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Introduction

Historic preservation is the conservation of buildings, sites, and artifacts that are significant to American culture and history. In the past century, local history and the desire to find personal connections to the past have become prevalent across the country. This desire has brought an interest in preserving historic landmarks in certain communities. Ohio’s Lucas County has been active in the American historic preservation movement, which seems to make it an ideal area to study the trends in preservation research. The county’s preservation organizations have made tremendous efforts to designate sites to the National Register, preserve areas of historic interest, and have dealt with several issues of controversy regarding preservation that parallel the nation’s preservation struggles. The process of historic preservation in Lucas County, Ohio from the early nineteenth century to the present is examined, using research that indicates that the historic preservation movement and National Register designations are influenced by public perceptions\(^1\) in both the public and private sectors. These perceptions also connect the preservation movement to local history and local memory.

Historically significant landmarks that are no longer present or have been altered due to lack of preservation intervention, as well as historic sites that have been preserved in Lucas County are identified and analyzed as examples of the preservation movement. Their recognition signifies the interests of both local and federal governments, the impact
of law in historical preservation, and the change in communities in relation to historic significance throughout the years. Historic landmarks and sites that are identified in this study were built between the years 1820-1910 and are either on the National Register of Historic Places or those few that have not been nominated, but still provide historical importance to the community. The sites serve as a record to determine how interest in the past has changed over time. These changes in interpretation regarding the historic significance of landmarks present fundamental problems in the area of preservation as emotions run high, depending on the organizations or administrators that hold power over what is to be saved.

A few significant questions are answered in this study that present certain themes and problems that either have been sparingly discussed or have been ignored in scholarly literature referring to preservation efforts in Lucas County. These questions include the following.

How and why are sites and properties designated as historically significant?

What happens to these sites and properties over time, both in physical upkeep and in continued public perceptions concerning their historical significance?

In order to better understand both the historic preservation movement and how it is perceived, it is necessary to define preservation and the interventions that were used to save historic sites. Preservation is defined as maintaining an artifact in the same physical condition in which the curators received it. There are no additions or subtractions from the building’s aesthetics. In order to preserve a structure it is sometimes necessary to intervene in regard to its physical integrity, such as fire protection, security systems, and protection from heat, cold, and lighting. A good example of natural preservation is the
Franklin D. Roosevelt House in Hyde Park, New York. It was given to the nation by the president’s family and managed by the National Park Service. The house and furnishings were kept as close as possible to the condition it was in at the time of Roosevelt’s death in 1945. Restoration is returning an artifact to a certain physical condition at some point in its development. A historical association or property owner often determined the era in which the site was to be returned. The site may also be restored to a certain state in a particular year when historic events took place or when the site was at its most important architecturally. Mt. Vernon, Monticello, and Colonial Williamsburg are examples of the process of restoration. Most often, especially in the early days of preservation, buildings were often restored to represent the colonial era or to indicate the day a significant event occurred, such as the death of Abraham Lincoln.

Another form of intervention was conservation. Conservation is the physical intervention of the actual fabric of the building to “ensure continuity in its structural integrity.” Examples of intervention may include fumigation, minor stone cleaning, or inserting new foundations. Reconstitution is saving a building piece by piece and reassembling it on its original site or on a new one. This kind of intervention usually takes place when wars or other factors destroyed sites and scattered remains. A very popular form of intervention is reconstruction. Reconstruction is recreating vanished buildings on their original sites. The form that the buildings take is established by archaeological, archival, and literary evidence. Occasionally this attempt to reconstruct the past can be quite subjective and is usually revised over the years as new evidence surfaces. Examples of reconstruction are the Governor’s Palace and the House of Burgesses at Colonial Williamsburg. Replication is the construction of the exact image
of an existing building on a different site. This is more accurate than reconstruction because the prototype is still present. An example of replication is Plimouth Plantation in Massachusetts. Only replicas exist on this site and the originals are housed at a different location. The replica can stand in the open air and the original can be preserved by being placed in a controlled environment in a museum or elsewhere.4

When buildings are culturally significant or physically valuable, sometimes the only way to preserve these buildings is to move them from their original sites. Moving was a popular preservation practice in the early years of the preservation movement. Many people were forced to move buildings to save them if they were in the path of construction activities that were seen as more important than the site that remained. Most could be moved intact, depending on the nature of its construction. The weight, materials, and logistics of the move were all important factors in deciding whether a building could be moved intact.5 Some parts of the buildings were sent to museums, but many were moved through dismantling or the moving of the entire structure.6

In this generation, many buildings are believed to be valuable if they continue to be used in community life, rather than be isolated for veneration and inspiration.7 Present ideals include serving a constant purpose in society. Historical relics that are no longer recognizable, useful, or significant can be put to better use and the public still feels that they are preserving the past in light of bettering the present.8 Buildings that were at risk of being destroyed because the original tenants disappeared or if they were not historically or architecturally significant could be remade for adaptive reuse. Physical intervention was usually involved to prepare the building for its new use in society. The visual identity of the building was celebrated and preserved and not concealed. The new
use was inserted into the old building with minimal visual alterations through minor remodeling. These preservation techniques enhance knowledge of the reader in understanding the context of this research. This research is applicable beyond academe as both scholars and novices can explore the historic structures and sites of Lucas County, learning how society changes its views on the meanings of historic significance and knowing that their ancestors felt that preserving or reinventing the past was a means of getting in touch with their heritage and their futures. In addition to public perceptions, issues surrounding the preservation movement are thoroughly clarified as connections are made relating Lucas County to the nation.

The first chapter discusses the country’s involvement in historic preservation prior to 1930. It reviews the disinterest of Americans in the past and shows how patriotic celebrations and sentiment encouraged the public to save certain aspects of their pasts. The chapter also explains the private efforts and grassroots organizations that crusaded for preservation awareness and the lack of government involvement in the national movement. Chapter Two contains an overview of the historic preservation movement after 1930, the period when the federal government finally became involved in preservation through the development of federal organizations, legislation, federal planning, and funds for local and state preservation organizations. It also discusses the problems that slowed the preservation movement, such as urban renewal, federal budget cuts, war policy, and modernization. Chapter Three takes an in depth look at the decline of historic preservation in Lucas County, Ohio from the nineteenth century until the present. The chapter examines specific sites in the county as examples of poor
preservation through description and before and after pictures of the historic sites. It also explains how the failures of preservation in Lucas County parallel those of the nation. The fourth chapter discusses the successful preservation efforts in Lucas County. The descriptive before and after pictures are again used to study examples of good preservation and explain the reasoning behind this process. It also shows how public perceptions influence which sites are saved and how preservation law and government assistance play a role in preservation planning. The final chapter is a narrative case study of the Lathrop House in Sylvania, Ohio, which exemplifies contemporary historic preservation and public controversy in Lucas County. The conclusion shows how local communities such as Lucas County have influenced the historic preservation movement and have depicted several similarities in the nation’s struggle for preservation. It takes into account the public perceptions on both a local and national scale in how sites are preserved and how these sites are continually affected by public opinion throughout the ages.
It is noted that the perceptions of the American public are difficult to measure, short of performing a nationwide survey. Voter initiatives, newspaper editorials, general observation, and trends that have been exhibited in secondary surveys were used in this thesis to measure public perceptions, but are not representative of what all or even a majority of Americans think about historic sites and preservation. Trends from secondary sources were used to gain a hypothetical notion of what is perceived.

2 Ibid, 88.
3 Ibid, 47.
4 Ibid, 133-134.
5 Ibid, 44.
9 Fitch, 44.
Chapter One
The Historic Preservation Movement Before 1930

“How will we know it’s us, without our past?”

-John Steinbeck, “The Grapes of Wrath”

The historic preservation movement in the United States started to develop in the early nineteenth century, but did not gain momentum until that century’s end. Many Americans did not see the need to preserve buildings, sites, or artifacts from their history as they questioned how they could preserve anything when this young nation had no past. As perceptions and attitudes towards the past changed, so did the disinterested position that Americans took in saving national landmarks. Though still numerous Americans did not appreciate maintaining sites important to history, anniversaries of significant historic events, such as the American Revolution, brought patriotic and cultural fervor into the country. This incited several upper class organizations and private citizens to crusade for saving sites of national and revolutionary significance. These organizations were usually led by wealthy women who involved the community in their efforts, making historic preservation a true grassroots movement. Government involvement in the preservation movement was virtually nonexistent, but the private sector was able to raise enough awareness and funding that it could generate and utilize government legislation to aid it and the rest of the nation in saving historical sites. Preservation was well on its way to
gaining federal and public recognition, showing that Americans were preserving their pasts in order to create their identities in the present.

In the early nineteenth century, a majority of Americans disliked the past and did not support any means of historic preservation. Before 1870, middle class citizens were quite present minded and felt indifferent to their own histories. Identities were “assumed or invented, not inherited” through discoveries of the past. The past was less intimate to these particular Americans. These citizens felt that the past should be “derogated as a reminder of decadence and dependency.”¹ This indifference caused national landmarks to be lost throughout these years due to “neglect, expensive repairs, obsolete structure usefulness, death of original owners, changing fashions, ignorance, and indifference to its historical significance.”² In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries upper and middle class Americans glorified ancient remains from Europe, but looked at buildings from their own past with contempt. The architecture of these eras was seen as “exceptionally crude and aesthetically distasteful.”³ They thought that change and progress was better for the nation, not reliving the past. Americans preferred older objects to look new. They felt that sites that looked old were not properly cared for and were considered seedy and ragged. Decay was seen as a symbol of failure.⁴

Middle class Americans during this time liked new and modern objects as they related a sense of prestige to their fragile egos. Several members of this class did not think it was prudent to organize preservation societies and deemed early preservationists too sentimental. Though most thought that the past was irrelevant, there were always conflicting views as many high-class citizens venerated the past. This prompted a sudden interest in saving historic sites.⁵
The motives for nineteenth century preservation were quite complex. In the mid-nineteenth century, national identity gained importance as the public focused on the great men of the past and the deeds that they performed to help form the American nation. In turn, preservation became a patriotic venture. For example, Princeton University’s Nassau Hall sustained burn damage in 1855 and the Trustees voted to retain as much of the historic structure as possible. The reason for this was that the hall was the site of the Continental Congress of 1783, which caused the university to boast strong patriotic associations to the structure.

The strongest initial impetus for preservation was the constant effort to memorialize heroes of the Revolution. The Centennial Exposition of 1876 in Fairmount Park, Philadelphia drew much attention to the preservation movement and to the devotion of saving certain American building types. This centennial celebration provoked the idea of preserving all things that were related to the American Revolution. It was now thought that as a result of this war, America now had a past worth saving.

As a result of this devotion to the Revolution, George Washington became the ultimate symbol of patriotism in the country, nearly reaching a point of religious zeal. State legislatures and private organizations were soon in frantic competition to buy houses where Washington slept or had made headquarters. The Centennial Association of Valley Forge organized to commemorate the hundred year departure of Washington’s army from the Valley Forge encampment. It bought Washington’s Valley Forge headquarters in 1878. Several other preservation organizations bought Revolutionary homes and most patriotic organizations safeguarded at least one of the headquarters that
Washington used. These organizations also tended to save the homes of Revolutionary heroes in hopes to inspire patriotism in the area. The patriotic enthusiasm from local communities allowed several buildings to be saved from destruction. However, the preservation of these sites provided narrow aims. Since no one else had any aims in comparison, whole areas of “America’s cultural heritage disappeared,” especially those that included ethnic influences.

The Northeastern region of the country saved homes from the Revolutionary Era, mostly due to local significance and pride. The services of these early inhabitants and their motivations were also reasons that provoked preservation as a form of ancestral worship on the part of local citizens.

The writing of local history was an incentive for encouraging historic preservation in the country. Historian Carol Kammen has written about the purpose of local history in her contribution to the book, On Doing Local History: Reflections on What Local Historians Do, Why, and What it Means. She explains that when local histories were written or read widely in the community, they portrayed viewpoints of those that revered ancestors and immortalized local heroes. The histories brought a close connection to the past for those that admired the characters and deeds written in local histories. In turn, communities felt a sense of duty and pride in saving local sites that were associated with those mentioned in local histories.

Local history was written mainly by “patrician historians” prior to 1870. Most of the writers were male, had some formal education, and were attracted to writing about their hometowns. Others not of this professional background, such as elderly women, also have written understandable histories due to their interest and knowledge of their
community’s past. Most local histories were written to honor the original settlers and to outline their deeds in creating the settlement. They were written in an optimistic manner to commemorate the successful frontiersman as a form of “ancestral worship.” They also celebrated the American ideal of the “sturdy citizen” exploring new frontiers and overcoming all obstacles to build a prospering community. Many of the early histories were written around the time of either the nation’s or states’ centennial as a way to show the patriotism of their communities. Wealthy residents attempted to lure settlers and tourists to their region with “booster” histories that showed the community in a favorable light. This image played on local pride.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, many people felt drawn to historic preservation because historical resources are all that link us to the past. Preservation was a means to recognize the nation’s identity, how we became who we are, and how we differed from other nations. During this time, members of the upper and middle classes reached out subconsciously to maintain individualism and identity. They saved sites to gain a better connection to the past and with the people that lived then. The past became respected because it molded what is now the present.

Preservation was also used to stimulate cultural and political hegemony in the country during the 1880s and 1890s. In the attempt of maintaining their own hegemony in the face of diversity, individuals and various groups looked for associations within history for personal reassurance. A post Civil War affluence encouraged numerous families to pursue genealogy and the preservation of their ancestral lands. One reason for this interest in ancestral preservation was for wealthy families to challenge those newly
wealthy citizens establishing themselves as prominent in the community and to claim a legitimate legacy in the community’s political hegemony and power.\textsuperscript{20}

Concerned community members wanted to preserve their history and to tell the story of the nation’s collective experiences. After the Civil War, increasing dissatisfaction with the present made veterans yearn for the fantasized ideals and artifacts of the American Revolution. Times after the Civil War were less congenial with the development of industry and massive immigration. People were beginning to resist change. As new generations of immigrants came to America at the turn of the century, the middle class felt threatened. It was then commonly thought that one’s past andReminiscing about the “good old days” would bring a cure to America’s social ills.\textsuperscript{21} Anxieties caused by these social troubles were calmed by the public’s veneration of the past. The middle class turned to saving the homes of historic personages such as Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Jackson, and Paul Revere and turning them into public shrines that were symbols of the greatness of America, which supposedly paralleled the greatness of all Americans and made clear that immigrants coming to the country should remain inferior as they did not relate to this personification of greatness.\textsuperscript{22}

Another motivation for preservation was the romantic ideals of the past that the upper and middle classes were actively seeking. In the 1820s, authors such as Washington Irving and James Fenimore Cooper published highly romanticized versions of regional history and folklore.\textsuperscript{23} In *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*, Michael Kammen makes clear that literary sources inspired popular stories of a romantic past. In lieu of this idea, imaginative magazine illustrators drew influential images selected by editors, publishers, authors that added
Due to these popular images, the mythicization and distortion of Revolutionary heroes and creators of the country began to take place. Though people were enamored with these popular historical myths, there was often little correlation between the actual remains of a place that is described in a myth and the myth itself. One instance of this included the Alamo. After the Alamo’s defeat, much myth surrounded the glorified structure. However, no one was interested in preserving or appreciating the site until the 1890s.

This nation of mythmakers was obsessed with authenticity, though they rarely reached this truth. In the twentieth century, crusaders for preservation looked for truth in tradition because they felt the need to compensate for the lack of authenticity by preservationists of the nineteenth century. In the 1800s, the Betsy Ross House was purchased for restoration, but there was no evidence that Ross sewed the American flag, nor were preservationists sure if the home they purchased was actually inhabited by Ross. In 1897, an evangelist exhibited the Lincoln log cabin at the Tennessee Centennial in Nashville. When asked about the cabin’s authenticity, the man replied, “one log cabin is just like another.” What was thought to be authentic was often proved false.

Though there were traces of interest in preserving older buildings in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, very few efforts were made to preserve until the mid 1800s. However, there were exceptional sites that were preserved in these early eras. The initial stages of consciousness in the preservation of historic structures in the United States began as early as 1749. Peter Kalm, a Swedish botanist, commented that it would be a shame to lose one of the first log cabins in Philadelphia. Private benefactors reportedly preserved the cabin as a “relic of early days.”
Americans needed much more time to develop perspectives about their heritage. Most often, they needed to lose significant sites before they saw the need to preserve them. As a result, interest developed as the fear of losing national monuments became a reality. In 1816, the Old Philadelphia State House (Independence Hall) was threatened with demolition. After the nation’s capital was moved to Washington D.C., the building became useless to the government. At this point, the site’s physical condition was beginning to deteriorate. The site was once considered the structure that housed the Declaration of Independence and the “birth of the free Republic.” Wealthy citizens convinced the city of Philadelphia to buy the Old State House from the State of Pennsylvania for seventy thousand dollars. The prominent citizens of Philadelphia felt that the building would still be useful as election headquarters. Though the site was rescued from demolition, much work was needed, especially if the lost downstairs library and extra wing were to be restored. The city then restored parts of the exterior and missing woodworkings in the room in which the Declaration of Independence was written. They also hired architect William Strickland in 1828 to rebuild the steeple of the hall. A replacement for the original tower was constructed in the Georgian style of architecture. In preparation for the nation’s centennial, Colonel Frank Etting of Philadelphia asked the Philadelphia Committee of Councils for the Centennial to restore Independence Hall as a national museum in 1871. Four chairs and several portraits of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were found and placed in the room where the signing took place. These artifacts were to replace the miscellaneous memorabilia present in the room, as all chambers were to be restored as they originally appeared during the signing of the Declaration of Independence. In 1873, the Liberty Bell was
placed in the hall tower, rooms were refurnished, pillars were added to support the ceilings in both the upstairs and downstairs rooms, and the first floor was restored by the centennial committee for public pilgrimage.30

In 1828, the Touro Synagogue in Newport, Rhode Island was the site of the first known completed restoration in the United States. This locally significant site was the first synagogue in the state. The structure was originally built in 1763 by local architect Peter Harrison, was repaired and completely restored.31 Shipper Abe Touro, son of the founder of the synagogue funded the operation as he had deep personal connections to the structure.32

Another example of early preservation was done privately in the 1830s when Uriah Levy bought Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello in 1836, not for museum purposes, but for personal reasons. One of which was to privately venerate the late president.33 Between the years 1836-1926, countless people tried to make Thomas Jefferson’s home, Monticello public property. Several of these citizens urged Congress to make the property one of the first national historic sites in the United States. Uriah Levy, the owner in 1836, left Monticello to the public in his will. The U.S. Congress refused the conditions of the will and continued to debate the issue for nearly sixty years. During this time of Congressional deliberation, the Levy family allowed Jeffrey Levy to care for the house, restoring its ruined condition. In the early 1900s, Jeffrey Levy took it upon himself to claim ownership of Monticello and refused to sell it to the state unless they met his price of five hundred thousand dollars. In 1911, Mrs. Martin Littleton, wife of a New York congressman desired to buy Monticello in order to memorialize Jefferson. Mrs. Littleton wanted to place the property in the hands of the public and to use the
Virginia legislature to aid her in enticing the public to see Monticello. After numerous attempts failed to purchase the property, a new organization formed to commemorate all aspects of Thomas Jefferson, raising enough money to buy Monticello from Jeffrey Levy around 1920, which in turn prompted Levy to donate other Jeffersonian artifacts for the house. This organization was named the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association. The organization later worked with the future National Monticello Association to keep the property in working condition, renovating the house for public exhibition in the 1920s. All of these people saw Monticello as an important connection to history. They found its “classic design and influence on the evolution of American styles” and ideas to be a significant part of the nation’s past that was essential to preserve.  

The first real success that did not involve much organizational effort was the endeavor to save the Hasbrouck House in Newburgh, New York. It was also one of the few landmarks in this period that received aid from the federal government. This site was an important landmark for that area as it was used as George Washington’s headquarters for the last two years of the American Revolution. The Hasbroucks went to court in 1813 to keep the state from building a road through the property. The house was allowed to stay after a fierce court battle. In 1837, money was given to the owners as a loan from the Commissioners of the United States Deposit Fund. The federal government gave this money for the purposes of upkeep of this national landmark, provided that the money was paid back each year. Eleven years later the owner Jonathan Hasbrouck could not raise enough money for the payment of the loan. The federal government offered to sell the house for the loan price of two thousand dollars plus additional fees. When no one could pay the price, the state of New York made an attempt to auction the house at a low bid
price to a few private citizens. After that action failed, the commissioners asked the city of Newburgh to find money to help them make the house state property. They also asked the governor, Hamilton Fish to ask the state legislature to pay the debt and in turn, the government would renew the loan to protect the site from deterioration. The New York legislature reimbursed the Deposit Fund and the Hasbrouck House was purchased as the nation’s first historic house museum.35

A clear example of the early preservation movement in New England manifested in Deerfield, Massachusetts. In 1847, the last surviving home of a massacre by Indians in 1704 was to be sold and then destroyed. This site, locally known as the Old Indian House, was popularly visited and locals had intense interest in the house, as it was the last memorial of Indian warfare in the area. The house door still had the hole cut by Frenchmen and Indians to kill the inhabitants inside. The owner, Henry Hoyt wanted to sell the house, but if no offers came, it was to be torn down. Citizens petitioned to save the house from destruction. However, the locals could not raise the two thousand dollars to save it, nor the one hundred fifty dollars that it took to move the house from the location where new construction was in planning. The building was razed and the town was in stages of regret. The only relic rescued from the house was the hatched marked door, which the Hoyts sold to a firm in Boston. Organized citizen groups interested in local history requested the door be returned to Deerfield and later bought the relic in 1868. It is now housed in the Memorial Hall of the Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association.36

The early phases of the preservation movement consisted of grassroots organizations that showed a national consciousness toward the past. The people that
enrolled in these organizations and the public that they reached felt a common sense of community and sense of belonging to a national movement as they worked together to save historic sites. Leading historian in historic preservation theory, Charles Hosmer writes extensively on the change in preservation organizations going from largely volunteer to a professional venture in the late nineteenth century. In the nineteenth century, the national preservation movement became an enterprise for women and elite individuals. Several organizations, driven by these female leaders, rallied to raise funds to save buildings from destruction by buying them, but a few organizations failed to provide money for preservation and maintenance, as they could not see a future for the building beyond its purchase. These organizations were not usually realistic about the economic forces that went against them in purchasing historic landmarks. Land values raised asking prices, raising money through campaigning was difficult, assistance was needed from the public and other organizations to make payments, emotional fervor of the public with correct timing was needed, and organizations needed to move quickly in order gain a site. Organizations thought that the admission fee would take care of the site’s maintenance, but low fees, low attendance, and high maintenance costs in the early years added up to break several organizations. Organizations asked for endowments, lifetime membership dues, selling and purchasing to a sympathetic owner so that they could get back on track economically. Despite all of these challenges, there were a few successful organizations that helped make preservation a popular venture.

