Willey house was erected, the site at the south end of Bedford Street offered a dramatic view toward the Mississippi River.⁶⁶

The Willeys' relationship to the university is part of a pattern of interconnections between that institution and Prospect Park. Ralph Rapson (1914–2008), one of Minnesota's foremost modern architects and the long-time dean of the university's architecture school, commented on the difficulty of finding clients for modern houses, except in special enclaves like University Grove.⁶⁷ Prospect Park and its progressive, academic residents were receptive to modern architecture. Another outstanding example, just across the street from the Willey House, is the first independent work of Winston Close (1906–1991) and Elizabeth Scheu Close (1912–2011), the first architects in Minnesota to base their practice on the International Style. The Bedford Street house is arguably the first single-family residence in that style in the Twin Cities.⁶⁸ The Closes, who were educated at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, came to Minnesota in the 1930s to work for the firm Magney and Tusler on the Sumner Field Homes, Minnesota's first public housing project. They formed their own firm in 1938 and married soon thereafter. The house at 252 Bedford Street (Photograph 45) was built in 1938 for Willem Luyten and subsequently enlarged in 1940 for Benjamin and Gertrude Lippincott. Luyten was a professor in the political science department at the University of Minnesota and she was a dancer and dance teacher. The Close-designed house for Harold Deutsch, chairman of the University of Minnesota's history department, was built in 1950–1951 at 90 Seymour Avenue. In 1950, Winston Close joined the architecture faculty at the University of Minnesota, which was still under the direction of Roy Child Jones.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ For the list of Wright's Minnesota commissions see William Allin Storrer, *The Frank Lloyd Wright Companion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 478. The Willey House is discussed in entry S.229. Millett, *AIA Guide to the Twin Cities*, 142.

⁶⁷ Jeffrey A. Hess and Paul Clifford Larson, *Saint Paul's Architecture: A History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 197.

⁶⁸ Millett, *AIA Guide*, 142–143.

⁶⁹ This association brought the Close firm a number of university clients, primarily in University Grove, near the University of Minnesota campus in Saint Paul, although their first commission there dates from 1939. As advisory architect for the university, Winston Close oversaw the planning for the University's Morris campus, the Duluth campus, and the expansion of the Minneapolis campus on the West Bank. For the latter project, he worked closely with Ralph Rapson, who had become third head of the University's School of Architecture in the fall of 1954. Linda Mack, "Winston Close Dies at 90," *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, June 17, 1997, B7; Linda Mack, "Women Architects Make Their Way in an Old Boys' Profession, Lisl Close Has Always Been Ahead of Her Time," *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, April 5, 1992; Close Associates Papers (N78), Northwest Architectural Archives, Elmer L. Andersen Library, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. For more information on the Lippincotts and Deutsch, see Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 21–22, 48.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 25

Ralph Rapson succeeded Roy Child Jones at the University of Minnesota. Trained at the University of Michigan and under Eero Saarinen at the Cranbrook Academy of Art, Rapson had been on the faculty of the architecture school at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology when he was invited to come to Minnesota and expand the program. He and his wife, Mary, purchased the large Colonial Revival house, designed by MacLeod and Lamoreaux and built in 1897 for Wilbur J. Hartzell, at 1 Seymour Avenue. The Rapsons modernized the interior, installing furnishings from Rapson-Inc., the furniture design firm they had founded in Boston. Rapson established an architectural practice in the Twin Cities, although he designed no new houses in Prospect Park. In addition to Robert Cerny, who was already on the faculty, Rapson brought numerous local practitioners to teach courses and invited guest lecturers. One notable speaker was Frank Lloyd Wright, who caused a sensation at Northrop Auditorium by speaking for two hours to a standing-room-only crowd.⁷⁰

Another architect who embraced modernism and taught at the university was Carl Graffunder, who found receptive clients in Prospect Park, where he designed several notable modern houses: 91 Seymour Avenue (1955); 135 Malcolm Avenue for Richard Von Korff (1962); 163–165 Malcolm Avenue (1963); and 21 Seymour Avenue for Dr. R. Edith Stedman (Photograph 12), dean of students at the University of Minnesota (1964). Graffunder's business partner between 1956 and 1962, Norman Nagle, also taught at the university and was the architecture curator at the Walker Art Center between 1952 and 1958.⁷¹ Thomas Hodne, who had a practice with James Stageberg, another university instructor, purchased the 1905 house at 100 Seymour Avenue (previously owned by Harold Deutsch) and in 1967–1969 added a modern extension to accommodate his large family. It is set at the rear of the original house and largely concealed by the sloping site. In 1970, Hodne/Stageberg designed the park building in Luxton Park (originally Prospect Field), which is nearby but outside the boundary of the historic district.⁷²

Other clients turned to contractors to create modern houses, often on hilly sites, that are innovative and compatible with the architectural character of the neighborhood. A particularly interesting example is the house at 222 Melbourne Avenue, erected in 1941 by builder Henry J. Peterson for Starke Hathaway. Hathaway was a psychologist at the University of Minnesota Medical School and developed the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory test.⁷³

Prospect Park also holds a scattering of houses of the same types that appeared throughout suburban communities in the Twin Cities after World War II—Cape Cods that are variations of earlier Colonial Revival styles, ramblers, and ranch houses. These wood-frame houses typically used standardized parts and plans that were widely available to builders and contractors.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ The best source of information on Rapson and his career at the University of Minnesota is Jane King Hession, Rip Rapson, and Bruce N. Wright, *Ralph Rapson: Sixty Years of Modern Design* (Afton, Minn.: Afton Historical Society Press, 1999). Mary Rapson died in 2000; Ralph Rapson lived at 1 Seymour Avenue until his death. He was a great admirer of the Prospect Park Water Tower and drew it and redrew it "a thousand times. I can draw it in my sleep, actually." Quoted in "Architects' Dozen," *Architecture Minnesota* 34 (July–August 2008): 48.

⁷¹ Hess and Larson, *Saint Paul's Architecture*, 193–194, 262 n. 53.

⁷² Gebhard and Martinson, *Guide to the Architecture of Minnesota*, 48, 90–93.

⁷³ Prospect Park History Committee, *Under the Witch's Hat*, 52.

⁷⁴ Robert Gerloff, Kristi Johnson, and Peter J. Musty, *Cape Cods and Ramblers: A Remodeling Planbook for Post-WWII Houses* (Minneapolis: Minnesota Housing and Redevelopment Authority, 1999), 4–6.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Prospect Park Residential Historic District
Name of Property
Hennepin County, MN
County and State
N/A
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 8 Page 26

CONCLUSION

Prospect Park is significant both as a unique Minneapolis neighborhood and as a representation of the pattern of development as the city matured in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The district evolved during a formative period in Minneapolis, when the number of residential structures jumped from approximately 24,000 in 1890 to 83,604 in 1934.⁷⁵ Prospect Park’s initial development was slow because of its relative isolation from the downtown and lack of mass transportation, but houses began appearing with greater speed after the arrival of interurban and streetcar lines in the 1890s. Construction was steady for the first half of the twentieth century, continuing until the 1960s when the majority of the lots were filled. The result is a neighborhood of diverse housing stock reflecting a spectrum of popular styles.

The neighborhood’s platting was influenced by the picturesque movement in landscape design. Within this setting, the community was shaped by its unusual topography, its progressive residents, and the related organizations, particularly the Prospect Park Improvement Association and its successor, the Prospect Park East River Road Improvement Association. The result was a closely knit neighborhood with modern amenities, including the landmark water tower, and it retains that character to the present day.

⁷⁵ Schmid, *Social Saga of Two Cities*, 189.