A majority of preservation historians consider Ann Pamela Cunningham’s effort to save Mt. Vernon and her establishment of one of the prominent early preservation organizations (Mount Vernon Ladies Association) to be the beginning of the historic
preservation movement in America. Since Mt. Vernon was grossly neglected in the 1850s, many people wanted the state of Virginia or the federal government to buy the property. However, they both repeatedly refused. The wealthy citizens of Virginia believed that Mt. Vernon should be enshrined to commemorate Washington and that it ought to be the property of the nation. A descendent of the general, John Washington, inherited the property and attempted to sell it for two hundred thousand dollars. The previously mentioned citizens considered this asking price much too high and complained that it was unpatriotic of Washington to pose such a price. The local government could not afford to buy the property and Washington tried to sell Mt. Vernon as a future hotel site. There was a public outcry against this idea, which led Ms. Ann Pamela Cunningham to appeal to Southern women to aid her in purchasing and preserving the site. As Cunningham tried to raise public support for Mt. Vernon, the owners of the property were not sympathetic to her project. Cunningham wrote appeals to the women of the South in several newspapers, indicating plans to start an organization to purchase the site. The Virginia governor, Johnsen, asked the state legislature for help and in turn the legislature chartered the Mt. Vernon Ladies Association (though it was previously initiated years before by Cunningham) in 1857 to raise funds for preservation purposes. Former senator and orator from Massachusetts, Edward Everett, was intrigued by Cunningham’s cause and helped the Association by giving speeches about George Washington and the importance of Mt. Vernon to the state and nation. Everett donated the plentiful proceeds to the Mt. Vernon Ladies Association (MVLA) to save Mt. Vernon. John Washington did not want the Ladies to give the money to the state of Virginia, but Cunningham changed the charter terms to suit his needs and he accepted.
The Ladies purchased Mt. Vernon on March 19, 1858 when a bill was passed stating that Mt. Vernon now belonged to the state of Virginia and the MVLA.\textsuperscript{41}

The Civil War was difficult on the Mt. Vernon Ladies Association. The steamboat that took visitors to Mt. Vernon was seized by the army, leaving the association with no transportation, resulting in fewer tourists. These tourists, who were the sole source of income for Mt. Vernon, could not visit the site. Exterior work needed to be done to the house and money was scarce. After the Civil War, the national organization did not have enough money for the needed repairs. In 1869, a bill was passed to give the Ladies Association seven thousand dollars for repairs and for loss of revenue during the war.

The MVLA’s main goal in the preservation of Mt. Vernon was that of historical accuracy. The Association adhered to Cunningham’s wishes to preserve the house in the exact condition in which Washington had lived in it. Cunningham had stated that, “those who go to the home in which [Washington] lived and died, wish to see in what he lived and died.” The Association took this phrase literally and restored the site with the aid of extensive documentation. Washington had kept detailed records, which allowed the Ladies to recreate the atmosphere of Mt. Vernon from years past. The Ladies also made “invisible” interventions to make the past as it was, but still allowed the house to withstand tourists. For example, the main staircase was strengthened with a “hidden steel armature” to carry the numerous amounts of people that would climb it daily.\textsuperscript{42}

Cunningham’s victory with the Mt. Vernon Ladies Association established certain presuppositions about historic preservation in America. These deductions included “private citizens and not the government were the proper advocates for preservation, buildings and sites associated with military and political figures were worthy of
preservation, historic sites were treated as shrines or icons, and women would assume the
dominant role in the acquisition and management of properties.\textsuperscript{43}

Other groups tried to imitate the success of the Mt. Vernon Ladies Association to
gain prominence as a national organization. However, the ladies that saved the
Washington headquarters in Valley Forge and those that refurnished the Hermitage failed
to gain nationwide interest in their projects. Many other organizations also failed in their
attempts to become national in scope. These failures were mainly due to the lack of
funding and the disinterest in the particular projects that certain preservation
organizations were trying to save. Financially able Americans were more interested in
preserving the home of a national icon such as George Washington, rather than waste
time and money on historic places that were associated with men of lesser cultural
value.\textsuperscript{44}

The next major preservation organization that gained national recognition was
again headed by female preservationists. In 1888, the Association for the Preservation of
Virginia Antiquities (APVA) became one of the first and largest groups to be formed
after the Civil War that did not have gender or heredity specifications for membership.
This change in membership specifications for preservation organizations signified that
they (along with the preservation movement) were leaning toward a grassroots
involvement headed by women that included not only the elite, but also individuals of all
classes that were interested in saving significant sites. Headed by Mary Galt, the APVA
was given a charter by the Virginia legislature in 1893, which allowed the association to
own property in the state. APVA’s major interest was the preservation of Jamestown
Island. The Association’s efforts prevented the James River from washing away what
was left of the historic island. The APVA had spent too much money on building a wall around the island and on the upkeep of the buildings, which kept the group from doing much preservation in the rest of the state.\textsuperscript{45}

The Ladies Hermitage Association in Nashville, Tennessee initially organized to save Andrew Jackson’s home. The state of Tennessee had previously owned the Hermitage and the government did not think that it should allow the public to take care of the property.\textsuperscript{46} The Tennessee legislature passed a bill that set the house aside for twenty-five years as a veteran’s home for Confederate soldiers. This bill destroyed the site’s value as a shrine and the Ladies campaigned under Mary C. Dorris for a charter in 1889 to plead their case to restore and memorialize the property. In a compromise, the government gave the Association the house and twenty five of the five hundred acres to support their efforts. The Ladies were not trusted to run these affairs unassisted so nine male trustees were appointed oversee them. Though women were allowed to organize people, designate sites to be saved, and raise funds for historic preservation, men were to control how sites were preserved. This notion was the beginning of the shift from women organization leaders to male leaders in later years. The remaining acreage was set aside for the Veteran’s Home, which made it difficult for the Association to support its ventures. In addition to the Association’s troubles, it was hard to transport tourists to the site before the invention of the automobile. The house was also difficult to refurnish because all of the original furniture belonged to the family. The Association paid the family a fee of seventeen thousand five hundred dollars to buy the furniture. It also had to pay an interest of three percent on the purchased price in order to help the Jackson family survive economically, due to loss of income from the Veteran’s Home.
The Ladies Hermitage Association became the only private preservation organization to receive government aid before 1926. In 1907, Theodore Roosevelt developed a liking to the Hermitage and signed a bill granting twenty five thousand dollars. Five thousand actually came to the Ladies, whereas the other twenty thousand was never received. The added funds did help the Ladies restore the house and maintain it for the numerous visitors over the years.\textsuperscript{47}

There were two dominant patriotic organizations formed in the 1890s that were open exclusively to women, had specific genealogical qualifications for membership, and were nationally recognized. However, both groups found that most preservation work was done at the state and local levels. These two organizations were the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) and the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America.

The DAR’s preservation principles aimed for revolutionary monuments and patriotism through historical research. The members contributed funds to save Revolutionary sites.\textsuperscript{48} There was a huge membership within the DAR and work was only done through the local chapters. The reason for this being that at Meadow Gardens in Augusta, Georgia, the DAR purchased the home of George Watson, a signer of the Declaration of Independence. Since the home was of moderate historical significance the national society debated not purchasing the property. The members in Georgia were upset and soon members in all of the states wanted money from the national organization to save sites of local significance. After this point, each state had a DAR chapter and raised their own funds to save whichever sites they pleased. In 1896, one of the individual chapters in New Jersey preserved and restored the Washington headquarters in
Somerville as a museum. The state DAR societies also united to save the William Henry
House in Vincennes, Indiana in 1917. The individual chapters often saved certain
buildings to serve as chapter houses. They also tried to save one to two buildings per
year in different sections of the country.\footnote{49}

The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America, unlike the DAR was
interested in preserving almost any site that exhibited associations with the history of the
nation, though they did emphasize preserving sites of the colonial period. They were
wealthy women and had less trouble raising funds than the DAR.\footnote{50} One of the first sites
saved by the Dames was the Van Cortlandt Mansion in Van Cortlandt Park, New York
City. It was property of the city in 1889, but it was not used as a museum until 1896
when Mrs. Mary Church, president and founder of the Colonial Dames in New York
convinced the state legislature and park board to lease the house to the society for thirty
years. The New York Dames restored the house and opened it to the public in 1897. The
Dames’ primary intentions were to “Americanize immigrant children, to make the public
more interested in historic sites, and to make good citizens out of foreign youths.”\footnote{51}

In 1910, William Sumner Appleton founded the Society for the Preservation of
New England Antiquities (SPNEA), which lobbied for the preservation of both historic
and architecturally important buildings. This society focused more on the aesthetics of a
site and its significance in relationship to historic architecture. The SPNEA was very
successful at restoring old landmarks. In 1915, the organization had fifteen hundred
members that raised a large amount of funds through generous donations. Appleton
proposed an amendment to the Massachusetts state Constitution in 1918 to make
preservation and maintenance of old houses for “public use.”\footnote{52}
The SPNEA obtained some of its buildings through wills requiring preservation of the site. The society was not tied down to a specific use for the site and it provided endowments of at least five thousand dollars to aid in maintenance costs. The public became quite impressed with the society’s efforts.  

In California, white elite men and women identified themselves with the “white” pioneers of the Gold Rush heritage, recognizing others very selectively. Children of the men from the pioneer era started preservation societies memorializing sites of the Gold Rush and marking them as historically significant. Two of these societies called themselves the Native Sons and the Native Daughters of the Golden West. The Sons were formed in 1875 and the Daughters in 1886. The Daughters had more members and stretched all over California. In 1898, the Daughters launched a statewide crusade to mark historically significant sites. Eliza D. Keith from San Francisco led the landmark committee and began a movement in 1901 to survey historic families for their support in town improvement and preservation so that the Daughters may one day become a national organization. The Daughters joined with various women’s clubs and male organizations to form the California Historical Landmark League. There was an urgency to mark and preserve these sites relating to the Gold Rush because the organization feared that people might forget that part of the past.

Preservation organizations of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries usually found that their goal was to acquire an early or significant endangered building and restore it for museum use. In 1926, Williamsburg was first financed by a nonprofit organization called the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. It created a passion for preservation, especially among wealthy industrialists, which explains the funding of
historical sites by Rockefeller, Ford, and Albert Wells (Sturbridge). Restoration of these sites coincided with the “automobile vacations” as they developed in the 1920s and 1930s. The organizations of this era were often spin-offs of the women’s garden clubs, consisting of rich women with social aspirations. They used auto tours to promote and visit these sites.\footnote{55}

There were several techniques that preservation organizations used after they had saved a site. Most often, they used adaptive reuse to preserve historic sites, while making them relevant to the present day. The most popular form of adaptive reuse in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was the historic house museum. They were the earliest and most basic “modules” of the preservation movement. Professional institutions and prominent individuals ran many of these museums. Numerous establishments were preserved because of their association with famous people of historical events.

Mt. Vernon and Monticello were two of the first prototypes for historic house museums. They contained much educational and entertainment value as evidenced by the many visitors that experienced the grounds. House museums such as Mt. Vernon taught the public how George Washington lived, while showing the objects of his everyday life.\footnote{56} However, contemporary knowledge and attitudes of the twentieth century have determined some deficiencies in the presentation of these two museums. It has been found that these sites have biased interpretations, educational programs, and publications by groups of elites that have restored the properties for public exhibition.\footnote{57}

Patricia West’s book, *Domesticating History: The Political Origins of America’s House Museums* indicates that the development of house museums created a political
context that involved women active in preservation. Women were the primary force in managing house museums, as saving “sacred” houses was within the “domestically based sphere of their activity.” They organized to preserve the homes of historical figures, “transmitting once private houses into democratically accessible exemplars of domesticity, which offered cultural solutions to public and political problems.”

Using Mt. Vernon as a model, sectional politics between north and south over the issue of slavery divided the nation, but the admiration of George Washington brought unity in saving his home. Cunningham unintentionally became involved in the issue in an attempt to bring northern and southern women together to help finance Mt. Vernon. The home appealed to women “split along sectional lines because both could claim George Washington” as an identity shared. It was the hopes of political factions that this shrine would “inspire the kind of political moderation that would stave off civil war.” The process of establishing a house museum brought women out of the private sphere and engaged them in the political world. Though women were disenfranchised, they could create chartered “corporate entities that could claim a full range of legal rights.” The development of house museums extended women’s values into the public realm and relayed its function in defining the public role on political issues.

Outdoor architecture museums were another way in which to preserve sites. These museums exhibited entire buildings in the open air. Private individuals that were history buffs and amateur local groups first did this. Examples of outdoor museums included Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan and the Old Sturbridge Village in Massachusetts. Both institutions hired professional staffs to reorganize collections and to provide accurate interpretations of the sites. Everything was put on display, including
artifacts that were originals and replicas of originals. The replicas were usually accurate facsimiles as modern research gave enough information to accomplish such feats.  

The concept of an outdoor museum was becoming an interesting idea for Americans and they soon had a prototype in the form of Colonial Williamsburg. The interpretation of colonial artifacts and architecture became increasingly popular as the nation began to appreciate the eighteenth century aesthetics and political heritage of the country. Williamsburg became a training program for historic preservationists and history professionals as they continually rescued physical evidence to reconstruct the town and return it to the present as a “spirit of the past.”

It is nearly impossible to produce permanently convincing fakes as time usually finds a way to expose them. Each epoch leaves its own imprint on everything that it makes, including its own version of the past. However, replicas can be used occasionally as surrogates for the originals. In Williamsburg, the town plan would be virtually unintelligible to visitors if the vanished buildings were not reconstructed. It is often necessary to reproduce missing elements of a building that has been mutilated by fire, neglected, or remodeled. In the area of replicas, most museums in the twentieth century opted for using new wares, rather than the worn originals so that visitors could gain a sense of what it was like for people to live during this particular era when these artifacts were being used for the first time, not after they had been deteriorated for many years.

An excellent example of early twentieth century preservation in the country is the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg. It was one of the few sites to incorporate every level of “curatorial intervention” from preservation to restoration. The private undertakings of W.A.R. Goodwin, rector of the Burton Parish Church in Williamsburg,
Virginia, to restore Colonial Williamsburg caught the interest of John D. Rockefeller Jr. The idea of restoring an entire town to its eighteenth century state was a phenomenal concept that the oil tycoon felt he needed to take part. Williamsburg was considered to be the “birthplace of liberty” and both Goodwin and Rockefeller worked to embark on the first American experiment in a museum oriented preservation of a community. The preservation of Williamsburg was community wide in scope as many people came to evaluate several buildings in relation to their surrounding structures. In 1926, Rockefeller funded the restoration and preservation of significant portions of the colonial capital. The existing buildings were restored and much historical and archeological research was performed to rebuild structures that were demolished years before.

In setting the cut off date for restoration at 1775, the preservation of Williamsburg became distinctly blurred as more than half of the buildings were reconstructed. Two of the most important reconstructions were the lost Capital and the Governors Palace. No one knew what these buildings actually looked like as they were destroyed over one hundred years before. There was much textual material describing their appearance, but only one pictorial document was discovered. This single engraving was the basis of their reconstructed appearances. The rest of the restorations to these two buildings were highly hypothetical.66

At Williamsburg, the preserver’s aims were still narrow as the views that were portrayed were upper class WASP histories. The streets were clean, there were no slaves, no outhouses, and the environment was not as it really was in antiquity. A past shown behind glass did not enrich the lives of those who viewed it, if no direct connections were made about how the past really happened.67
Henry Ford’s Greenfield Village intended to be different in its interpretation. It was established to become an “animated textbook” to teach the public about simple American life and the power of American inventions. By late twentieth century standards, this outdoor museum was not an entirely authentic piece of preservation. The buildings located within Greenfield Village, though historic, were taken from their original sites and taken for exhibition at Ford’s village. These buildings were used to “teach the public; stimulate professional discussion of the past, and to bring general preservation awareness to the general public.”

William Murtaugh’s Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America mused that visitors to both Williamsburg and Greenfield Village have developed changing attitudes about the meanings of American history. These attitudes were measured by comment cards visitors filled out at the museums and by comments made to staff that have changed the way exhibits have been interpreted. Visitors have seen the museum’s interpretations as “celebratory, educational, commemorative, and patriotic.” However, the museums did not exhibit workplaces of the past. It was not till a later date that preservationists and museum curators would preserve where historic figures worked.

Preservationists were very selective of the material that was interpreted. Entire pasts were never put on display due to space and budgeting concerns, and many aspects of the past could not be replicated as people’s tastes changed so drastically throughout the ages. Sensations such as smells and sanitation, as well as controversial issues, could not be brought to the public and the sites ultimately lost much of their realism.
Outdoor museums were initially interpreted by untrained staff. Early in the preservation movement, another trend occurred as untrained amateurs were in control over how to save certain landmarks. However, these amateurs grew to depend on architects or antique connoisseurs for advice. Most architects felt that they were trained to restore buildings to their original states, but they were not familiar with the methodology of colonial builders, so they often lacked authority in how to restore most sites. An exception to this case occurred in the 1930s. The Board of Advisory Architects was asked to oversee the Williamsburg project. The original material was retained and they respected the surviving work, even though it was more expensive. They approved the inclusion of new material, but they made no attempt to use new methods, they only used the construction methods of the past. Much research was done before construction and the entire restoration of the town was carefully recorded through writings and photographs. The architects on the project stated that they would rather preserve structures than restoring or reconstructing.

Usually the person that was supervising the work that was being done influenced the restoration of the site. These individuals attempted to make the structure more useful and an accurate representation of the past. Many historical organizations in the early twentieth century freely altered sites in order to serve their needs. For example, in 1906, one local chapter of the DAR tore down portions of the Spaulding House in Lowell, Massachusetts so that it could have a larger meeting room.71

Tourism gave economic aid for preservation but it also threatened the survival of the site. The transportation of tourists often hurt historic sites that were being shown to the public. This was due to the “material waste, vibrations of machinery and people, and
often the structure of the site could not support the capacity of the great numbers of people that visited it each year."  

Criteria in establishing historical significance were constantly changing and reflected upon the major changes running rampant in American social thought. Most preservationists did not usually think certain criteria were important in saving a building. Generally, the most important element in saving a site was the immediate danger of destruction, and then they would later think about why the site was significant.

In the initial stages of the preservation movement the criteria for historic landmark selection was determined by several factors. Early preservationists looked to significant architecture or historical and inspirational value in order to save sites. In 1913, Edward Hall, secretary of the American Scenic said the preservationists saved “use-historic” sites because famous Americans were born or had lived in the buildings at some point or the site was the scene of important historical events. Sites that were not connected with important men or historic events were only “time-historic”. They had to reach a certain age before they could be considered worthy of preservation.

Patriotic criteria was often used as a reminder of the hardships of our revered ancestors or as examples of “peace and harmony” of an “uncomplicated past.” Local pride and good citizenship were also seen as criteria as they were important ideals in American life.

Preservation occasionally forgets to “critically question” the diverse meanings of structures because local residents saw sites as having only one history, rather than several. Usually the version of history that is set up for the public is institutionalized politically. The history represented to the public has the potential to “articulate
overarching broadly shared civil or national faith that transcends ethnic and class
loyalties.” However, prominent individuals employed “objective” criteria for the
inventory of designating significance. A local criterion was not usually viewed as
significant because the more important political criteria won out.75

The historical significance of a site became associated with important people or
events in history. Before 1876, sites of the Revolution or places where the nation’s
founders inhabited were deemed important to the country’s identity and sought to educate
and inspire patriotism upon the general public. Symbols of the past brought immense
value to historic sites as historic preservation spread to historical and patriotic groups. As
local groups would place commemorative tablets on demolished sites, the preservation
movement evolved from concept to policy.76

The concept of preservation was modified between 1910 and 1931 to include
architecture as a criterion for preservation. Enthusiasm for colonial houses formed which
spawned colonial revival styles of architectures to spread throughout the country. It also
established aesthetically pleasing architecture as criteria for preservation. This
architecture criterion was still limited in scope as it was still linked with historic aspects,
but it prepared the groundwork for SPNEA founder, William Sumner Appleton to make
architecture recognizable in preservation.

Appleton believed that the preservation of sites should not always be based on
historical significance, as it should be because of architectural significance. Other
organizations followed suit and became less focused on the patriotic aspects of a site and
became more interested in saving a site for its architectural importance. Appleton, an
architectural historian, was a strong supporter of saving architecturally significant sites.
Appleton was less interested in the historic heroes or the wealthy patronages that were previously seen as criteria for preserving buildings. Mourning the loss of several sites that were architecturally important, but not historically significant, led Appleton to mold public enthusiasm to consider architecture as criteria to save sites.\textsuperscript{77}

As a result of this addition of architecture as preservation, historical societies and preservation organizations were beginning to preserve sites based on architectural merit. In New England, two examples of architecture in Ipswich, Massachusetts motivated its local historical society to think about restoration as one of its primary aims. One site that it sought to save was the John Whipple House, built in the seventeenth century. The site was not historically remarkable, but it represented old styles stemming from English roots. Another site on the society’s preservation list was the Paul Revere House. In 1905, there was private interest in saving the home, as it was Boston’s oldest surviving frame building. The house’s altered appearance was due to interference to make the site more useful. These sites were examples that trends in preservation were beginning to change.\textsuperscript{78}

Federal and most state governments were not actively interested in purchasing historic buildings before 1926 as private groups took care of this task. Nevertheless, the state and local governments gave intermittent help in preservation since 1816, for example in the restoration and purchase of Independence Hall. However, the private sector was the dominant driving force in preserving most sites. State legislatures would occasionally be persuaded to give money to preservation as exemplified by the Hasbrouck House and Hermitage.\textsuperscript{79} Though little federal legislation was passed, it impacted the way in which the preservation movement would prosper.
In 1872, the federal government set aside Yellowstone as a national park to “protect curiosities and natural wonders.” The government was to protect property and federal lands, provide a national survey of significant properties, and involve the general public in national heritage protection. During this period, however, this oath was often reneged.\textsuperscript{80} In 1889, Congress authorized the Casa Grande Reservation in Arizona to save and protect prehistoric ruins. It was one of the first examples of “federal responsibility for cultural resources on public property” in an era where government involvement was extremely limited.\textsuperscript{81}

Civil War veterans groups pressured for a national cemetery in 1890, forcing the federal government to name the first battlefield park at Chickamauga, Georgia. It was to serve as a memorial to the lost soldiers as well as to present an interpretive site of the Civil War.\textsuperscript{82}

There was growing popular interest in historical landscapes and preservation. In 1890, a landscape architect named Charles Eliot helped to organize the Trustees of Reservations to protect Massachusetts’s disappearing historical sites and natural resources. In 1895 the Trustees of Scenic and Historic Places and Objects was formed in New York which was a model of the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, which was the forerunner for the National Trust and the Antiquities Act of 1906 to protect Native American sites on federal land.\textsuperscript{83}

Two actions by the federal government set the stage for modern preservation. The first piece of legislation was the legal response to pressure from educational and scientific groups that were concerned about the prehistoric remains in the American Southwest. The Antiquities Act of 1906, also known as the Lacey Act, was signed by
President Theodore Roosevelt. It stated that those that destroyed “antiquities on public lands” would be fined or imprisoned. The President was authorized to “declare properties as national monuments, along with the parcels of land large enough to ensure their proper care and management.” It also proclaimed that permits were needed to “examine, excavate, or collect antiquities.” These permits were issued by authorized institutions for the proper preservation of these antiquities. This was the federal government’s first acknowledgement of historic preservation and its responsibility towards archaeology. It was the first “central authority” on which historic preservation is based. The second was the development of the National Park Service in 1916. It promoted and regulated federal areas as the government became concerned about land conservation. The first director of the NPS, Stephen Mather, encouraged the growth of private fund raising for conservation. As the NPS was placed under the Department of the Interior, preservation became more prominent across the country.

Early public perceptions of historic sites were an important factor in determining whether historic sites would be preserved. As Americans continued to lose their identities in place and time, old buildings contributed valuable historic testimonials of what America was and what it is now becoming. Old buildings were physical links to the past. It gave common individuals a sense of “national and personal identity, environmental diversity, contributed to urban revitalization, encouraged patriotism, and fulfilled nostalgic instincts.”

According to professor of architecture, James Marston Fitch in his book *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World*, one aspect that influenced public opinions about historic sites was the aesthetics of the building. Cosmetic
conditions had a detrimental affect on the public’s reaction and judgment of older buildings. The public may see older sites as looking dark, bright, old, new, neglected, ugly, or pretty, but these judgments were not always valid as looks could often be deceiving. When physical intervention was completed, preservationists asked themselves whether the building should look old or new. It was regularly questioned if the replaced elements should weather naturally, or if it should be made to look antique. The original designers or the owners usually decided the aesthetic ambitions.  

The importance of emotional attachments to places was vital to the American sense of history as the public continued to ask, “What happened here?” When individuals have a sense of place, it shows that the role of the physical environment is important to forming individual identities. Many late nineteenth century laborers experienced placelessness as they were constantly moving to seek employment and had no real attachment to buildings of the past. They felt that they did not belong. They experienced no connection to the land if it was not identified as something in which they could relate to in their memories. The sites then lacked historical consciousness for the viewer and perceptions were changed as a result. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the middle and lower classes were planted in their urban neighborhoods, feeling a connection to their homes and to those that lived there before them. When historic sites were destroyed, the individuals that identified with the site lost their sense of place and all evidence of land use was obliterated.  

The institution of history often catered to popular expectations and it was difficult for visitors to distinguish what sites had been interpreted accurately. This usually happened early in the preservation movement as historic sites were preserved as shrines.
because that was how the nation viewed sites that should be noticed. If it was not for commemoration or aesthetics, sites were perceived as unworthy of recognition. How the past shapes the public’s perception of place helps us to understand the versions of the past underlying the historic preservation strategies the communities employed to “define and protect their special character.”

Local communities found ways to personalize the past using historical knowledge to enhance, enliven, and alter history to parallel public expectations.

As a result of the early historic preservation movement, history became misread and later evolved into myths as people started to believe things about the past that did not happen, but should have. As patriotism and pride were significant criteria for preservation, the sites that were preserved due to these ideals were seen by middle class Americans as fantasized images of heroes that were based on historical fact, despite how preservationists tried to maintain historical accuracy. The famous American fables such as George Washington cutting down the cherry tree were proved wrong, but they continued to live on in popular memory and nothing could extirpate them. Members of all social classes demanded formal history to be truthful, but they did not usually understand that with so many different views of the past, historical truth was ever-changing. These “truths” would evolve over time as new evidence or interpretations occurred.

Faith in a believed past that was not accurate brought the nation together to share a common heritage. The public frequently saw the past through “modern eyes and biases,” bringing all aspects of the past into the mindset of the present. They could not avoid relating aspects of the past to similar aspects in one’s own time. A good example
of this can be seen in the archives of Mt. Vernon. An 1860 engraving of the Banquet Hall at Mt. Vernon tells scholars more about Victorian tastes and decoration than Washington’s. The engraving shows elaborate dark draperies, ornate wall and floor designs and guests in nineteenth century dress styles. This was the nineteenth century view of the previous century, improving upon the simple styles of the past. As seen in the previous example, many prominent citizens tried to improve upon one’s own heritage through updating with present perspectives. With presentism, the past became more familiar and reasonable, but it also developed into credible reality that was once set in the past. Though many Americans wanted some sort of direct contact with history, due to lingering modernist ideas, they tended to “prettify” the past once they had completed their so called preservation feats. Sites were to be altered to look new or changed to make a deteriorating town become revitalized. Meanwhile the site had sacrificed its historic features. In the public realm, heritage improves upon the past to suit present needs and consolidates history into generalizations that makes the past agree with public expectations. People change the past in order to justify present ideas about a particular era or to alter biases by previous commentators of history.

Several communities record present beliefs of the past as they are molded to public expectations rather than portraying a “replica of the past.” When ordinary individuals build a past that they desire, the more convinced they are that this desired past is truer than the actual past. What Americans expect the past to be, or what they had learned in error comprises the product of the past that heritage brings to the audience. This tended to happen most often in the “boosterism” of local histories written for ancestor worship. Historic sites were saved that were associated with these perceived
heroes because the local community expected the histories that were written to be a testament to the past, yet claiming that their ancestors performed heroic deeds comparable to the expectations of the nation. When reconstructing artifacts of the past, adhering to public expectation often makes the subject more faithful to the truth, than the object that actually existed. This is an arrogant view that contemporary Americans are more knowledgeable about the past than those that lived in it.\(^{101}\)

As historic interpretations changed throughout the years, so did the public’s perceptions. Members of each social class felt differently about the past during different epochs. They went through stages throughout the years that were comprised of “vilifying the present in favor of the past, self confident improvement on valued precursors, using the past to aggrandize the present, and hapless ambivalence.”\(^{102}\) This was a vicious cycle that had beneficial effects for the historic preservation movement. Each era represented each of these attitudes toward the past at some point. These attitudes, though different, convinced middle and upper class Americans that the past was something to be valued and saved, despite the reasoning behind it.

The historic preservation movement may have been in its initial stages during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but the leaders and organizations that were developed during this time worked hard to make preservation a success. The private efforts of this age set the stage for future preservationists, expanding to use the resources of the public sector. The motives and the criteria for preservation would continue to change, as would the perceptions of historic sites. In the next few years, preservation would become extremely important in the eyes of Americans. In learning from the
mistakes of the past and with a new ally in the federal government, the historic preservation movement moved forward with great success.
In the nineteenth century, patriotism was defined as an almost blind allegiance to the nation. It corresponded with the rise of immigration, leading Americans to cling to a national identity that involved enshrining national heroes, which in turn would give them a feeling of justified superiority over the immigrants that challenged their way of life.

In 1888, the National Park Service was established to protect and preserve natural landscapes and historical sites. This marked a significant shift in the way Americans viewed their past and present. The establishment of the National Park Service was a reflection of the growing sense of national identity and a desire to preserve the nation's natural and cultural heritage.

The establishment of the National Park Service was not without controversy. Some argued that it was unnecessary and that the federal government should not be involved in the preservation of natural landscapes. However, others saw it as a necessary step in ensuring that the nation's natural and cultural heritage would be preserved for future generations.

Despite the controversy, the National Park Service continued to grow and expand, with new parks being established and existing ones being expanded. Today, the National Park Service is a vital part of the American landscape, preserving natural and cultural sites that are important to the nation's history and identity.
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Chapter Two

The Historic Preservation Movement After 1930

“We do not use bombs and powder kegs to destroy irreplaceable structures…we use the corrosion of neglect or the thrust of bulldozers…we ourselves create the blank spaces of memory by doing nothing when the physical signs of our previous national life our removed from our midst.”

- Albert Rains & Laurence Henderson
“With Heritage So Rich”

As the preservation movement entered into the 1930s, an era of economic “Depression” loomed over the nation, causing a number of drastic changes for historic preservation. For the first time in the history of the preservation movement, the federal government involved itself directly in establishing policies, professional programs, laws, funding, and federal agencies to aid the preservation of historic sites. From this point until the present day, the preservation movement has expanded to include sites of local significance; provided records and surveys of historic sites; established a National Register of nationally significant sites to receive federal funding, protection and recognition; created laws and funding incentives to promote preservation; established criteria for nominating historic sites; and brought the American public to interact with their pasts in more constructive ways. The role of the National Park Service also led the movement in a new direction that cooperated with state and local governments, along with local communities to determine what sites were to be saved and which were not. Though numerous problems arose throughout the years to retard the preservation
movement, such as urban renewal, war policy, budget cuts, and modernization, preservation planning persevered as the federal government, along with the public at large took the past and placed it in context with their present needs.

The economic and social devastation that followed the Great Depression urged the federal government to take a larger role in historic preservation and caused many American citizens to reevaluate their heritage. This crisis of the 1930s prompted Americans to seek a more meaningful sense of their heritage by focusing more on local architecture as they tried to save what was left of their past. American citizens clung to this intimate past, as they feared what horrors the future would bring to them.¹ This reconnection to a past that was more familiar and safe brought a love of the nation’s history to the public. A renewed love of history during this era inspired early American architecture such as Colonial to be used in new housing and to be preserved in old landmarks.² As a result of this love for the past, people in public life were more enthused about American history. Many thought that the federal government should be active in the nation’s commemorations of historic sites, as well as provide funds and programs to preserve what was left.³ For the first time in the preservation movement, the federal government took it upon itself to become involved entirely in preserving sites as a service to a public in need of employment and national unity. However, had it not been for the Depression, the federal government would have taken longer to concern itself with American history and preservation.

Throughout the 1930s, the federal government was to become the most important single agency for preservation due to its sizable programs, educational tools for particular sites, and its increasingly professionalized staff.⁴ People in authority positions in both the
federal government and the private sector were ambitious and wanted to do something worthwhile for the preservation movement. They hired more professional historians, architects, and surveyors to head the new historic preservation programs funded by the federal government. One federal agency, the National Park Service (NPS), organized several projects in preservation, employing out of work professionals in various specialized fields. These individuals started out in these projects just trying to make a living, but soon they grew to love preservation and what it did for the nation. These new professionals yielded several innovative ideas that eventually aided the preservation of several historic sites.

Due to the economic distress of the Depression, the federal government was able to commit “unprecedented” resources to several needs of the nation, including a number of preservation programs. A few of the resources that were contributed comprised of money, stronger NPS involvement, and the work of the Civilian Conservation Corp (CCC). The NPS created the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) in 1933 as the states and the federal government created more parks using historic interpretation. This creation power confirmed the central role of the NPS in historic preservation. President Franklin D. Roosevelt used one of his many New Deal Programs, the CCC, to make HABS successful. The CCC put architects and photographers to work preparing measured drawings of major historical buildings through HABS. HABS was not meant to save buildings; it was to create a national archive that included sources that were once ignored by previous preservationists, such as mills, barns, or churches. These surveys also featured photographs of the sites. That same year, there was a reorganization of the NPS, taking it away from the War Department and placing it in the Department of the
Interior to handle historic sites. The New Deal programs run by the NPS ran under other auspices to help train park employees in preservation techniques and policies and in connecting popular education with historical interpretation to increase public awareness about preserving sites.  

The Great Depression became a turning point for historic preservation as the Historic Sites Act of 1935 brought the movement into “mainstream American life.” Horace Albright was the NPS administrator who convinced President Roosevelt to put all historic sites owned by the federal government under the supervision of the NPS. In 1935, Roosevelt urged Congress to approve a “Historic Sites” bill to serve the needed stimulus for patriotism, which would help the nation live through the Depression. F.D.R. said that historic patriotism “tends to enhance the respect and love of the citizen for the institutions of his country, as well as strengthen his resolution to defend unselfishly the hallowed traditions and high ideals of America.” In the provisions of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, the Secretary of the Interior found professionals to conduct surveys of historic places and identified the properties so that they might be included in the NPS. However, privately owned structures of national significance could not be candidates for parks, so they were cited as National Historic Landmarks, which formed the basis for the National Register of Historic Places.

In the 1930s, the NPS connected patriotism with populism as its guide to create policies for preservation. In 1935, the mission of the NPS was “to recreate for the average citizen something of the color, the pageantry, and the dignity of our national past.” This mission reflected how the NPS wanted to make the public aware of their pasts through national historical programs that brought them the refuge that they were
currently seeking from a troubled era. The NPS developed restoration policies during this period, using Colonial Williamsburg as its prototype. Architecture and historic significance from different periods were certainly emphasized, but the NPS wanted to get away from this focus and try to put together a “broad historical program where the most important historical trends of the nation’s history could be interpreted.”

Under the new NPS nomination policies, organizations and individuals could nominate sites, but there ended up being too many requests for the preservation of sites, so the NPS established nomination procedures to regulate the process. These nomination procedures will be listed later in the chapter. However, this regulation may have stifled proposals from “regional, minority, and relatively uninfluential groups that found it hard to fulfill the lofty criteria for national significance.”

As noted in Michael Kammen’s book *Mystic Chords of Memory*, tradition changed slightly in the 1930s and 1940s as historic figures “without high prominence, genealogy, interest in ordinary people and everyday life, and putting less emphasis on heroic individuals and more on the collective efforts of groups became popular among most citizens.” In concurrence with this notion, the twentieth century preservation movement showed a broader range of interest with a variety of people taking part and not just wealthy whites. There was more of a concern for social history and of a past more understanding of the context of surviving buildings. The general public felt more of a need to protect a history that was closer to them, a history of ordinary citizens, like themselves that they could identify with. As a result of this new mindset, preservation moved from sites of national significance to local values. It also expanded the movement to include aesthetics, planning, and the economy.
The blossoming interest in social history allowed the states and the federal government to protect historically significant, yet ordinary neighborhoods through historic districts. These historic districts were established in order to protect significant houses and to protect against the threat of development. The designation of a historic district also encouraged preservation development of older neighborhoods, thus improving their community image and maintaining their property values. However, some problems arose in the debate over nomination criteria for historic districts and sites. A few of the questions that were asked included, whose history was important? What are the legitimate boundaries of a historic district? Should the physical integrity of a building be the primary test of whether or not it will be protected? These questions would remain controversial especially in the 1960s and continue until the present day.

In 1931, the legislature of South Carolina approved the “Old and Historic District of Charleston,” making it the first historic district in the nation. The district was preserved using architectural control with the state and local governments. It showed that there was a value in the community that wanted to preserve the aesthetic character of entire areas rather than just individual sites. This preservation ordinance was based upon the principles of municipal zoning, a preservation device that prevented the construction of new buildings that were incompatible with the remaining sites, or preventing alterations of the older sites that would not look pleasing. The ordinance protected the exteriors of the buildings without affecting how the interiors would be used, thus allowing for adaptive reuse measures. It introduced the concept of *tout ensemble*, which is the character of the area derived from its entirety rather than individual buildings.
Other historic district ordinances followed, using the “Charleston Ordinance” as a guide. Historic district ordinances should, but occasionally do not reflect the public’s interest in preservation with architectural control and administration duties by designated commissions. The ordinance controls specific areas that hold the majority of buildings with historic or architectural significance. The historic district commissions control all of the buildings and can decide whether to raze, allow exterior alterations, or to design new buildings in the area. The commissions also have the power to permanently bar demolition or alterations to all buildings in the district.\textsuperscript{24} In addition, historic district commissions have put to use zoning ordinances to strengthen the original ordinances in keeping the integrity of historic districts. Historic zoning ordinances require new construction in the districts be architecturally compatible or harmonious with the character of the existing structures. This is determined by an architecture review board as established formal criteria are rare.\textsuperscript{25}

There was little activity in the establishment of historic districts locally until after WWII. The reason this changed after the war was a boom in construction and development that threatened older parts of the city. This aroused residents to preserve their local historic neighborhoods. A few of the earliest historic districts in the nation included New Orleans, Louisiana; Alexandria, Virginia; Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Georgetown, Washington D.C.; and Annapolis, Maryland.\textsuperscript{26}

As historic district ordinances proved to be a successful tool in preservation, the state and federal governments made ordinances that pertained to historical landmarks. In order to have a landmark ordinance, there must be some criteria to follow. Public interest in a project is needed in the form of either a commission or architects to help
control preservation measures in the community. The ordinance should cover the entire city or county, but the buildings that are protected can be saved individually or in random locations, not just historic districts. The ordinance commission cannot control areas near the designated landmark if they were to be used for construction purposes. Demolition and alteration are avoided at all costs, but the ordinances do not prevent it in all cases.27

In 1939, Congress disbanded some New Deal relief projects that promoted American culture. The country was recovering from its distressed conditions and Congress felt that some of these work and historic programs were no longer a “public responsibility.” This showed that “cultural democracy” was not universally accepted, nor was it a clearly established public policy. Only a few agencies encouraged this cultural activity, one of the few being the NPS.28

Preservation activities ceased with the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. At this point, there was more emphasis on defense. Congress cut funds to the NPS and historic tourism slowed as the country experienced gas rationing. Even after WWII ended in 1945, a strong national defense was still considered to be a driving force, not preservation. Industrial expansionism and an improved war industry provoked the demolition of many historic sites and uprooted Americans from the cities.29

Despite the lack of preservation efforts on the part of the federal government during the war, fearful Americans continued to cling to an idealized safer past as their contemporary conditions became susceptible. Threats to the nation’s freedom made them long for “individuality, self-reliance, and other virtues associated with the Colonial period and Early Republic as they were faced with national security, social change, and a sense of historical discontinuity.”30 This interest in the past allowed the public and the
federal government to draw strength from this concept during wartime. This was due to the lack of continuity in “institutional life.” The public became nostalgic as they fondly remembered a simpler time of prosperity and security. The intent to preserve historic sites was still strong, but more important things that needed federal funding took center stage, pushing preservation onto the back burner.

The preservation movement took a major blow after the war when the many veterans made a mass exodus from the city to the suburbs, leaving numerous sites in neglect. Mechanization and modernization after WWII made it easier for people and goods to move about the country. Commercial and industrial activities that thrived in the cities of the past began moving out to the suburbs and rural areas, leaving homes and businesses to deteriorate, thus draining the social and physical fabric of the city’s center. WWII veterans returned home and wished to achieve the American dream of the family home on an individual lot away from the problems of the city, thus beginning the mass migration to the suburbs. The federal government did not help the plight of preservation as it made accessible housing subsidies that supported this migration. One of these programs, the Housing Act of 1949, offered incentives for house development in the suburbs. Following these housing acts, came slum clearance and urban redevelopment, which brought historic sites under siege. Ronald F. Lee, chief historian of the NPS during the 1940s, described the post war era threats of “inflation, suburban development, highway building, construction of office buildings, the search for oil, and the destruction of sites through water control projects” as endangering the preservation movement.
To prevent the demolition and neglect of sites from urban development, preservation leaders formed from a 1947 charter, the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings, which later evolved into the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In 1949, the National Trust was formed as a liaison between public and private agencies. It linked the preservation efforts of the NPS and the federal government with the activities of the private sector. It could also own its own historic properties and provide leadership and support to the president on preservation issues, giving the movement national scope and visibility. The objectives of the National Trust included identifying and acting on important national preservation issues, supporting the broadening and strengthening of organized efforts, targeting communications to those who affect the future of historic resources, expanding private and public financial resources for preservation, serves as an advocate agency to Congress, and assumes ownership of problematic historic properties that are too problematic for the federal government to handle.

Congress passed the National Trust with the understanding that no funds would be appropriated; it would be supported by non federal government sources. Kammen observes that this kept in time with the traditional American assumptions about “responsibility by the privates sector for the perpetuation of culture.” The federal government was using its role as preservation custodian, but it remained in the background, allowing the states and private sector to take charge. The National Trust remains the only major organization spawned from the historic preservation movement. It is the largest organization that represents the private citizen on several preservation issues.
The National Park Service was still a driving force for preservation throughout the 1940s, making considerable changes in policies that would benefit the preservation movement until the present day. The nation’s thoughts were rooted in their patriotic educations, but the NPS was trying to move beyond this notion, to focus on more ordinary sites. The NPS attempted to educate the public in broad themes of national history in their sites. However, several local historical societies throughout the nation clashed with this idea as they continued to save only places of the “rich and powerful.” The predominant preservation observers of the era, the historians and architects, agreed with the NPS in wanting to focus more on the preservation of sites that portrayed “everyday life.” For example, Henry Russell Hitchcock tried to broaden the tastes of the preservation community years before the expansion of thought in the 1940s with a brief article entitled “Destruction” in the December 1928 issue of the *Architectural Record*. Hitchcock warned the public “the best works of the nineteenth century (namely unpopular Victorian buildings) were in great danger, while the classical buildings of the eighteenth century receive the attention.” Hitchcock urged his colleagues to weigh the destruction of the nineteenth century buildings with “equal care and more aesthetic delicacy.” The perceptive value of sites was tied to “age, relative abundance, and associations with particular themes.” The NPS and the state and local preservation organizations took these values into consideration when they picked sites to preserve. Forts, battlefields, and heroic sites were still considered of major value, but many disagreed with the value of twentieth century sites because they were too abundant and most likely to be encountered while surveying. These sites had the most written record and oral histories from the people that lived there, so it had been questioned why these
sites of the twentieth century were important. This question played on the minds of NPS preservationists.\textsuperscript{39} 

The NPS attempted to use a scholarly approach to their restoration policy. However, these policies did not have much effect on either state or municipal governments. The NPS found it difficult to influence public officials outside of the federal government unless federal funds came with their advice.\textsuperscript{40} Upon ending WWII, the policy of the NPS under staff historian, Charles W. Porter III was “authentic restoration.” This included several criterion. First, there was to be an orientation report filed by the NPS that contained basic historical data, such as description of the site, photographs, and plans for structural changes. There also was to be an archaeological investigation of the site and the area surrounding it so that the original site outline would be known and museums would benefit from any artifacts found. Professional historians, archaeologists, and architects carried out these studies. These individuals would decide if the site should be restored based on the data collected and compared against historical and architectural evidence.\textsuperscript{41} 

In 1945, NPS historians decided that any additions to their historic preservation program should have considerable “historical and architectural significance” included in its original surviving features.\textsuperscript{42} The National Trust was influential in expanding the definition of what would be preserved because it owned and protected many historic properties. In 1956, the criteria for evaluation emphasized the importance of broad “cultural, political, economical, and social histories of the nation, state, and local communities.” Mere antiquity was no longer sufficient for selection as a historic site as not all claims could be preserved.\textsuperscript{43}
Though the preservation of historic sites was not a top priority to the nation during the years of WWII, the NPS did in fact take on a few historic preservation projects, which fit under the category of “exceptional cases.” The first of these high priority sites was the Touro Synagogue. In 1944, cabinet members circulated the idea that there should be a historic church advisory board to select and set aside one Protestant church, one Catholic church, and one Jewish synagogue as “evidence of American religious unity” during the war. Secretary of Interior, Harold Ickes sent out a team to locate these sites and selected the Touro Synagogue to represent the Jewish faith. It was a logical choice to be labeled a national historic site as it was a fine example of Colonial architecture and it was the “oldest standing synagogue” in the United States.

The second “exceptional case” to be preserved was the John Adams mansion in Quincy, Massachusetts. This site, unlike Touro Synagogue, was chosen though it had nothing to do with national unity or the war effort. The mansion was open to the public through the Adams Memorial Society, which consisted of twenty-two descendents of John Adams. NPS staff historian, Charles W. Porter III took the initiative of convincing President Roosevelt that the site was an “exceptional case.” Porter soon convinced the owners of the mansion to give the site to the NPS for preservation and to donate all of the home’s furnishings. One incentive to declaring this area a national historic site was that the federal government would own the famous Adams Library and make the claim that they held “one of the most historic homes in New England.” The site’s supposed historical integrity was uniquely American and the site won universal acclaim. It was the only property in NPS that was designated without debate or urgings from an outside agency.
One other exceptional site that brought about much debate in the field of preservation was F.D.R.’s Hyde Park estate, which was on the NPS agenda since 1939. President Roosevelt offered land from his estate to the nation for a library site to store historic papers from his administration. Congress accepted the donation of the Roosevelt library, but debated the donation of the estate and began to analyze the president’s “greatness.” Critics believed that declaring the estate a national historic site lacked humility since it was to be memorialized while the president was still in office. After Roosevelt’s death, the estate was formally given to the Department of the Interior, declared a historic site, and became suddenly enshrined by the public. In 1945, the NPS planned to interpret the site in order to give the tourists a “historic sense of reality” by showing the home as it was during the Roosevelt era.46

During the 1950s and 1960s preservation suffered immensely as new internal improvements began in housing and urban renewal that put historic sites at risk. In the 1960s, there was a boom in highway development, which was President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s response to the Cold War and urban development. The new highway construction destroyed many historic sites and neighborhoods. Perceptions of urban decay met with programs that encouraged the redevelopment of sections of cities, which were usually older, so they were often swept away to make room for new buildings.47

As more people moved out of the city, historic buildings were neglected and left to deteriorate, which led government officials to combat urban decay by removing unsightly blights within the city. The Internal Revenue Code provided incentives for demolition and new construction, but none for rehabilitation of older structures. In addition, federal housing offered cheap mortgages in the suburbs as more people left their
declining older neighborhoods. Federal monies were used for urban redevelopment as the cities became abandoned by upper and middle class whites. In the 1960s many whites moved out of the city during a time of race riots, high crime, and poor schools. The thought of progress elsewhere encouraged a number of people to head toward the suburbs where shopping malls, businesses, and private homes were aplenty. As a result, more minorities replaced the whites in older neighborhoods, but found that they could not afford to upkeep older homes, leaving them to ruin.48

In the 1970s, downtown decay had become aesthetically and economically horrific. Older buildings were often referred to as “slums”, usually based on superficial and inadequate data. Structures were too often judged on their cosmetic appeal. Peeling paint, rust, or rotted materials made buildings look old and rundown. Residents and local government officials did not think to preserve these sites because they were too much hassle or not worthy enough to be saved for anyone to see. Instead they were labeled “blights” and were fated to be destroyed or abandoned.49 Older areas of the city tended to be worn down and were usually frequented by minority racial and ethnic groups. The minimal renovations to remove health and safety hazards without much cost to low income housing were neglected in American housing policies. Federal aid was available in the Housing Act of 1954, but there was still much fascination with clearance of older housing.

In response to the urban decay, downtown chambers of commerce and business communities looked toward preservation in order to survive as more and more shopping malls appeared in the suburbs.50 Another answer to this problem was rehabilitation of older sites. However, rehabilitation was tough on the minorities that remained as
gentrification became widespread. The low income residents were soon replaced by higher income individuals. This was a result of high cost rehabilitation that raised property values and increased taxes on those that stayed. Despite the push away from lower income inhabitants, the historic sites were ultimately saved for future generations to enjoy.

In the late 1960s, there was a widespread concern for America’s disappearing cultural heritage as the growth and change occurring within the nation threatened to eradicate the buildings of the past. The Lyndon Johnson administration was based on the idealism that followed John F. Kennedy’s death. Under this regime, the First Lady, Claudia “Lady Bird” Johnson was extremely interested in national beauty and the preservation of sites in the nation. In addition, the social displacement of American citizens from their homes and the obliteration of historic landmarks due to highways and urban renewal projects upset a large portion of city dwellers. At this point, the public looked at these cleared sites, utility lines, and cramped housing and thought about the “trashing of America which the throw away mentality of the twentieth century seemed to foster.” The federal government began to concern itself once more with preserving sites and the public outcry resounded against demolition of significant sites in the name of progress.

Charles Hosmer’s landmark work, Preservation Comes of Age: From Williamsburg to National Trust, claims that the preservation movement came of age when it developed new skills that were brought on by the new demands of the era. The movement developed several different organizations, fund raising endeavors, professional preservation disciplines, theories and techniques for restoration, and preservation tools.
The movement also expanded beyond individual buildings to consider broad community values and to “solve common social problems.” There may have been much destruction during this time, but many sites were also saved due to these measures.55

In response to American’s renewed desire for improved site preservation the National Trust published “With Heritage so Rich”, which illustrated what was lost in American heritage and asked for the expanded role of the federal government for preservation. It awakened historical consciousness in the American public, especially those federal officials and preservation organization leaders that read the document and took action to repair the federal government’s destructive mentality. This publication ultimately led to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 due to its evocative message. “With Heritage so Rich” provided that the federal government should be involved in the survey of historic sites, initiating a National Register, working with state and local governments, developing advisory councils for preservation, instigating programs for financial incentives, and designating State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) in the states.” Until 1966, preservation activities focused on establishing landmarks and local organizations that were interested in only those sites of “great” significance.56 Now with the influence of “With Heritage so Rich,” the preservation movement began to flourish and to include sites dear to local citizens with the help of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

The NHPA expanded the National Register of Historic Places and developed a process to nominate historic sites to the register for preservation. The NHPA required by federal law for the states to formulate statewide plans for historic preservation. Since there were constant changing attitudes on what was worth preserving, the list seemed
never ending. After the passage of the NHPA, the underlying theme of American preservation was to become the “effective partnership between the federal, tribal, state, and local governments and the private sector.”

The eligibility of historic sites under Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was laid out explicitly in Thomas King’s *Federal Planning*. Section 106 provided a few critical elements. It created guidelines for the National Register of Historic Places and Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP). Section 106 established an agency that applied criteria to properties. In theory, this was carried out with the State Historic Preservation Officer and the participation of the interested public. Together they would agree on the eligibility of a site. If the site was eligible, then the federal government would consider the effects of preservation, if they could not agree on eligibility, then the keeper of the National Register was the final determinant. Section 106 required federal agencies to “carry out, assist, or approve actions that may affect historic properties and to take into account the effects of these actions and to afford the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment.” The SHPO was supposed to “identify the historic property that the federal action may affect, evaluate its historic significance, make an assessment of the actions of these effects on historic preservation, attempt to resolve adverse effects on the property through consultations with federal agencies and stakeholders, and execute an agreement embodying project modifications and mitigations or obtaining advisory comments from the ACHP.” This review process was only undertaken when there was federal involvement that interfered with a preservation project. Another important benefit of Section 106 indicated that sites undergoing the review were eligible for the National
Register of Historic Places and could get the same protections as those that were listed. This list authenticated the historic worth in the community.61

The NHPA of 1966 and Section 106 established the National Register of Historic Places as a roster of properties deemed significant by the federal government. However, King points out that many outside the governmental realm questioned this authority. What authority did it have to tell the public which local sites were really significant?62 This question may never be answered efficiently, but those with the most power often have the most influence. In theory the sites that were eligible for the National Register were constantly expanding to include as many local historic sites with local input as possible.

As the National Register gained influence in preservation, nomination and evaluation of historic sites needed to be specific. The evaluation procedure for listing sites on the National Register of Historic Places includes the following criteria. The property must be categorized as an object, building, district, site, or structure. Next, it is determined which historical contexts the property represents and how these property types relate to archeological resources. The site is then evaluated by its significance under the National Register criteria A-D, then defining if it is of local, state, or national significance. The criteria considerations are applied and then it is determined by the Department of the Interior if the property retains sufficient integrity to convey its significance.63

The early associative values of preservation were almost exclusively historic and architectural as the “most valued cultural resources.” However, the preservation movement had been trying to move from this narrow view as exemplified in the National
Register’s Criterion “A”. The National Register lists four different categories of significance criteria for sites to become eligible to be on the list. Criterion “A” includes sites associated with events or made a significant contribution to broad patterns of national, state, or local history. To be important historically, the site must identify with an event, document the event’s importance to national, state, or local history, show the strength of the historical association with the site, and have enough integrity to interpret the association. To identify with Criterion “B”, the site must be associated with the lives of people that contributed to national, state, or local history. The significant people must be identified and documented to make clear associations with the site. Criterion “C” embodies distinct characteristics of a type of period, method of construction, or represents high artistic values. The site must be either the first of its kind, the last of an era, or portray a major technological change. Criterion “D” includes sites that are important to scientific or scholarly research.

The process for nominating sites onto the National Register is normally a grassroots effort that includes identification through surveys sponsored by the federal, state, and local governments. Anyone can nominate a site to the National Register, but the most common candidates are professional organizations, historical societies, private owners, and nonprofit organizations. Nominations are regulated by the SHPO’s, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, or Federal Preservation Officers, depending on the location of the site. The nomination is submitted to a state review board made up of professionals in history, archeology, architecture, and other relevant preservation disciplines. This board then recommends to the SHPO whether or not the site should be included on the list. The property is again reviewed and private owners and the local
government can comment or object the nomination. If passed, the site is considered for the National Register by the Keepers of the National Register at the NPS for determination of eligibility. There is then a technical review of the information, substantive review to document the property, and the Keepers of the National Register have forty-five days to act. A notice is placed on the Federal Register for fifteen days for comment and public view. After forty-five days, the property can be listed.66

When sites are being considered for the National Register, one of the factors for inclusion is historical or architectural integrity, determined by six elements. The first is location. If a site retains its historic place of significance, such as staying in the place where an historical event occurred, it has high integrity. Design is considered as surveyors look to see if the elements create good form, plan, space, structure, and style of the property. Setting is another indicator if the property shows the same physical environment as the historical event. The next three elements, workmanship, feeling/sense of portraying a particular time period, and an association that portrays a direct link between a historical event and the property all score high on the list of integrity.67

The National Register normally excludes certain property types from eligibility, such as birthplaces, cemeteries, graves, religious properties, properties moved from their original location, commemorative properties, reconstructed buildings, and properties less than fifty years old. There are a few exceptions to these excluded sites. They can be eligible if they are a key element of a historic district; if a religious property is architecturally or historically significant, if a property built in the last fifty years is exceptionally significant, or if there is no other site associated with an outstanding historical figure’s life, and then a birthplace or gravesite can be eligible.68 One of these
exceptions is the Brand Building, located in Toledo, Ohio. The building was put on the National Register as part of the historic warehouse district in downtown Toledo. The site was partially demolished in urban renewal efforts, but the façade was saved and moved to Fort Industry Block and placed within the other structures. As of 2004, it is protected individually under the National Register.

National Register criteria and standards were developed to balance the historic values of conflicting economic, social, and political interests. However, cultural resource management practitioner, Thomas F. King admits that there are a few problems with the National Register. Private ownership traditionally keeps the federal government away, but the federal government designates and governs how the properties are used. The list “gives preservation priority over all issues, but it is not realistic in this dynamic country.” Section 106 tries to address both of these problems. The federal government does not take it upon itself necessarily to preserve historic properties by acquiring or limiting modifications, but the government is required to take into account the effects of those actions on those properties. The National Register does not prevent owners of historic properties from remodeling, altering, selling, or demolishing the structure with other than federal funds. This leaves the National Register with an “identity crisis” that has lasted until the present. King asks, “is this a list of the nation’s best list of historic properties whose permanent protection that the government should invest or is it a list of places that should be considered in planning?”

In the 1980s, the list was thought to be too inclusive so a higher level of professionalism was insisted upon in the nomination process and determination of eligibility. The paperwork was completed by a professional in the preservation field or
federal government, which drove the “nomination costs higher and out of the reach of ordinary citizens, minorities, or low income groups.” The National Register still tends to favor the elite and makes issues less relevant to local concerns. Locally significant properties are sometimes destroyed because they are not recognized by the professionals or they do not fit the specific criterion boxes.70

The NPS shared its federal preservation leadership role with the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, which was created by the NHPA in 1966 as an “independent agency to advise the president and Congress on preservation matters and federal actions affecting historical properties.” It is composed of twenty cabinet officers and representatives to the preservation community that are appointed by the president of the U.S. The federal representatives include the Secretary of the Interior and the heads of four other federal agencies also designated by the president. The chairman of the National Trust and the president of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation represent preservation interests. The president also appoints four experts from state and local governments, usually consisting of mayors, governors, one Native American and one Native Hawaiian. As a note, the chairman of the ACHP is a member of the general public.71

The duties of the ACHP include, “policy advice, interagency coordination, training and education, and the protection of historic properties.” The council advises Congress and other federal administrators on preservation issues such as “tax policy, federal agency program improvement, pending preservation legislature, and suggests improvements on how to incorporate preservation values into planning.” The most visible role of the ACHP is in the administration of the “protective process” established
by Section 106 on how the federal government treats historic properties. In addition to its other merits the ACHP is insulated by direct political control, which allows its members to consider the true concerns of preservation and not a political agenda.72

The NPS set standards and criteria for programming, grants, tax incentives, and technical assistance programs. The ACHP was more independent and could make recommendations and conduct general oversight by taking steps to resolve conflicts between historic preservation and other federal needs.

In 1969, the NPS recognized the need to expand the recording work of HABS to include the unique nature of America's industrial and engineering heritage. The answer to this was the establishment of the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), emphasized more on preserving technological and engineering sites, rather than endangered historic buildings. The NPS, along with the American Society of Civil Engineers originated this sister program to HABS to record historically significant engineering and industrial sites that were previously ignored.73 As a more diverse variety of historic sites were being surveyed and recorded, the sites had an improved chance to become listed on the National Register so that they may be preserved. If nothing else, the records provided by HABS and HAER made the federal government and the American public aware of significant sites. These programs also offered documentation of sites so that future generations would remember them in case of their untimely demolition.

Between 1966 and 1980 most national standards for programs were supported with federal funding, which made a strong framework for the states and linked them to the federal government as the National Register expanded to include sites of state and local significance. By 1969, most of the preservation work fell to the states. The
SHPO’s were supposed to work closely with the federal government, but eventually finding “site information, area, surveys, eligibility, and effects of preservation federal projects” fell almost entirely to the state office.74

Political agendas often influence how much funding these programs receive as well as how sites are evaluated for preservation. According to Philip Burnham in his book, How the Other Half Lived: A People’s Guide to American Historic Sites, most people think that historic landmarks have a “self evident” purpose, but their designation is most often dictated by political agendas. When public sites have free admission, it is assumed that whatever is interpreted there is the truth. It is not thought that embarrassing truths or controversy are hidden below the surface.75 When it comes to designation of historic sites, local residents, as well as the federal government look at aspects of a shared history. This means that the history that is interpreted, often by selfish means, includes “elements of a past remembered as well as elements forgotten in common.”76 These elements are portrayed in historic Deerfield, Massachusetts. The town was restored to the seventeenth century to recall the sturdy yeomen spirit of New England. The town glorified its ancestors and remembered its brave citizens during an Indian attack on the town during the seventeenth century. Only in the 1990s, did the town begin to interpret elements that were forgotten, such as the reasoning for the Indian attack and misconceptions of Indians and the early pioneers.

Politics affect the way that historic sites are evaluated, but the preservation process sets standards to define “what to save, what to survey to locate, and to describe potential resources to be saved. That is evaluated against national criteria, given an official status, and is followed up with protective measures.” The criteria selected for the
National Register and also for state and local lists have often been driven by “fiscal and political motives.” These motives occasionally influence the decisions of local governing boards, landmark commissions, state historic commissions, SHPO’s, and the Keeper of the National Register.\textsuperscript{77} For example, sites such as the Valentine Theater in Toledo, Ohio have been preserved for economic reasons. The owners rehabilitated the property because it had the ability to return income and bring capital gain. On the same note, sites have been destroyed for political reasons as many homes in the Old West End historic district in Toledo due to highway systems that would bring in money and political favor for city improvement.

Preservation determined by political authority did not arouse widespread public or political enthusiasm, as preservation was still perceived by many in the nation as impeding progress. Property owners also wanted freedom from government restrictions in the use of private property.\textsuperscript{78} In identifying with this concept, preservation law was a reflection of society’s values and was a measure of the strength of the support for preservation. This showed an indication of shared priorities. If the public or federal, state, and local governments see sites as self serving and significant, they will have a better chance at being saved by federal legislation.\textsuperscript{79}

Preservation tends to fare badly when it is in conflict with competing interests. It is usually considered less important to the nation than “fundamental values, such as the Bill of Rights.” Preservation is widely supported, as evidenced by local organizations and programs in the media that advocate saving the nation’s past, but there are problems with the way that Americans perceive it. Many politicians believe that preservation is against progress, bad for the economy, does not produce jobs, or that many sites are just
not worth saving. These perceptions weaken preservation laws and occasionally, ordinances are repealed due to this train of thought. However, these perceptions are changing as preservationists address the issues mentioned above.\textsuperscript{80}

The Ohio Historical Society has said that a community’s heritage can be lost gradually through private and public action or inaction, taking the community’s “character, individuality, and vitality” with it. Historic preservation is often subject to the “pressures and issues of modern society,” which usually is at odds with more immediate needs for “affordable housing, economic revitalization, employment, and education.” Preservation officers and other state officials have noted that preservation helps combat these problems by “stabilizing neighborhoods, providing affordable housing, lowering crime, stimulating private investment, attracting tourists, and bringing people and businesses back to the downtown areas.” All this happens through planning. A historic preservation plan is a “statement of the community’s goals for its historic properties and the actions it will take to reach those goals.”\textsuperscript{81} Historic preservation planning was the key to success, but it took preservation offices and the federal government several years to utilize their resources.

When preservation was suffering in the 1960s and 1970s, it was found that planning was imperative for programs and efforts to succeed. Most state historic preservation offices had small staffs, little money, and fledgling programs. As a result of these factors, preservation planning could not be taken seriously.\textsuperscript{82} As soon as the federal government took notice of the importance of planning, it took the initiative by granting funds to aid preservation offices in learning how to use their resources to their benefit.
In the 1960s, preservation planning became accepted as city planners wanted to “look before they would leap.” Federal agencies had previously destroyed things that people had valued in history. These kinds of problems were avoidable if the preservation planning process was successful. Changes in national housing legislation during this period led to more conservation and urban renewal. As a result, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) initially tended to demolish sites in order to facilitate room for more adequate housing. However, during the 1970s and 1980s, preservation mentality changed and HUD began working with federal agencies such as the National Trust to emphasize the benefits of historic preservation as a method of urban revitalization through the use of planning. These two agencies believed that “historic preservation created a bond between a community and its citizens and had significant and ongoing impact beyond the project itself.” The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development was demonstrative of historic preservation and housing rehabilitation using zoning regulations, the use of nonprofit organizations, and revolving funds.

The successful development of preservation projects was due to good local support and public incentives, such as taxes or federal funding. Favorable zoning laws, safety regulations, and community planning were also helpful as they addressed community preservation concerns. Federal, state, and local governments felt that historic preservation planning should include the history and historic properties of the community, a map and address list, a rehabilitation tax credit log, and an agriculture chronology. When this criteria was used, thoughts were well organized and could keep a community on track as to what they expected to happen when they designated sites for preservation.
During the 1960s and 1970s, legislators were concerned with urban blight and affordable housing, but without much concept of preserving older structures and communities. In going through the new processes of preservation planning, it has been noted that one of the most important features was zoning, as it facilitated development in historic areas. The redevelopment pressures on a historic building were reduced when “density allowances are compatible with the scale of existing buildings.” Zoning ordinances allowed historic sites to remain intact and to keep their historic identities. It also permitted modern structures to be built around historic areas without disturbing the site’s historic integrity. Many legislators and urban planners were coming to see historic preservation as a new way to combat urban blight and affordable housing issues while avoiding the mistakes of past decades.

Another useful tool in preservation planning was using techniques, such as conservation and adaptive reuse, to save structures. Buildings designed for different activities could be rehabilitated for new functions. This usually strengthened the business districts by improving housing, and by restoring and adapting older homes for new users.

The exterior of buildings must be preserved, but the interiors must also be preserved so that the building may be used for more than an aesthetic façade. Restoring both the interior and exterior reaches higher standards, which can lead to more money, but also runs the risk of evicting poorer families from their affordable housing. However, as a downside, these older sites were usually quite expensive to renovate. Aging threatened the physical integrity of buildings, but only recently could preservationists slow down this process. In the past, parts of structures that could not be
saved would be replaced using different materials. How much time and money that was spent restoring a site depended on the value designated to it by the surrounding society.\textsuperscript{88} The money raised was usually not enough. The sites normally had sanitation deficiencies in heating, kitchens, and plumbing and it was difficult to install contemporary electric commodities easily or inexpensively.\textsuperscript{89} The decaying factors caused by neglect were taking their toll on the historic sites, often when preservation planning was not used efficiently and no funds for rehabilitation were available, and it was difficult to convince the local community to take an interest in the site.

One of the problems with rehabilitation was availability of capital. It was difficult to get loans due to the banks’ perceptions of preservation efforts being a greater risk to profit. The uncertainties of construction were also a problem as contractors were hesitant, costs were high, zoning proved difficult, and structure problems often caused delays. Finally, there was “community, employee, and management apprehension.” These individuals were not exposed to the beneficial qualities of buildings and were cautious about investing in a property if it did not appear profitable to stockholders.\textsuperscript{90} At the end of the 1970s, the funding of rehabilitating sites for reuse became more favorable. By 1980, more American construction work was in rehabilitating of older buildings, rather than tearing down sites for brand new buildings. In 1983, over two billion dollars worth of preservation projects received preservation tax credits. This shows that the community, along with governmental funding were improving and taking an interest in historic preservation to revitalize America’s cities.\textsuperscript{91} The restoration of old buildings encouraged a return to the city movement as there were more viable economic activities, increased property values, and tourism as a result.
Often, moving a building was the only way to preserve it when it was in the path of construction activities which were more important to the public or federal government than if the structure were to remain on its present site. Sometimes the structures could not be saved outdoors. In these cases, individual parts of the structure were taken and saved whenever possible. Often, facades were imported to new structures or put into museums for public view, when entire sites could not be saved. An example of this can be found in the Chicago Art Institute. The portal of the Louis Sullivan Board of Trade Building has been moved to the outside of the Institute for public display as would a piece of sculpture.92

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, new preservation and nonprofit organizations took form as preservationists noticed public landmarks and older neighborhoods were being destroyed. This new generation of activists saved many landmarks and paved the way for the preservation movement that we know today.93 During this period, nonprofit organizations reorganized to reflect new preservation interests. Local preservation efforts became professionalized as nonprofits hired prospects with degrees in business, planning, or law. This professionalism pushed public agencies to take surveys and to use conferences as a “network for preservation.”94

During the 1970s, there were over four thousand historic preservation organizations in the United States. Though some were quite prestigious, the majority were grassroots organizations comprised of active members of the community and private individuals that wished to restore their historic homes.95 At this point, professional preservationists were trying to help grassroots organizations and their efforts to give greater emphasis to engaging individuals on a continuing basis, not just deciding
to preserve sites in response to crisis. Most grassroots preservation efforts in cities came down to “eleventh hour” decisions to keep controversial local historic districts or landmarks in response to a pressing crisis of threatened demolition.

Grassroots movements worked directly with the local governments in preservation, often dictating whether or not sites should be preserved. Local governments were both “enabled and constrained legally and politically” by several factors such as federal and state resources, programs and policies, the state of the economy, and the availability of public or private funds. Local governments attempted to work with local communities on preservation, but when they were not adequately funded, there was little to be done to appease the locals. The local community needed to work with local government as a way of being heard in preservation. Preservation required local political support because otherwise there was little money to save sites. It was nearly impossible to stop the demolition of sites when government officials already had it in their heads that there was nothing else to be done for the site; there was no state or federal funding; or other political projects were at hand that took precedence over preservation. If the local government did not approve support, more individuals taking a stance against preservation were more likely to be appointed to landmark commissions in the name of balance.

Federal agencies began to extend preservation programs to benefit local areas in America’s cities in response to urban renewal. One solution came in the form of nonprofit organizations teaming up with developers in historic real estate. One program that the National Trust developed in the 1970s was the Main Street Program which rehabilitated and restored specific areas of neighborhoods. City government chambers of
commerce and downtown businessmen paid a “Main Street” manager to control the interests of the shopkeepers in the neighborhoods through “design, promotion, cooperation, and economics.” This program stimulated restoration and reuse of structures in historic neighborhoods so that suburb dwellers might return to the city, bringing along their businesses. The program still thrives in 2004, as evidenced by numerous cities throughout the country rehabilitating buildings, prompting people to come downtown to shop and take up residence.

In addition to revitalized programs, more powerful preservation laws took form in the decades following the NHPA of 1966. In 1971, President Richard Nixon signed Executive Order 11593, which directed federal agencies to accept preservation responsibilities for historic properties under their ownership or jurisdiction, whether they were listed or eligible for the National Register. This forced the federal government, along with their agencies to really execute preservation programs in ways that would prove successful, rather than pushing preservation issues aside, when something better came along that was beneficial. In 1978, Congress declared New York City’s Grand Central Terminal a historic landmark. Congress then made provisions to limit architectural alterations without violating the constitutional rights of the owners and commercial developers. This declaration established a national precedent that “municipalities could create landmark designations to protect culturally significant properties from demolition or unreasonable alterations.” Finally cities and the local government agencies that run them could have a larger role in preservation, overriding private businesses that wished to destroy sites to make a profit.
That same year, the Department of the Interior eliminated the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings and created the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Services (HCRS) in its place. Under the Carter administration, Chris Delaporte, head of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation set out to reorganize the “external” preservation programs jointly administered by the HCRS and the states. The “assertive management style” of Delaporte aggravated the existing differences between the federal and state governments over the control of the national historic preservation program. This introduced much protest in the states. This department cared more about land use than historic heritage. Federal and state preservation officials were caught up in this “war” until the Reagan administration when the HCRS was abolished, due to budget cuts and returned historic preservation to the NPS.  

Preservation thrived for a period during the 1970s concurrently with the American public’s intimacy with the past when celebrating anniversaries concerning the nation’s history. The Bicentennial of 1976 made Americans aware of historic preservation and brought local nature, the idea of the nation’s diverse character, and what was worth preserving to the public mind. This anniversary, along with the Centennial anniversary of the Civil War in 1961 brought more patriotism and interest in preserving national landmarks and in joining private preservation organizations.  

As federal government priorities changed, depending on who was in office, preservation efforts were cut back in the late 1970s and early 1980s. In 1976, the Gerald Ford administration claimed that they intended to reduce by one half the federal spending on the preservation of historic landmarks. The NPS let it be known that year that they would need “four hundred million dollars per year for the entire decade” to take care of...
the backlog of preservation needs in the country. Though Congress resisted the funding, other organizations attempted to compensate as saving historic sites and coming to terms with the nation’s past still proved dear to preservationists and the public at large.¹⁰⁶

Preservation is accepted as a major political and economic issue in the twenty first century. It now involves everyone, not just a select educated or wealthy few. This concept is possible through federal tax incentives favoring preservation and housing. “These kinds of subsidies are now a requirement for historic preservation to succeed due to economic disparity between new buildings and historic properties.”¹⁰⁷ These federal tax incentives were a way for the government to make amends to the public for not funding their preservation projects adequately. With these tax acts, a majority of preservationists and individuals with modest incomes were able to preserve historic structures.

Preservation tax incentives were available for any qualified project that the Secretary of Interior designated as a certified rehabilitation or certified historic structure. A certified historic structure was either listed on the National Register, located in a historic district, or historically significant to the Secretary of the Interior. The credit was available to owners and was taxable for the year that the rehabilitation is completed. The rehabilitation incentives operated within the context of the building’s local real estate market and project investor’s individual tax situations.¹⁰⁸

Listed below are the major tax incentives issued by the federal government for preservation purposes. The federal tax legislation of 1976 and 1981 increased the adaptive reuse of historic properties. The 1976 Act brought modest incentives for rehabilitation of historic properties and eliminated certain tax benefits for demolition. In
1981, incentives were stronger and became more adapted for homeowners. The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 provided a twenty-five percent tax credit for certified rehabilitations of certified historic structures, a fifteen percent credit for structures over forty years old, and a ten percent credit for structures thirty to thirty-five years old. The Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 required reduction in the “depreciable basis of buildings rehabilitated utilizing the twenty-five percent tax credit by half the amount of credit.” The Tax reform Act of 1984 provided lengthened depreciation periods of eighteen years. The Tax Reform Act of 1986 established a twenty percent tax credit for substantial rehabilitation of historic buildings for commercial, industrial, and rental residential purposes, and a ten percent credit for rehabilitation of nonresidential purposes of buildings built before 1936. Finally, the 1988 Rehabilitation Tax Credit was limited to seven thousand dollars for taxpayers with income less than two hundred thousand dollars per year.

Tax assessments were formed because it was unfair for owners of historic properties to pay more for maintaining the site, rather than replacing it altogether. The use of easements was another way, besides tax incentives, to lower the expense of restoration. In the use of easements, the owner retained use of the entire property, but agreed to give part of the rights inherent to the property ownership in return for favorable tax treatment or exemption. The organization that bought the easement helped maintain the property’s condition, but could not change the physical aspects of the façade.

Preservation law became more localized in the 1980s, mainly due to the Pennsylvania Station Supreme Court decision in 1978. This decision, in favor of preserving the historic Pennsylvania Station strengthened the hand of local government in
the “use of preservation regulations.” In addition, there was an amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act in 1980, which created Certified Local Governments (CLGs). These CLGs received a portion of the state’s federal preservation funds and could participate in some aspects of the national program. It also gave individual owners the right to veto listing their properties in the National Register. Certified Local Governments were formed in Ohio in 1985, so that communities could participate more actively in state historic preservation programs. To become a CLG, a unit of local government “must have an approved program for recognizing and protecting its historic, architectural, and archaeological resources.” The Ohio Historic Preservation Office helps local governments achieve these programs, develop plans and nominate sites for protection. The CLG’s could also apply for matching grants by the Ohio Historic Preservation Office to fund their additional preservation projects.  

The private sector is still the most involved in enticing the nation’s memory and developing programs to perpetuate history and preservation. With this in mind, it only seemed logical that preservation policies should be beneficial directly to local programs as local organizations are the driving force to saving the majority of historic sites. In the 1980s, the federal government became more responsible to state and local government for preservation due to federal funding cuts to historic preservation programs, such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Park Service, and the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation. It was thought that the local sector should be the driving force as preservation was still perceived as being a local venue.  

Though federal support was crucial to the preservation movement, the federal government could not handle all problems that preservation encountered.
problems arose that could not be resolved easily, it showed that despite the federal government’s growing role as the “custodian of tradition”, cooperation between the public and private sectors remained essential and prominent groups or individuals were more likely to benefit and achieve their goals than more “humble” organizations. The federal government was comprised of elite political heads, which pushed their views. This was usually different from the private sector. Up to the years of the development of the National Trust, government involvement was predominantly male, which was a sharp contrast to the role of women in the private sector.

In the 1980s there was a growing conservatism in the country and individual property rights were deemed an important issue. On a national, state, and local scale, historic preservation was viewed as a “liberal activity.” Lobbyists during this period tried to limit the scope of the National Historic Preservation Act by “restricting federal involvement to nationally significant properties.” The historic preservation movement “remained badly underfunded at all levels of government.” In 1981, for budgetary reasons, President Ronald Reagan reduced preservation funding to almost nothing. The reasoning for these cuts was that preservation was not considered a mainstream public priority and still may be seen that way as evidenced by federal spending in the area. However, though lacking in funds, historic preservation was still viewed as a major industry to the public, though unknowingly. Programs such as “This Old House”, Home and Garden Television, Home Depot, and Building Doctors were all viewed widely and used by a historic minded public. In 1985, over two million people were involved in preservation in some way, either by renovating a historic home or participation in local historic preservation groups. The National Register cited 37,500 properties; four
thousand historic districts in the nation, one thousand local preservation commissions, and over four thousand state and local organizations for preservation.\textsuperscript{122}

A perceived federal surplus in the 1990s led to more interest in funding for preservation, bringing programs such as “Save America’s Treasures.” This program encouraged private donations to preservation projects and provided federal grants to individual projects. This proved popular until the federal funding cuts after September 11, 2001. The nation focused more on funding the military and security against terrorism. It was apparent that preservation needed sufficient local planning and zoning regulations to survive.\textsuperscript{123}

In the twenty-first century, federal agencies for preservation, such as the National Trust are going through a transition, where federal appropriation is diminishing. The short term problem for preservation is that current budget proposals from the George W. Bush administration would cut back from over one hundred million dollars in funding. The Historic Preservation Fund is being cut back in order to support larger tax cuts in the country.\textsuperscript{124} This shows that funds have been given to more important matters such as homeland security and the war in Iraq and cuts have been made on cultural activities such as preservation. As a result of the cuts in the Historic Preservation Fund, Ohio organizations such as the OHS have had to cut back on preservation efforts, exhibits, and staffing in their programming. Preservation is currently funded minimally, given occasional grants by the federal government or private connections to help preserve sites.

The new mandate for the historic preservation movement during the 1990s was the inclusion of integration with the larger economic and social community, joining “business, industry, and culturally diverse groups and traditional colleagues in
government conservation and planning. In the current era, the urban planner has become somewhat of a preservationist. The historic preservation movement has led a dual life over the course of several years. There has been much moral or political opposition to developers and this opposition has been the mainstay of preservation theory. Lately, the movement has initiated a marriage with developers as they found that they can gain from using preservation techniques. Rehabilitation, since not funded well by the federal government has looked to the developers to be their life blood financially. Rehabilitation has proved to be big business with developers, renovating older structures for commercialism, playing on the public’s love for the past.

From the moment that the federal government intervened in the preservation movement, public perceptions regarding preservation changed. Many local citizens, along with novices in the federal government used their modern perspectives to influence how they felt about historic sites, thus changing how they were to be designated. As local communities and their cultures guided public perceptions of historic sites, the preservation movement expanded as residents changed what they felt was significant to save. As conditions changed throughout the later years of the preservation movement, residents required a heritage in which they could continually interact, fusing the past with the present. As a result, they updated and upgraded to improve their heritage, endowing the past with today’s perspectives. They looked at particular sites in their areas and used their presentist views to reinterpret the sites to fit their present needs or to change the historic identity of a site to make it more comprehensible to how we think the past ought to be. The plantation homes of American founding fathers such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson (Mount Vernon and Monticello) suggest to visitors
that these prominent moral socialites were reluctant slave owners and morally opposed to slavery. “Seeing slaves as less then men was not then discordant with professing liberty and equality.” Just because it is now, we as a nation feel the need to change and improve upon these interpretations of history to protect the names of idealized figures. Sites were even altered beyond recognition so that they may be adapted to fit modern views. This can be seen in Toledo, Ohio displayed in the Nasby Building. Once a beautiful ornate skyscraper modeled after the Giralda Tower of Seville in Spain, the Nasby is unrecognizable as white and blue paneling cover the entire structure as a means of making a more modern structure that fit the expectations of a public that wanted a 1960s era office building that blended in with new construction. The society of the twenty first century still views progress and modernization as imperative, though it comes in conflict with their conceptions of the idealized past. These two ideas are in conflict because Americans of the twentieth and twenty first century see the past as unchanging and wholly different from the present. Americans want to freeze a moment in time to happily remember certain aspects of the past, but at the same time, aspects of the past not as important are changed or destroyed to portray a view of progress.

The media plays a role in how Americans perceive their pasts by how they portray historic sites. The media and political leaders like to place identities on historic lands, mainly for tourist purposes. These sites are reconstructed and changed each season to mirror the transformations in consumer capital and interests. The sites are continually catering to public expectations as popular media is taking over what is significant and how historic sites should be interpreted. In addition, ad campaigns for historical sites such as Colonial Williamsburg, package the site with nearby attractions such as Busch
Gardens so that the visitors will associate commercialized theme parks with history and excitement.\textsuperscript{130} Heritage fabricated by media seems more real because it is more familiar to the public than the original. To the public, plausibility is as good as truth. Tourists visited the Alamo in droves after a memorial mural of the actual heroes of the Alamo were replaced with “Hollywood actors from the 1960 film. John Wayne’s Davy Crockett was easier to recognize than the actual Crockett.”\textsuperscript{131} People believe that history is unchanging because it is comprised of stagnant facts. In turn, they think that historic experiences do not change, which seems to offer stability for “personal, family, and national identities.” However, academics see the past as societies that construct changes over time in response to present needs.\textsuperscript{132} These misconceptions of the past often lead visitors to expect historic sites to relay a certain message that parallels what they think they know about the sites. If visitors get what they expect out of a site, it is more likely to be preserved, though the site risks losing its historic integrity and identity when it is changed to fit distorted perceptions of individuals with influence.

Historians, David Thelen and Roy Rosenzweig in their work, \textit{The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life} indicate that the importance of emotional attachments to places was vital to the American sense of history. David Glassberg, a leading scholar in public history gives insight in his book, \textit{Sense of History: The Place of the Past in American Life} about how the American public perceived historic sites through emotions and connections in personal life that provoked them to think about preservation.\textsuperscript{133} Each historic site provided a sense of place for the local public as it gave the community and the site an identity. It gave the community continuity with the past and their memories of the site became continually shaped by their social and economic
status. Stability in a built environment was needed to instill confidence in the future as constant destruction and rebuilding “tears at the heart of a community.” Community members feel a loss and breakdown of pride as places that they identified with are destroyed and cease to be a part of them. A shared past in buildings and other historic sites have come to define and reinforce American identity. The Thelen and Rosenzweig study surveyed a diverse sample of Americans, asking them what they thought about the past and how they interacted with it. Most respondents stated that the past made them who they are and gave continuity in passing ideals of what they and others had to future generations.

A sense of history reflects an intersection between intimate history and the public nature. It evokes a sensation, giving one a sense of belonging and connecting to the past. It attaches a history to places and an environmental value comes from the history that the public associates with it. Respondents from the Thelen and Rosenzweig survey visited historic sites and felt a need to reminisce about the past. They remembered a past that they could connect to their own personal histories, making the memory more intimate. They wanted to reach out to people that lived in other times and places. Most often, remembering the past and certain places often has more emotional impact on individuals than what was actually experienced at the site.

This impact has much to do with the memories that the survey respondents had when connecting with historic sites. They used memory in many different ways, thus changing how they see and interpret historic sites. Individual’s memories were an essential tool in gaining public perceptions of sites as Americans shared identities by identifying and agreeing on memories, so that they could decide what should be
remembered and how it should be remembered. Memories were often changed to go along and please others, which explain why Americans continually change their mind on what should be preserved. An eighty five year old widow observed, “Different people remember things differently. Two people can see the same thing and describe it totally different.”

Historical geographer, David Lowenthal claimed that the public at large tended to view history “through the same distorted lenses that filter their own memories.” The collective past was seen as a personal extension of the present and thus brought with it personal bias that ultimately infiltrated recollections of the past. The construction of memories was not made in isolation, but in conversation with others that occurred in context with the community. Unfortunately, memories change over time, as do the perceptions of the public concerning saving their pasts.

The American attitude towards heritage has been important in influencing perceptions and policy decisions about what sites were significant in the nation. It has been previously viewed that the commemorated sites were most important, followed by sites of local significance. Though Rosenzweig and Thelen’s survey respondents connected personally with local sites, they also identified with being “American” and sharing a national heritage. Therefore, they thought that saving national sites were just as important as those that were locally significant because they drew personal meaning from these sites, indicating that they were affected by them on a personal level. Histories were attached to places and the environmental value that was attached to the place came with it through memories and historical associations that Americans have with it.
Changes in perceptions also occur when historic labels, such as listing on the National Register, are designated to sites.\textsuperscript{144}

In the past year, a panel of experts was convened by the Center for Arts and Culture\textsuperscript{145} which discussed major issues in preservation policy and public perceptions on a forum for preservation. The panel was moderated by Ellen McColloch Lovell, former director of the White House Millennium Council, which originated Save America’s Treasures. The rest of the panel included Peter Brink, Vice President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Larry Reger, President of Heritage Preservation, James Early, director of Cultural Heritage Policy at the Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage at the Smithsonian Institution, and Jack Meyers, Deputy Director of the Grant Program.

When asked if the public was thinking as broadly about preservation as the panelists, Brink replied, “the preservation movement has become much more holistic and community focused, yet our reputation and the way people think about preservation is lagging decades behind. There is still the problem of people viewing preservation as only saving dead white men’s houses. The problem in their eyes with saving neighborhoods is that they think that we want to freeze it, to make it a museum. We hope to change these perceptions in the public to a much more community oriented, broad, dynamic picture of historic preservation.” Over the past few decades there has been a shift from fighting for landmarks such as Penn Station to focusing on things like revitalization of entire communities. It was also noted that the National Trust has also shifted from last minute “stop the bulldozers” to being more integrated in the planning process and governmental work.
Reger commented that people generally did not give much consideration to the issue of preserving things if it does not directly pertain to them. The public gets the impression that the preservation movement is not very diverse. The perceptions are always changing. Preservation has been fighting Congress for homeowners’ tax credit for years. It is clear that in a broad sense, the public values preservation efforts.\textsuperscript{146}

On a national scope, the preservation movement has progressed and expanded throughout the years with federal assistance. Federal agencies such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the National Park Service have brought numerous preservation programs, policies, and legislation that have benefited organizations and other concerned citizens, encouraging them the save historic sites. Except for a period in the 1980s, the federal government has strengthened its involvement on domestic issues such as preservation, using the programs and agencies that it has formed in cooperation with the private sector to work through the problems that have plagued the preservation movement throughout the years. The preservation movement has evolved from early elitism in saving sites, to local community outreach and programs to preserve new sites that were previously ignored.
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Chapter Three

The Decline of Historic Preservation in Lucas County, Ohio

“We will probably be judged not by the monuments we built but by those we have destroyed.”


In looking at historic preservation efforts in Lucas County, Ohio, it is evident that the process of preservation and the struggles of preserving are closely paralleled to the national historic preservation movement discussed in the previous chapters. Lucas County has undergone periods of interest in preserving historic sites coupled with periods of destruction, urban renewal, and perceived progress. Preservation issues that directly affected the nation as a whole, including the formation of grassroots preservation organizations, urban renewal, migrations from the city, and housing problems were also experienced on a local scale in Lucas County. Themes that are further explored include the early preservation movement in Lucas County, local sites that have fallen at the hands of wrecking crews, the reasoning behind these poor preservation efforts, and the organizations that formed to combat the lack of preservation in the area.

As early as 1840, interest in historic sites was prevalent in the Maumee Valley and generally paralleled the historic preservation efforts of the nation, except these local
preservation endeavors usually occurred at an earlier date than those attempts made in the nation.\footnote{1} Attempts to preserve sites in the Maumee Valley were in fact recorded before the turn of the twentieth century. Two instances of early preservation endeavors included the “1840s purchase/lease of Fort Meigs by a family interested in its perpetuation” and the attempted erection of a memorial at Fallen Timbers by local citizens. These examples illustrated local interest in preserving certain aspects of the Maumee Valley’s history. These preservation efforts began largely as private ventures. Certain sites, such as early battlefields, elicited local interest in preserving more historical landmarks in certain aspects of the valley’s history. The history that was worth saving at that point in time was in the founding of the state or in the Maumee Valley and especially focused on the early pioneers; the ancestors of these early preservationists.\footnote{2}

Early organizations were formed to preserve the name, history, and sites of the significant individuals and events in Lucas County. One of the first was the Maumee Valley Pioneer Association (MVPA), established in Toledo in 1864 with Peter Navarre as president. Navarre was seen as a local hero for his role in the War of 1812 and this post was merely honorific due to his “advanced age.” He was involved little in preservation efforts, but he was seen to others in the community as an inspiration to preserve patriotic landmarks, as he was the ultimate local symbol of patriotism.\footnote{3} The Association stimulated patriotism in revering the pioneers of the Maumee Valley and the sites and artifacts that they had left behind. Motives for preservation were mainly patriotic in nature. The MVPA often tried to gain aid from the federal government, but could not obtain funds, or recognition for their efforts.\footnote{4} The MVPA encouraged remaining pioneers “to write their remembrances of the early settlement of the Maumee Valley,” for
future generations to learn of their pasts.\textsuperscript{5} Anyone could become a member of the MVPA, as long as one resided in any part of the Maumee Valley for twenty-five years and paid annual dues of one dollar. The meetings were held in Toledo at the County Courthouse until the Association had permanent quarters in Maumee, Ohio.\textsuperscript{6}

The MVPA was concerned about the lack of community interest in saving aspects of the past. The MVPA made a note in its annual address at the reunion meeting in 1900 that historians had lost sight of the events that occurred in the Maumee Valley and only the pioneers brought those memories back to life. MVPA members also asked in a thought-provoking tirade, “Are the citizens of Toledo going to continue to live within themselves in a routine life of inactivity and permit these sacred spots on the banks of the Maumee to be unknown, unmarked and forgotten?” The officers of the MVPA wanted to arouse greater public interest on both the national and local level, which would result in the preservation of historic sites.\textsuperscript{7}

The counterpart of the MVPA, the Maumee Valley Pioneer and Historical Association (MVPHA), originated in 1902 to “purchase sites and to accomplish more practical results.” Its purpose was to “collect and preserve facts, incidents, and information concerning forts, battles, battlefields, and early settlements of the Maumee Valley and Northwest Territory; collect and provide a place of security for preservation of all such mementos…erect and maintain memorials to the memory of the soldiers and pioneers…provide people with facts to be preserved and handed down through the generations.”\textsuperscript{8} The MVPA and the MVPHA merged in 1909 to bring attention to residents about the preservation efforts at Fort Meigs.
Local organizations realized that in order to gain recognition and funding to preserve historic sites, they needed the help of the federal government, though these attempts rarely prevailed. The Maumee Valley Monumental Association (MVMA) evolved to incite the United States government to take a larger role in preserving sites in the Maumee Valley. Their prodding instigated an official War Department survey of almost a dozen historical military sites of the Maumee Valley in 1888:

By an Act of Congress approved May 24, 1888, it was enacted: That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, by an officer of the Engineer Corps, in cooperation with the Maumee Valley Monument Association, an examination and inspection of each of each of the following named historic grounds, locations, and military works...And he shall cause to be made a survey and full report to Congress of the location, situation, and condition of the same, and the amount of grounds necessary for the protection, situation, and condition of the same, and the amount of grounds necessary for the protection and improvement of the aforesaid works, forts, battlefields, and burial places in and near the same, as well as the probable cost thereof; and the said report shall be accompanied with the necessary maps and drawings.9

The survey was completed under the direction of Col. O.M. Poe and a team of local engineers. The survey provided for preservation and the erection of monuments at each site, which included Fort Industry, Fort Meigs, the battlefield at Fallen Timbers, Fort Miamis, Fort Defiance, and Fort Wayne. However, the legislation to provide for the appropriation of these funds “to effect these recommendations never made it out of the congressional committee. The Committee of Historic Places of the MVPA claimed that no action came of this report.” A later bid for governmental support during WWI was also not successful in involving the federal government in preservation efforts.10 Most attempts to preserve before 1930 were provincial in Lucas County.

In 1918, the Historical Society of Northwestern Ohio emerged and stated in its constitution that it would “maintain a library, encourage the publication of local history
volumes, preserve and collect museum objects and manuscripts documenting Maumee Valley history.”

The society endeavored to secure a complete directory of the county in 1930 and in 1932; they held a Toledo Centennial celebration under the leadership of then president, Walter Sherman. It became a citywide observance that marked the founding of Toledo and the residents pride in the city’s history. The Historical Society of Northwestern Ohio was incorporated as a nonprofit organization in 1952 under Ohio law.

Toledo, the largest city in Lucas County, became the focus of most of the preservation issues. As the end of the nineteenth century neared, preservation efforts slowed as more city dwellers concentrated on making the city prosperous through building developments. As Toledo became a major transportation center due to the railroads and canals, the city turned to manufacturing as its primary function. The most successful industries were the manufacturing of motor parts, milling, and glass and oil refining.

In the 1890s, residents were moving out of the center of the city. Businesses abandoned the waterfront to go inland as a result of the decline of water transport during this era. The city core found a new role not as residential center, but as a retail, wholesale, and service commercial center. This moved the Central Business District (CBD) to Monroe, Jackson, Summit, and Michigan Streets where stores and services were flourishing.

This period of financial success between 1890 and the 1920s witnessed a construction boom in Toledo, especially on Madison Avenue, considered the city’s commercial strength. During this commercial boom, downtown residences were torn
down and replaced by commercial structures that reflected the city’s new wealth and industry promise. The residents moved to suburbs in the Old West End (OWE) and beyond.\textsuperscript{15}

Toledo exhibited the trend of “urbanization and sprawl” at the end of the nineteenth century. The construction of large industry was turning away from the city and toward newly formed suburbs, such as the Libbey-Ford glass plant formed in Rossford in 1889. Electrified street railways encouraged the movement away from the city during this critical time of urbanization.\textsuperscript{16} In the 1930s, more residents migrated out of the city. 83.3\% of the population of Lucas County lived in the city of Toledo before 1930. By 1960, 69.3\% of the population moved from the city to suburban centers for commerce. There was more auto travel and residents moved out of the Central Business District and the capital investment there became lowered. The city could not keep up with the deteriorating buildings and land real estate was lowered, so government officials cleared most of this land, along with many historical landmarks to make way for parking lots.\textsuperscript{17}

There were a brief few years when preservation prospered with the advent of city wealth. Local interest was once again ignited in the Maumee Valley in 1929 with the widespread use of automobiles and the creation of the Metropolitan Park system. Also, on a national scope during this time, there was growing influence in the preservation activities at Williamsburg and Greenfield Village, giving historic preservation national recognition. This recognition spread to the Maumee Valley and preservation grew in Northwest Ohio as a result. Sites in Maumee and Waterville were renovated while
Toledo continued to seek new construction. This age turned away from the “romantic sentimentality that characterized many of the early attempts in preservation.”

During the Depression, financial burdens in Toledo slowed new construction. Buildings were abandoned when owners could no longer pay their rents and they began to deteriorate. Under the New Deal, the Public Works Administration created a housing division in Toledo. A Toledo Metropolitan Housing Authority was established and soon identified blighted areas within the city for slum clearance (urban renewal). It was an “effort to provide employment”, but later became a federal government program to “restructure urban society and American society in general.”

After WWII, Toledo followed suit with the rest of the nation in poor preservation that would continue well into the 1970s. The soldiers coming home from war moved their families to the suburbs and retailers followed their customers out of the city, leaving a number of buildings vacant and left for deterioration and clearance. Wanting to stimulate the downtown area once more to revisit the wealth that Toledo used to embody, developers and city planners tried their hand at urban renewal policies. However, the improvements did not work out as well as planned. The early planning movement in Toledo brought expressways, migration to the suburbs, decline of downtown business, and urban decay. In 1971, Franklin Park Mall opened and marked the end of downtown Toledo as a shopping center. More residents moved toward malls and areas of entertainment as downtown no longer provided these luxuries.

In addition to lack of necessities in downtown, slum conditions and racial problems started to plague the city, which drove more people out. Toledo, like other American cities experienced racial unrest in the 1960s, recessions, inflation, and
problems in the auto industry. The urban uprisings of the 1960s came to Toledo, whose African American population was slowly increasing and moving into subsidized housing in historic areas of the city, such as the Old West End and Vistula neighborhoods. The African American population of Toledo was concentrated in one general area and it confronted many of the same problems “that set off rioting in the nation’s major black ghettos.” The riots in Toledo drove many white citizens away from the city, leaving their homes to deterioration and neighborhoods to violence.  

In 2004, potential homeowners often shy away from these areas of older neighborhoods as perceptions of rising crime and decaying infrastructures keep them from buying homes there. As a result, these neighborhoods continue to deteriorate.

In the 1960s and 1970s, many retailers abandoned downtown for the suburbs, taking their customers with them. The demolition of so many buildings “is a more complex issue and lacks a singular reason or cause.” As a result of this destruction, the downtown area has been depleted, showing more empty space and asphalt than buildings that would designate the area as a downtown district. Once upon a time there were stores lining the streets with restaurants, theaters, and people crowding the area. Those days have vanished for years. Mike Young, former city planner has said, “it is not prudent to destroy a building that could be an important component of tomorrow’s revitalization because it doesn’t fit today’s economy.” The city has not kept figures that “pinpoint” the number of buildings in the downtown area during its peak years, but one can get an idea of how many have been taken down since the 1960s, when “urban renewal triggered the demolition era.” A plan commission report released in 1992 noted that “fifty six per cent of the downtown’s three hundred ninety acres was made up of vacant land, parks, plazas,
parking lots, and garages. When you consider that streets make up twenty three percent of the total downtown acreage, that means only twenty percent of the land had buildings on it.” This report helped bring a demolition review process initiated by the city planning commission as a result of prodding by preservationists. This review saved the Gardner building from destruction in the late 1990s. However, this review does not always work as the city planning commission board votes to oppose demolition of building, a six month moratorium is imposed, after which the owner is free to tear the structure down. As it turned out, parking lots were in demand and empty buildings were bought by companies wanting to tear them down for surface parking which proved more profitable than maintaining costly half empty buildings.\textsuperscript{22} Irene Martin, current member of the Landmark Preservation Council, agrees that Toledo’s preservation laws have no bite. She states, “the city of Toledo lacks the legislative tools necessary to force developers to prioritize historic preservation, unlike other cities in the East concerned with their heritage.” Martin asserts, “We need laws that have more teeth and with strong safeguards to prevent reckless destruction of our history. The only significant provision in building code is the right to impose a moratorium on demolition of a structure. This only delays and most likely does not save a site.” This moratorium is the only means the city can delay demolition.\textsuperscript{23}

Political agendas often determine what sites are saved and restored. The mayor and the city council control the purse strings of the city expenses and the mayor appoints the plan commissioners that have say over development. If preservation were not on the mayor’s political agenda, many sites would be destroyed through supposed lack of
funding. Instead they turn to the profitable ventures that urban renewal projects bring. To shortsighted politicians, demolition is cheaper than renovation.\textsuperscript{24}

As a condition to urban renewal, other environmental surveys were undertaken to see what buildings were in the project area and to determine their land usage. After the National Historic Preservation Act passed in 1966, these surveys also established whether or not historic landmarks were in the project area and if they would be affected detrimentally by the development project. A survey in September 1967 was taken of downtown Toledo, excluding the Central Business District to investigate its environmental and physical worth. The objectives of the General Neighborhood Renewal Plan (GNRP) study were to analyze the city’s “land-use planning, traffic management, market protection, and urban design.”\textsuperscript{25} The report showed how the “strategic development” of weaker areas in the CBD could help to alleviate poor environmental factors downtown and recreate some of the old character and vitality to the downtown area. This urban design report was also looking for a site for a convention center, auditorium facilities, and large areas where parking garages could be made available.\textsuperscript{26}

By this time, the CBD had shifted to Washington, Madison, and Adams Streets and many retail stores were located between Tenth and Seventeenth Streets. There were few residential areas, most being on Washington, Adams, or Seventeenth Streets, but these areas were mainly subsidized housing in poor shape. An expressway had tore through Washington and Monroe Streets, demolishing many historic sites and displacing several residences and retailers.\textsuperscript{27}
The Toledo CBD in 1967, shifting to Adams, Washington, Madison, and Tenth Streets. Section 1 is wholesale, Section 2 is light industry and transportation, Section 3 is institutional and recreational, and Section 4 is residential. The darkened areas show blighted structures.

According to the environmental survey, Madison Street had a higher environmental quality than Jefferson, and Monroe Street was poor due to its used car lots and garages. Washington Street was the worst however. Along with Monroe, there was much heavy traffic, which made it difficult for pedestrians to move throughout the city. The Avondale Street landmark (St. Patrick’s Catholic Church) and housing projects in the Port Lawrence area had nice layouts; the rest of the city was in poor condition. The Toledo GNRP urban design report proposed the protection of a number of buildings of architectural and historical interest. There were many areas suffering from severe environmental blight, which would benefit from renewal, however, some of these were significant historical buildings.

An exterior survey carried out by Barton-Aschman Associates of the structural condition of 1,775 buildings in the study area as a whole revealed that only “nine percent
were sound, whereas twenty five percent required minor repairs, thirty percent major repairs, and thirty six percent were structurally substandard.” The greatest concentration of defective structures was found around Jefferson Avenue. There were smaller concentrations around the intersection of Adams, Summit, and St. Clair and the block bounded by Adams, Jackson, Erie, and Huron Streets. The environmental survey of the CBD carried out in September 1967 tended to reflect these findings. There was much decay and lack of maintenance in the buildings where investment deficiencies had left their mark. There were also a large number of open sites, which had been cleared for street level parking. Project planning criteria determined several substandard structures that were torn down, despite the structures’ significance to the city.

This view of the environmental condition in the report additionally revealed a number of buildings “both individually and in groups” which were regarded as valuable to the city for architectural and historic reasons. These sites were recommended for preservation, but few stood the test of future development plans. One of the saved landmarks, St. Patrick’s Church, was in the vicinity of the CBD and areas of urban renewal. It was considered by the GNRP committee, the city council, and preservationist groups as a rare find that could “form a strong core to the redevelopment of the surrounding area.”

Though, several landmarks were listed in the report, St. Patrick’s Church was one of the few sites to survive this project of urban renewal. As an explanation, the renewal developers claimed “the statutory preservation of a building in circumstances where rehabilitation is unlikely or impossible has often in the experience of the GNRP
committee, defeated its objectives by blighting the surrounding area until the building itself becomes unfit through lack of attention.”

Another survey was conducted in downtown Toledo as a plan to revitalize the city. However, the survey put the fate of several downtown landmarks in jeopardy. In 1967, a survey of the Old West End was issued to determine the condition of the exterior of more than 5,400 buildings. The purpose of the survey was to analyze certain structures in the Old West End, including their condition, architecture, and property use so that the city of Toledo could go forward in its plans for urban renewal in the area.

The Old West End Urban Renewal Conservation Project began shortly after the survey to “repair and bring up to building and structural code standards residences and commercial buildings in the area.” Sites that were structurally unsound were not usually repaired for preservation, but were demolished in order to save money. City councilman and head of the Old West End Association Board at the time, Andy Devine, said that the project would at least provide basic funds to “demolish dilapidated buildings in the area, a code-enforcement program to protect against further deterioration, long term, low interest loans to persons needing financial help in rehabilitating properties, and rehabilitation grants of fifteen hundred dollars to those in dire need.”

When Congress enacted a program of slum clearance and urban redevelopment in the Housing Act of 1949, the law established a system of credits to local communities for what were called noncash contributions to a project. In general, the “cost of acquiring a blighted area at current market value and of clearing and preparing it for redevelopment was greater than the value of the land when redeveloped.” The federal program called for payment of up to “two thirds” of the net cost. The government encouraged
redevelopment planning to include parks, schools, and other public facilities. The law contained a provision that communities could receive credit, in addition to any cash they put up for their cost of demolition or removal work of site improvements within the project area. The purpose of the law was to “remedy the housing shortages and replace substandard and other inadequate housing.” Toledo’s Old West End rehabilitation project ran into problems as the city had trouble receiving credits because it could not get credit for “expenditures more than three years prior to the federal approval of a renewal project. Without credits, the city would have to pay over half with its own funds.” The Urban Renewal Committee attempted to apply for additional grant funds, which would bring a total planning cost of $764,562 to complete the appraisal work on the renewal plan (Plan 10) for the OWE. Plan 10 called for the “the acquisition and demolition of three hundred one buildings in the project area.”

A map of the OWE, showing the entire renewal area for Plan 10. It is bounded by Central Avenue, Bancroft Street, I-75, and Collingwood Boulevard.
The city obtained six million dollars in federal grants for the project, but at least twelve million dollars was needed to carry out the redevelopment for the twelve hundred acre area. A scaled down urban renewal plan was approved by the Old West End District Council. This plan deleted the Warren-Sherman area of the OWE, which was to be undertaken as a separate urban renewal project. The plan was to be allocated over the next eight years as told to the residents of the OWE. Both residents and preservationists protested that significant buildings in the OWE were being razed when they could be saved through renovation. City Council’s rationale for the OWE renewal plan indicated that this project prevented the demolition of the entire area. If nothing was done, OWE homes would eventually become deteriorated from neglect. One solution for the financial dilemma was the proposition of a GNRP. Under a GNRP, planning for the redevelopment of the OWE could go forward and the city could designate something less than the entire project area as its first renewal project. This approach permitted Toledo to make the OWE a unit and redevelop it in stages. The original planning grant did not cover the additional four hundred seventy properties to be acquired.

Toledo’s urban renewal director admitted under questioning by City Council that about seven hundred properties would be demolished in the OWE under Plan 10. The remaining five hundred properties that were either in good condition or could be potentially rehabilitated were taken for “planning objectives.” Councilman Andy Douglas questioned tearing down good houses and “relocating people because they didn’t fit into the concept of the area.” He believed that the new look of the neighborhood should take these residents into consideration. This did not happen entirely, however. Some areas of the OWE were given a chance to renovate and preserve some of the most
important structures, keeping the historic identity of the neighborhood thriving. Unfortunately, sites that could have been rehabilitated were razed for future land projects of revitalizing importance because it was cheaper than donating grants to renovate the sites. Though many sites were beyond repair and cleared, several more could have been reused and utilized to bring homeowners back to the city. This renewal plan emphasized that perceived attitudes often align with the individual’s pocketbook. If it seems that new construction is cheaper than renovation, then sites will be demolished with little afterthought. This idea was soon to be seen in later urban renewal projects downtown.

The city of Toledo did follow preservation procedure as addressed in the NHPA of 1966 when applying for grants to build the Webstrand Office building, Seagate Hotel (currently the Wyndham), and the Festival Marketplace (Portside) in 1982. Though the Webstrand project did not demolish as many older buildings due to the preservation report, the report could not save all important sites as the law could not protect it from the owners’ or city’s wishes.

The development committee applied to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG) funds and gave Dr. Ray Luce, historic preservation officer the project description with maps, photos, and reports to evaluate its impact on the area’s cultural resources. The Committee acknowledged that there were historic properties in the vicinity of the project area and that it would have no effect on their historical or architectural integrity.44

An environmental assessment was prepared for the UDAG, which had been used to finance urban renewal projects such as the SeaGate Building (Owens-Illinois) and parking garages. In the historic preservation review, it was found that the Trinity
Episcopal Church, which was eligible for the National Register, was the only significant structure remaining in the project area. The area was otherwise totally cleared from renewal efforts and contained approximately seven acres of land. In the immediate vicinity, it was also found that the Valentine building and Edison Steam Plant were worthy of historical significance. However, none of these places were listed on the National Register. It was fortunately proposed by the project commission that all of these structures would remain, as they would not affect the project plans.45

Before 1970, structures on the Trinity block that were built in the nineteenth century were intact, but the Vistula Urban Renewal Plan in the 1970s cleared the entire block except for Trinity Church. Under the Webstrand project plan, the proposed buildings would restore solid slab surfaces to the block. The Trinity Church made minor modifications for the project at its own expense to give access to a parking facility. It returned the block to a more urban setting that was once there when the church was originally built. It was expected that the economic impact of the entire Seagate project would bring revitalization to these sites and increase their potential for reuse, especially for the Valentine Building, which would become vacant the very next year.46

In 1978, the Landmarks Committee lent its support to the city of Toledo’s UDAG application. However, the Committee was still concerned for the safety of historical sites in the project areas. It thought the structures themselves could help revitalize the city in addition to the new proposed buildings. Committee members lost a few landmarks, such as Wheeler Block in the erection of the Seagate Civic and Convention Center, but their concerns also saved many more than in previous years.47
One of the largest urban renewal projects was for the Seagate Convention Center built in 1987. The project to develop the SeaGate Civic/Convention Center was established in 1983 and again Historic Preservation Officer, Dr. Ray Luce was contacted to be alerted that four structures on the National Register List were in the designated project area.48

The Wheeler Block, Secor Hotel, part of the St. Clair historic district, and Fort Industry Square were within the vicinity of the project site, all listed on the National Register. This designation supposedly gave these structures certain protection from demolition if federal funds were involved. The SeaGate Civic Center project made use of UDAG funds from the Department of Housing and Development, but the property owners of Wheeler Block and the eastern side of the St. Clair historic district allowed the project developers to raze these properties to make way for the civic center. Surrounding areas were also razed for parking and hotels that catered to the center.49

In the 1980s, a number of large corporations were taken over or downsized and unemployment soared. Portside Festival Marketplace had lost its appeal after being built in 1984 and closed in 1990. Several urban renewal projects that only temporarily brought prosperity to the city were proving unsuccessful in bringing downtown business. With this atmosphere, many Toledo landmarks fell to the wrecking ball as high rents kept downtown property owners from maintaining their buildings.50

Listed below are several examples of architecturally and historically significant sites in Toledo that were taken down or horribly altered as a result of poor preservation and supposedly to promote progress through their demolitions. These sites are featured with their before and after photographs to show the “progressive” sites that replaced these
historical landmarks. It is evident that many of these structures were razed to make way for larger, more progressive structures, while others were abandoned and razed in renewal efforts, and others burned.

The Ketcham-Morton House at Madison Avenue and St. Clair Street was built in 1843. Early Toledo pioneer Valentine Ketcham cleared the land to build this simple Greek Revival home. Daniel Morton, the next owner was an “attorney, 1849 mayor of Toledo, and brother of Levi Morton, vice president under Benjamin Harrison.” The home was converted into a boarding house and tavern during the Civil War, known as the St. Elmo House. It was demolished in 1878 as a result of downtown construction and the clearing of residences. The site was occupied by Levis Square in 2004.\textsuperscript{51}

The Ketcham-Morton House c. 1877 when it was known as the St. Elmo House (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

In 2004, the site occupied Levis Square.

The Trinity Church was built in 1843 on the corner of Adams and St. Clair Streets. It was moved several feet in 1863 and was demolished that year to make way for the present and larger Trinity Episcopal Church that suited the growing congregation.\textsuperscript{52}
The Lucas County Courthouse was built in 1853 when the county seat moved to Toledo. The structure was razed in 1898 when the new courthouse, built on the same property was constructed. This Greek Revival courthouse had a jail in the rear and despite numerous additions, the building became obsolete in the coming decades.\(^5^3\)

The Old Post Office was built in 1853 at Madison and St. Clair. The stone post office was designed in the Tuscan Renaissance Revival style, with “rusticated base, arched windows and doors, and a heavy cornice.” Toledo residents picked up mail here until 1863 when mail was delivered. This was the site where eulogies for Abraham
Lincoln were given in 1865. The site was demolished in 1881 when a new office opened. In 2004, Levis Square occupied the site.\textsuperscript{54}

![Image of Old Post Office c.1860](image1.png) ![Image of Levis Square in 2004](image2.png)

A sketch of the Old Post office c.1860 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library). The site in 2004 was situated in Levis Square. A portion of Madison Street was paved over to make the park area.

The Morris Block at Jefferson and Summit was constructed in 1852 as a row of commercial buildings typical of the nineteenth century. The block reflected the Greek Revival style and housed some of the most successful Toledo merchants. The block was torn down in 1961 for the now demolished Federal Building, which was razed for the Radisson Hotel adjacent to the SeaGate Center.\textsuperscript{55}

![Image of Morris Block c. 1860](image3.png) ![Image of Radisson Hotel in 2004](image4.png)

The Morris Block c. 1860 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library). The Radisson Hotel was on the site in 2004. It replaced the Federal Building in the 1980s.

The Lucas County Jail and Sheriff’s Residence was built between 1865 and 1867 by architect C.C. Miller. One interesting occupant, William Harbeck, whose father was
sheriff in the 1880s, filmed the San Francisco Earthquake and fire in 1906. The building was razed in 1900, three years after the present sheriff’s residence and jail was built in the same general area as the original.\textsuperscript{56}

St. Patrick’s Catholic Church was built in between 1862 and 1864 by Father Edward Hannin as the first Irish Catholic parish in Toledo. The church was demolished in 1892 to construct the present larger church for its growing congregation.\textsuperscript{57}

St. Francis De Sales Parish House built in 1858 next to the St. Francis De Sales Catholic Church four years before the church was constructed. It was the oldest remaining residence in the downtown area when it was demolished in 1968. Though it
was in fairly good condition when razed, the pastor claimed that it could no longer be efficiently utilized. The site was occupied by a Goodwill store in 2004.\textsuperscript{58}

The St. Francis Parish House c. 1940s (Courtesy of the Toledo Museum of Art). In 2004, the site was occupied by a Goodwill store.

The Fitch Mansion was built in the 1850s as the “architectural wonder” envisioned by Frank Scott for Toledo Judge, John Fitch. It looked like an Italian villa with Italian renaissance concepts. Architects from all over the country came to see the mansion. In 1887, the mansion was used as a private school called the Smead School for Girls. It remained a finishing school until 1934 when it was changed into a country day school. New acreage was found on Reynolds Road and a new school was built and renamed the Maumee Valley Country Day School. The old school building was razed in 1934. In 2004, the site was an empty lot.\textsuperscript{59}

The Fitch Mansion/Smead School for Girls c. 1880s (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library). The site was an empty lot in 2004.

The Phillips House at 220 Columbia was built in 1866 in the Italiante Villa style, consisting of “informally arranged masses and towers, loosely based on northern Italian
medieval houses.” It was constructed for Henry Phillips, seed importer and an early pioneer of the street railway system on his family homestead. In the 1940s the home was remodeled as an apartment house named the Columbia Villa. The site was later abandoned and neglected, as it was vandalized several times and several items were stolen from the interior. The home burned in 1980 and only a vacant lot exists on the site. The home was listed on the National Register in 1979.60

The Phillips House c. 1950 when it was the Columbian Villa apartments (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

In 2004, the site was an empty lot in a deteriorated neighborhood.

The Boody House Hotel at 405 Madison Avenue was built in 1872 as Toledo’s most elegant hotel. It housed many famous celebrities, such as Clarence Darrow, William Jennings Bryan, and every U.S. president from Grant to Taft. It was razed in 1928 and the headquarters of the Ohio Savings and Trust Company was built in its place in 1930. The Boody House was razed for a new bank as the operator; Smith Welsh obtained control of the Madison hotel and was offered a substantial amount of money to turn over the Boody House property. The last tenants had left the hotel and little was to be done with the structure.61 The bank was forced to close shortly after opening as a result of the Depression. Owens-Illinois purchased the site in 1945 and used it as their
world headquarters until the completion of their SeaGate offices in 1981. National City Bank owned the skyscraper in 2004.\(^{62}\)

The Boody House Hotel c. 1890 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).


Tiedtke’s was Toledo’s “most distinctive downtown store.” It began in 1894 and was moved to Summit Street in 1910. Tiedtke’s has been called “America’s first supermarket.” It brought big advertising, sales, and displays to a store that carried most every kind of item. This was much more desirable than the old general store. In the 1960s, the grocery section of the store had diminished and the store became a part of a national chain that went bankrupt in 1972. The store closed immediately and the abandoned building burned in 1975. Portside and COSI were built in the general vicinity of Tiedtke’s.\(^{63}\)

Tiedtke’s Department Store c. 1930 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

Portside and COSI were situated near the site of Tiedtke’s in 2004.
The Lenk Wine Company on Detroit Avenue was built between the years 1867 to the 1880s by German immigrant Carl Lenk. The Winery used Lake Erie Island fruit and grapes from Lenk’s own vineyard and housed the world’s largest wine cask. The property was bought by the DeVilbiss Company and demolished in 1987 to make offices for the ITW Ransburg Electrostatic Systems Company.64

A sketch of the Lenk Wine Company c. 1890 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The site was offices for the ITW Ransburg Electrostatic Systems Company in 2004.

Fire Station No. 7 at Franklin and Bancroft was built in 1873 as a typical firehouse of the nineteenth century. The structure was demolished in 1969 to build an updated firehouse that would meet the needs of the community through more advanced technology.65

Fire Station No. 7 c. 1880 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The updated Fire Station No. 7 in 2004.

St. Vincent’s Hospital was Toledo’s first hospital, operated by the Grey Nuns of Montreal in 1857. The sisters bought two acres of land on Cherry Street and built a three story building to serve the sick. St. Vincent’s has been added to and modernized over the
years. The original building was razed in the 1966 as the later additions later “dwarfed” the original, which was in need of modernization.\textsuperscript{66}

The Toledo State Hospital was considered one of the most advanced and humane facilities for the insane in the country. The Constitution of Ohio required that “the insane be cared for by the state, but lack of funds hindered the building of facilities for such care. Someone proposed building the cottage type hospital to meet the needs since this building program would cost almost half of the regular large hospital type.” In 1888, Toledo was designated the site of the new hospital and was one of the first in the country to use the cottage type facilities. It was razed in the 1960s and 1970s as patients were moved to more modernized facilities. Several businesses and a post office occupied the site in 2004.\textsuperscript{67}
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\caption{St. Vincent’s Hospital c. 1890 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{The modernized St. Vincent’s Hospital c. 2004.}
\end{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{toledo_state_hospital}
\caption{The Toledo State Hospital c. 1890 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{occupied_site}
\caption{The site was occupied by several businesses, a post office and open space in 2004.}
\end{figure}
The First Congregational Church on St. Clair Street was erected in 1877 in the High Gothic style. The congregation was moved to a more impressive church in 1917 and the site used as a dancehall, skating rink, and theater before it burned down in 1933. In 2004, the site was a parking garage.⁶⁸

The first church in Toledo was constructed by the Presbyterians in 1838 at the corner of Cherry and Superior Streets. The church was also used by the Congregational, Episcopal, and Unitarian congregations as their first churches. The building was later moved when purchased by Catholics. The structure was demolished in 1943. A parking garage was at the site in 2004.⁶⁹
The Cummings House at 1505 Jefferson was built in 1874 by Robert Cummings, a shoe wholesaler. The house was the best example of the French Empire style in Toledo and its westward location showed the movement of prosperous Toledoans out of downtown. It was converted into the Chesbrough Dwelling apartments and razed in 1956 for insurance offices. The insurance building became vacant in the 1990s, under the ownership of the Jefferson Avenue Association Incorporated.  

The Colton House was constructed in 1889 at West Woodruff Avenue by Abram Colton. His daughter Olive, who presided in the house, was a “well-known writer and early crusader for women’s rights.” The house was demolished in 1940, labeled as blight by the housing commission.  

The Island House Hotel and Railroad Station was built on the Middlegrounds in 1856. It was a popular hotel, which competed heavily with the Oliver House. Five
railroads used this “combination hotel and railroad station.” Station hotels were important before railroads had dining and sleeping cars. The Island House Hotel was built in the Lombard Romanesque style and suffered flooding in the 1880s. A new station was constructed as a result of the major flooding in 1886 and the Island House was later abandoned. It was demolished in 1906 when business became slow. Owens Corning Headquarters is situated at the site in 2004.\textsuperscript{72}

The Island House Hotel c. 1870 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

Owens Corning Headquarters was on the site in 2004.

The Lucas County Armory was built in 1892 as a “symbol of Toledo’s strong sense of patriotism when war was an exciting and glorious event.” It was a drill hall for the Ohio National Guard, storage area for military equipment, and arena for sporting events and concerts. A cigarette from a wrestling match caught fire and burned the armory down in 1934. The U.S. courthouse occupied the site in 2004.\textsuperscript{73}

The Lucas County Armory c. 1900 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

In 2004, the U.S. Courthouse was located at the site.
The Toledo Club was erected in 1891 at the corner of Madison and Huron by David L. Stine for the Draconian Club headquarters. The club contained a large banquet room, billiard hall, and guest rooms. The club outgrew its building in 1915 and moved to Fourteenth Street. The building held a number of businesses before being destroyed in 1922 for the creation of the Homes Savings Bank and Trust. The site was the location of Sky Bank in 2004.74

The Toledo Club c. 1910 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

Sky Bank is located at the site in 2004.

The Nasby building was constructed between 1891 and 1895 for Horace Walbridge as the tallest skyscraper in Toledo. It was named after the character Petroleum V. Nasby in David Ross Locke’s famous Civil War essays and was modeled after the Giraldo Tower in Seville, Spain.75 In 1934 the tower top of the Nasby building was removed, supposedly for safety reasons. However, as the building had long since dwarfed the other structures on Madison Avenue, the removal of the tower was largely unnoticed and “unlamented.”76 In 1964, a steel frame and metal panels were placed over the brick and stone facades and the building was renamed the Madison. Glimpses of the building’s beautiful façade can be seen where a few panels have been removed. In 2001, the Madison building’s roof was repaired by the city for $205,000 so that continued deterioration would not occur. In 2003, attempts by Detroit developers to convert the
building into a sixteen million dollar residential, office, and retail center failed. A barbershop is the building’s only remaining tenant at present. Many developers stayed away from the site, as renovations were costly and would require rents too high for the area. The market could not afford renovations in 2004, so the city mothballed the structure until the site becomes more desirable through street improvements on Madison Avenue.\(^77\) Altered beyond recognition and ignored by the public, the Nasby faces an uncertain future.

![The Nasby c. 1900 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department Of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).](image1)

![The Nasby c. 2004 as the “modernized” Madison building. The tower is gone and paneling covers its façade.](image2)

The Wheeler Block, constructed in 1896, was a commercial structure noted for its unusual curved corner, open entry, and cast iron columns. It was built in the early Italian Renaissance style and replaced the former Wheeler Opera House. The site was placed on the National Register in 1984 and was demolished that same year to build the SeaGate Center.\(^78\)
The Secor Building was constructed in 1892, housing the Lasalle and Koch’s Department Store from 1894 until 1916. It later became offices for Toledo Edison. In 1941 it was razed for parking. In 2004, a Subway Restaurant was located at the site with surrounding parking.\(^79\)

Lake Erie Park and Casino lasted only fifteen years from 1895 to 1910, but remained quite successful until one of its fires finished off the site permanently. Street Railway lines and trolleys carried passengers to the boardwalk that led to the park. In the park was innovative entertainment such as a roller coaster, two casinos, ice cream parlor, theater, concessions, rides, mock sea battles, and park like atmosphere. Cullens Park was situated on the site in 2004.\(^80\)
In recent years, the city of Toledo has not improved much in its tear down mentality and lack of preservation efforts. For example, Mayor Jack Ford’s mission to clean up the city of Toledo is admirable, but the demolition list that was released in 2003 would leave much of downtown, especially the Vistula area full of vacant lots. Three hundred properties were scheduled to be destroyed, and though many were beyond repair, the majority could have been saved through rehabilitation. This should have been done so that others could appreciate the properties’ historic integrity. The character of Toledo neighborhoods was slowly being destroyed as barren lots were taking over. Ford also cut the funding to neighborhood development corporations, some of the only groups actively building homes and rehabilitating in these areas. It has been noted by concerned Toledoans that the City should encourage more rehabilitation and less bulldozers. Even neglected sites could have a chance at preservation efforts, though no viable plans have been determined as of 2004. According to a staff report of the Toledo-Lucas County plan Commission; most buildings are bulldozed as a result of deteriorating conditions caused by the neglect of property owners. “When you neglect a building, you kill it. Turning around and handing out a demolition permit rewards for bad behavior.”

By bringing
older homes to a more stable condition, the city would encourage “investment in long neglected areas, reduce blight and crime, and help slow the exodus from Toledo.”

Another issue that has been raised by historic neighborhood residents is haphazard preservation efforts versus urban renewal, creating a stigma of subsidized housing. Bill Hirt was considered somewhat of a preservationist at one time when he took risks to restore the rundown, yet historic neighborhood of Vistula. Though Hirt has generated many stable, restored homes in the district, the neighborhood has been labeled as an area of subsidized, low-income housing in Toledo. Hirt’s Vistula Development Corporation had a twenty year contract with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to generate “so-called” Section 8 housing in the Vistula neighborhood. Section 8 housing requires the tenant to pay thirty percent of their income as rent and the taxpayers pay the rest. The program has been important nationally and has transformed several urban areas into useful and “viable” neighborhoods once more. However, for Vistula, the low subsidized housing stigma hangs over the neighborhood, preventing it from returning to its vibrant and thriving past. The residents have begun to take more interest in the future of the district and want to rent at unsubsidized market rates or sell to occupants that want to become homeowners. As the area is so heavily subsidized, there is no long term stability as renter turnover is frequent. The area has little of the “residential and commercial diversity that give a neighborhood a positive identity and feeling of home for those who live there. There are no bakeries, cleaners, or shopping.” The deterioration of the subsidized homes and lack of commodities keep new homeowners from moving to Vistula. The district is eighty percent low income.
Resident Sue Burkett states, “hopefully with the new I-280 bridge opening in 2005, North Summit Street will be in line for redevelopment.”

Toledo’s fascination with the wrecking ball not only comes from the personal ideals of the local government, but also stems from Toledoans second rate attitude toward the city and structures within it. The opinion of Toledo Blade reporter Sally Vallongo implied that the city’s residents were not quite satisfied with the accommodations and history in the city. It was thought that Toledo never lived up to its potential and residents wanted to improve upon places to make them better, prosperous, progressive, and to develop a city worthy of pride. Many sites were also destroyed because it seems that Toledoans do not appreciate the quality of the city’s architectural or historical heritage. The baby boomers are the last generation to remember Toledo as it was, when it was still alive.

Despite the less than encouraging evidence mentioned above about the lack of preservation in Toledo, there are a number of concerned citizens that have formed preservation organizations to combat the destruction mindset of city planners. Not only is Toledo beginning to take some interest in preserving what is left of the downtown landmarks, other cities in Lucas County, such as Maumee, Waterville, Grand Rapids, and Oregon have made strong efforts to preserve architecturally and historically significant sites.

In an era of poor preservation and ongoing urban renewal projects, several historic preservation organizations originated to educate those in Northwest Ohio what preservation can do to stimulate society. The Maumee Valley Historical Society was established in 1963 as a result of the merger of the Historical Society of Northwest Ohio
and the Maumee Historical Society; whose original purpose was to save and preserve the Wolcott House. The MVHS endeavors to pursue preservation and educational efforts throughout the Maumee Valley. Its headquarters are located in the Wolcott House in Maumee, Ohio.  

The Landmarks Committee was established in 1968 as Toledoans soon became concerned with the loss of important historical structures in their neighborhoods and in the city. The Landmarks Committee was a driving force in the 1970s as it brought surveys and nominations of historical sites in Lucas County to the National Register of Historic Places. The goals of the Landmarks Committee of the MVHS were the “location and documentation of historic structures, education of the public to importance of preservation, and involvement in actual restoration projects.” The Committee has surveyed all of Lucas County in search of historical structures.

In the late 1960s, concerned members of the MVHS saw that historic sites that were photographed and surveyed were quickly being destroyed. Though there were many improvements in preservation law through the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, urban renewal funds for improvement of historic sites, and Ohio’s ability to apply for federal historic preservation funds, old buildings continued to disappear, especially in downtown Toledo and the Old West End. The rumored destruction of the Solon Richardson home in the OWE sparked the Landmarks Committee to form and take action in 1968. Fourteen interested citizens came together and decided that the Richardson House must be preserved and saved from future threats, along with many other historic sites. At that time, citizens such as Judge Geraldine Macelwane, chairman of the OWE District Council, Mrs. A.L. Bentley, Sr., vice-president of the Ohio Historic
Sites Preservation Advisory Board, James Reeve, curator at the Toledo Museum of Art, and Walter Edelen of The Toledo Urban Renewal Agency were among the first members of the Landmarks Committee. The Richardson home was the mansion of the second president of Libbey Glass Company and Toledo’s best example of the neo-Palladian style of architecture popular in the Edwardian period.⁸⁹

In 1969, the Ad Hoc Committee adopted the name of Landmarks Committee and merged with the MVHS. The Richardson home was ultimately destroyed, but several sites were saved due to the vigilance of the Landmarks Committee. The Committee gained grants from the Ohio Historical Society to conduct several surveys of interested areas in Toledo and the Maumee Valley. In addition, the Committee published books and produced programs on the area’s landmark architecture, which raised public awareness and preservation efforts significantly.⁹⁰

In the first survey, twenty six buildings were recommended for the National Register, including the Wheeler Block, which was scheduled for demolition. The committee had been the first recipient of state administered federal money for historic surveys in Ohio, which was used for the Old West End-Downtown Toledo inventories of 1970. Though nominations were sent in and Ohio Historic Inventory Forms were filled out, many sites were only delayed in their demolition as they were in the direct path of the expressway.⁹¹

The Landmarks Committee did have part in making the Old West End and Vistula historic districts, restoring the Sheriffs Residence and Jail, and aiding in the Oliver House and Fort Industry Square restorations. It aided in listing the House of Four Pillars, Berdan Building, Pray-Starkweather House, First Church of Christ Scientist, Isaac Hull
Store, and Grand Rapids Town Hall to the National Register. It gave preservation awards
and historic landmark status for the Pythian Castle, Ashland Avenue Baptist Church,
Libbey House, Columbian House, First Presbyterian Church in Maumee, Gerber House,
and Wolcott House.\footnote{92}

The increased awareness and demand for historic preservation information
resulting from the efforts of the Landmark Committee in 1976 made it evident that a full
time office was needed to meet preservation needs. The Northwest Ohio Historic
Preservation Office was set up under the statewide regional program founded by the Ohio
Historical Society, “as a result of the federal money available to states for historic
preservation activities under the Historic Preservation Act of 1966.” The state program
was governed by the Ohio Historic Site Preservation Advisory Board.\footnote{93}

The office was responsible for preservation activities in the northwest counties of
“Defiance, Fulton, Henry, Lucas, Ottawa, Sandusky, Williams, and Wood.” It was
funded on a fifty-fifty matching basis, where all monies given by the federal government
were matched by the local sponsoring group. In 1976, the office was established in
Toledo in the Bell Building on Madison Avenue. Theodore Ligibel was the Regional
Preservation Officer. The office answered to the Landmarks Committee, Ohio Historical
Society, and the Office of the Interior when making decisions on preservation issues.\footnote{94}

The office moved to Bowling Green State University’s Center for Archival
Collections (CAC) in 1978. This permitted use of the university’s facilities and research
holdings to bring a larger staff to deal with preservation issues. During this time, “2,204
Ohio Historic Inventory Forms were completed; twenty three National Register
nominations were submitted; 2,304 requests for historic preservation information were
received from area groups, businesses, agencies and individuals; sixty two governmental project applications were reviewed; and 193 lectures/tours were provided” in cooperation with the Landmarks Committee. Historic surveys were completed in each of the eight northwest Ohio counties, which brought historic sites to the eyes of the public and many were designated and protected by the federal government. The massive cutbacks in federal and state programs in 1980 by the conservative administration caused the preservation office to reduce the number of regions it represented in 1981, as funds were lost to keep all aspects of the office running.95 Regional coordinator Maura Johnson met preservation needs in the CAC office until 2000, when it was officially closed. She accomplished much in her five years as coordinator, processing many National Register nominations, including the Fallen Timbers battlefield. She also worked very closely with the Maumee Valley Historical Society and Toledo Area Metroparks to produce historic programming in the region.96

Other development organizations that promote preservation and rehabilitation of buildings in historic districts such as Vistula and the Old West End have encouraged residents to become involved in the preservation of their homes and their communities. The Neighborhood Improvement Foundation of Toledo Inc. was established in 1952 and incorporated in 1957 by Wayne Snow, a local salesman. It was a “local nonprofit, nonpartisan, state incorporated, public service organization that made efforts to conserve and improve Toledo.” Its goal was to make the public interested in historic structures, to “replace apathy and neglect with action, and to stimulate better citizenship and cooperation with the city.” The organization had a board of directors and committees to
address low housing issues and rehabilitation. As of 2004, the organization was still in existence.  

The Vistula Historic District Commission develops neighborhoods through the renovation and restoration of structures to revitalize the community and raising property values. This commission, founded by area developers in Toledo, works to preserve neighborhood character and brings a sense of history in the oldest neighborhood in Toledo. The Vistula Historic District Commission has the power to “review building permits for exterior renovation, demolitions, and new construction to insure that the proposed change is consistent with the architectural and historical character of the district.” The Commission consists of eleven members, one representative from each of the following organizations, the American Institute of Architects, the Arts Commission of Greater Toledo, the Landmarks Committee, the City Plan Commission, the American Society of Landscape Architects, and neighborhood delegates.

The Vistula Development Group has renovated some seventy five buildings in the neighborhood, especially those that have been abandoned or vandalized. It meets with city officials, owners, and residents to explain the needs of the neighborhood and to preserve its exterior structures. All renovated buildings were nominated for the National Register and have received local historic designation.

When the Seagate Center was opened in 1987, it was supposed to bring the prospect of new growth for Toledo. However, business owners and residents worried that if the city did not have proper planning, the Seagate Center would also bring “pressures to demolish parts of the Warehouse District for parking or new ventures that have little to do with its character.” Those concerned citizens were proud of their
heritage and wanted to see the area preserved. A coalition of twenty five business owners and residents formed the Warehouse District Association to represent public concern. They formed in 1986 as a nonprofit community development organization. It was made up of businesses, residents, property owners in the district, and interested parties in the “increased economic development and preservation of the area.” The Association was to address a number of issues that affected the district such as the speculative demolitions of empty warehouses that were listed on the National Register. This area is one of the “finest collections of historic buildings in Toledo,” according to city planner Mike Young. The Association wished to discourage more surface parking that would come along with the new convention center. The Warehouse District Association encouraged people to make use of resources to create a good investment in Toledo’s economy. Over two million dollars has been spent in improvements to the Warehouse District. The rest of the Warehouse District was listed on the National Register (the St. Clair block had been previously listed). This listing will bring some protection to the structures. The historic designation draws the public’s attention to that the area and to the structure’s historic significance to the city. In 2004, the Association was still preserving the structures of the Warehouse District. It has helped developers financially and socially to rehabilitate buildings for adaptive reuse. Several older structures adjacent to Fifth Third Field (The Toledo Mud Hens stadium) were rehabilitated by the Association, turning them into restaurants and bars, such as Fricker’s.

In the mid 1960s, the Old West End faced “plummeting property values, panic selling, long time residents leaving, and deterioration of buildings through vacancy or vandalism.” The Old West End Association (OWEA) was recreated as a result, as
residents refused to allow their neighborhood to fall apart. The original OWEA was created in 1940 by seventy five residents.

By the 1970s, property values climbed, the population movement in and out of the neighborhood had stabilized, and hundreds of homes were rehabilitated. The OWEA continued to develop a sense of community and cooperation among the residents as they began to realize that the history and identity of the neighborhood was worth preserving. The association protected the interests of the community before the City Council, “guarding zoning, fighting the increased institutional use of the properties, and securing the best in educational facilities and programs for residents.”

Several aspects of Lucas County’s preservation movement have been comparable to those of the nation. Preservation efforts began early as a form of ancestor worship with a number of grassroots organizations driving the community to become interested in saving sites, as there was a lack of involvement from the federal government. The nation and Lucas County slowed their preservation efforts after WWII with the migrations out of the city and plans for urban renewal in the cities. Social change and unrest brought stronger organizations and legislation to combat the widespread destruction that was occurring in many American cities, which is explored in the next chapter.
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Chapter Four

The Historic Preservation Movement Takes Hold of Lucas County, Ohio

“In a world of concrete, Concorde, and computers, it is vital that we preserve what remains of our individuality. If everything were modern, everywhere would look pretty much the same.”

-Timothy Cantell “Why Care About Old Buildings?”

The passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) increased preservation activities in Lucas County, as it did across the nation. Virtually every documented site featured some state involvement and “nearly all have had at least a passing connection with a federal agency.” Minimal direct involvement by the federal government has impacted the quality of preservation and the perceived significance of historic sites in the Maumee Valley. Though federal funds and designation were very important in preserving sites; local organizations, citizens, and governments provided the manpower in the preservation movement in Lucas County. The national movement brought several preservation issues to the county, including developer intervention, preservation laws, public perceptions towards sites to be preserved, and federal cooperation with local governments, to make preservation possible. Local sites that have been successfully preserved and the motives that led to that status are examined, as well as the changing perceptions of the movement and of historic sites as evidenced by news reports and general observation.
Preservation has been strong in the city of Maumee as the members of that community value the sites where important events occurred and important people lived to help create the flourishing Maumee Valley. Other places such as Waterville and Grand Rapids hold a long list of preservation efforts and laws that will be evident when historic site examples are given later in the chapter. However, the focus should go back to Toledo to discuss the preservation of a few notable historic districts.

Before looking at historic districts in Toledo, one should ask, how are historic sites and districts designated in Lucas County and who designates them? Where is the line drawn between significant, historically interesting, and irreplaceable structures? Initially, historic designation is placed at the local level at each city council or by individuals filling out nomination forms and sending them to their state preservation office. Historic districts are designated by the Toledo City Council because they “reflect a particular period, character, historical and architectural quality that is significant to the city and embodies and era’s sense of place.” Normally, the individuals or local governments look to the criteria designated by the National Park Service for placement on the National Register. There are also local designations for historically and architecturally significant structures, but they often do not receive federal funding for protection. Local agencies, such as city council or the MVHS weigh the historical integrity of structures, their age, their uniqueness to the area, historical environment (historic districts), and the relatively unaltered architectural state of the site. In these cases, local politics and power have much to do with what is designated as significant. Discussed below is one of Toledo’s most notable historic districts.
The Old West End (OWE) exhibits architectural styles ranging from Second French Empire to Chateauesque, with ornate designs, lush landscaping, broad streets, and expansive lots. The social history of the OWE is equally important as its architecture. A majority of the well known and wealthy families in Toledo, such as the Spitzers, Secors, Fords, Libbeys, Walbridges, Stranahans, Berdans, Reynolds, Tiedtkes, and Coltons lived in the elegant neighborhood. The OWE was built up in the 1870s by those that wanted to move out of the city. It was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1973 when community members wanted more preservation and protection from urban renewal and federal land projects. The neighborhood is in differing stages of preservation. The Old West End is recognized as one of the largest remaining districts of late Victorian residential architecture in the country.\(^3\)

The Old West End was Toledo’s first suburb in the 1870s. City dwellers wanted to move westward and by the turn of the century, the OWE was the place of the rich and powerful. The wealthy wanted to move away from the CBD during the building boom in Toledo and the widespread use of streetcars. The OWE was promoted as being a “healthful” and beautiful neighborhood where city dwellers could live, staying away from the dirty Black Swamp image that downtown portrayed. However, the OWE was close
enough to downtown that residents could use public transportation, no longer needing to live near their place of employment.

During the 1960s, community leaders were beginning to write off the neighborhood as urban decay began to take root. In the twenty first century, the neighborhood proved predictions wrong and has boosted interest in preservation throughout the area. Residents love the OWE due to its uniqueness and visual value. Kristin Hurdle, spokesperson for the National Trust for Historic Places comments, “preservation connects us with our past. Old buildings have an infinite capacity for reuse.” Mr. St. John, who has restored several Old West End homes, claims that his rule of thumb for preservation projects is “no matter what you plan on, it’s going to cost double. Every old house has surprises.” The residents have become somewhat like amateur historians in finding information about their homes and their restoration. One resident admits that she “likes old houses because it feels like you’re at grandmas all the time. And everything was always good at grandmas.”

Though the entire neighborhood (consisting of Monroe Street, Glenwood Avenue, Delaware Avenue, Bancroft Street, West Woodruff, and Collingwood Boulevard as borders) is on the National Register, listing on the National Register of Historic Places is purely recognition, “awarded after the approval of a lengthy application.” In most cases, property owners can do whatever they want to a building after designation; even destroy it. However, local regulations are the ones that take the most effect in preserving sites. Usually, they include entire neighborhoods and are established after a majority of homeowners agree to the designation. Local review boards must approve all visible changes to buildings. In Toledo, the Old West End Historic District commission powers
“extend to any exterior change except paint color; in some cases a new roof is subject to commission approval.” To preservationists, this review is to the homeowner’s benefit. It protects from untoward changes by neighbors that can undermine property value. Restrictions on historic districts are rarely onerous, “especially when compared with those in other neighborhoods. Expensive new subdivisions usually include more restrictions than do historic districts.” People make excuses. It is a tough compromise between respect for a historically significant neighborhood and a desire “to live comfortably in the present.” Few people want to limit owners’ rights to do what they want to their homes, but few want to see old neighborhoods renovated out of existence either.6

In 1985, the Toledo Plan Commission voted to expand the boundaries of the OWE historic district. The district was expanded to include the West side of Glenwood, the East side of Collingwood, 23rd Street, West Woodruff, and Lincoln Avenue. These streets were to be included in the National Register designation of the historic district. The historic designation meant that applications for building permits and any new construction would first be approved by the historic district commission. Owners of the buildings in the expanded district were now eligible for federal tax credits and local abatements to restore and maintain their properties. The designation also protected structures that were historically or architecturally significant by restricting changes that were not in character with the rest of the buildings. The expanded district was approved as it would greater represent the historic architecture associated with the area. The district was bounded by Monroe Street, Glenwood Avenue, Delaware Avenue, and Collingwood Boulevard.7
Even in historic districts, problems with preservation occur when many residents do not cooperate to keep their neighborhoods from deteriorating. In 1995, members of the Old West End Association proposed to reduce the size of the area that the association represented. This division was to split the “mansion district” section of the OWE from the more modest homes built at the turn of the century for the middle class. The boundaries were drawn because “people were worried that one part of the neighborhood was concerned with preservation and people in the other part of the neighborhood were concerned with fighting gangs.” The Northern part of the district was not participating in preservation efforts so it was thought that they should no longer be represented. This proposal never passed, however. Residents from the north end voted it down because they did not want to lose the historic designation. If they lost the designation, they would experience decreased property values as a result.
Another important district in Toledo is the Vistula Historic District. Vistula is the oldest neighborhood in the city and “actually predates the incorporation of Toledo.” Most of the homes were built between 1830 and 1900. Founded by B.F. Stickney in 1833, Vistula later merged with Port Lawrence to become the city of Toledo in 1837. This local historic district has some of the earliest remaining architecture found in the city in a variety of styles, especially the vernacular folk houses of the “burgeoning working class that characterizes so much of the nineteenth century built environment of Toledo.” Living together was a mix of wealthy with the middle-class. Salem Lutheran Church and the Raymond-Ketcham House are fine historic examples in the district. Vistula is one of the best examples of early Ohio urban development. It was listed on the National Register in 1978.  

Vistula c. 1910  
Vistula in 2004, off of Lagrange Street.  
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The St. Clair Street Commercial District is the only group of commercial buildings remaining near the “once busy dock area of Toledo.” Structures in the vicinity of the district built in the nineteenth century have been torn down and vacant lots are rampant. These structures were built during the period of prosperity of the 1880s, when the railroad was top priority for transport and the discovery of natural gas lured industries into Toledo with the promise of cheap fuel. The buildings were also used as brothels, as the sites were in the heart of the red light district. These Victorian buildings represent a
significant part of the rapidly vanishing old commercial districts and portray the strength of Toledo at the end of the nineteenth century.

Nearly all of the structures have been altered in some way. The west side was nicely preserved, but the entire east side had been demolished during the era of urban renewal in the 1960s. The Dixon building’s lower level had been resurfaced and interior renovations were still being done by owner Kathy Steingraber in 2004. The building next door, operated as the Dixon saloon has been converted in a coffee house, called Downtown Latte. The upper floors have been turned into studio apartments. The facades were repainted and restored. Various developers own the remainder of the block and have been renovating older buildings for use as bars and restaurants. This spur in development was a result of the increased traffic of people in the area going to the Mud Hens Stadium at Fifth Third Field. The district was added to the National Register in 1975.\textsuperscript{11}
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\caption{South St. Clair Street c. 1885 and Dixon Block on St. Clair Street in 2004. (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).}
\end{figure}

The Warehouse District was first settled in 1817 as the town of Port Lawrence. This spot was seen as the future center of trade to the “developing Midwest of America.” The district was a hub for shipping and was filled with saloons, breweries, hotels, and stores that lined the canals. In the early twentieth century, the district became a major distribution center for the nation’s “hardware, seed, printing, and vegetable industries, until the railroads replaced the canals.”\textsuperscript{12} Construction in the Warehouse District nearly
came to a halt with the Stock market crash of 1929 and resulting Depression. This along with the development of interstate highways and use of trucks to deliver direct from factories to stores reduced the need for warehousing and contributed to the decline of the district. The Warehouse District was rarely used and many sites became vacant as a result. Several buildings were demolished to provide parking for the growing use of automobiles. It was listed on the National Register in 1993.13

The final notable historic district, Bronson Place, is much smaller than those listed above. It was included on the National Register in 1984. Bronson Place is significant as an “early, innovative concept in privately owned, incorporated communities within a larger urban setting.” It was the first nonprofit, incorporated neighborhood in Toledo with residential buildings constructed between 1899 and 1913. This neighborhood inspired the creation of larger incorporated communities such as Ottawa Hills. The entirety of Bronson Place was originally owned by Circuit judge Samuel Brinkerhoff of Sandusky County. He built four of the earliest homes and the rest of the lots were purchased by realtor E.H. Close, including his own residence. A majority of the homes were built by popular Toledo architect Harry Wachter. In 1913, five homeowners formed the Bronson Place Company, which incorporated the residents to share the cost of
maintenance to the park, surrounding area, and home lots. It still operates in 2004. The architectural styles of the homes range from Colonial Revival and Dutch Colonial to Tudor Revival. Bronson Place was designed for the “nouveaux riches” where landscaped lawns and protective community resembled the elitist tastes of the Old West End. There have been exterior alterations to some of the residences, such as aluminum siding, but the general character of Bronson Place is unchanged. One residence was destroyed by fire in 1974 and a Family Dollar fronting Cherry Street, comprises one of the razed lots.\(^{14}\)

Bronson Place c. 1900

Bronson Place in 2004.
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

Historic districts and sites in Lucas County often benefit from legislation and federal tax credits that aid in their preservation. Direct federal involvement has been useful in preservation laws such as the NHPA of 1966 and in the use of federal tax credits. However, most of the preservation efforts are being redirected to the states and Ohio takes great pains to make historic landmarks a priority when funds are available. Ohioans are starting to recognize that historic landmarks are important cultural and economic assets rather than just a “nostalgic reminder of antiquity.” More sites are being saved as a result. When historic properties are threatened, Ohioans usually respond by forming “historic preservation organizations, encouraging elected officials to pass local historic preservation ordinances, preparing architectural standards and guidelines,
investing in historic neighborhoods, and advocating for land use planning.” Preservation actually stabilizes neighborhoods, increases property values, lowers crime, brings people and businesses back to the area, attracts tourists, stimulates private investment, and ignites community pride.\textsuperscript{15}

The Ohio Historic Preservation Office was developed in 1967 when the Ohio Historical Society was designated to manage responsibilities delegated to the state by Congress under the NHPA. The Historic Preservation Office “identifies historic places and archaeological sites, nominates eligible properties to the National Register of Historic Places, reviews rehabilitation work to income-producing National Register properties for federal tax investment tax credits, monitors federally assisted projects for effects on historic, architectural, and archaeological resources, consults on the conservation of buildings and sites, and offers educational programs and publications.”\textsuperscript{16} The office is partially funded by an annual grant from the Department of the Interior’s National Historic Preservation Fund. The Ohio Historical Society, the State of Ohio, and several other private and public sources contribute to match these federal funds.

The Ohio Historic Preservation Office reviews more than “four thousand federally assisted undertakings a year to see that alternatives are considered in any action that would damage or destroy properties listed on, or eligible for, the National Register.” It will only agree to the loss of a significant property if there is no other alternative and if the steps were taken to reduce the impact of the destruction.\textsuperscript{17}

In addition to listing sites on the National Register, an Ohio Historic Inventory program was developed to serve as an “accurate and continuing record of the architectural and historic properties currently existing in the state.” It is used to record
basic information on historic properties in Ohio. The inventory is utilized by the Historic Preservation Office staff, federal, state, and local agencies, and the general public for “land use planning, urban planning, and road improvement decisions.” This inventory does serve as an important database, but does not automatically nominate or indicate acceptance of a property to the National Register. However, the inventory does not provide protection against the demolition of sites. The NHPA directly involves the states in establishing historic property inventories. The steps for completing the Ohio Historic Survey are basic. The survey area must first be identified, a survey plan written, a preliminary inspection of the area conducted, historical research pertaining to the site found, and a field survey conducted. The inventory is used as a permanent record of historic properties within the area that warrant further investigation and archival record if it is decided that the site might not be preserved. It is also used as an evaluation of sites that could be placed on either the National Register of Historic Places or a local historic register.  

Another proposed piece of legislation that favors preservation in Toledo is the Historic Homeownership Assistance Act, which was awaiting action in 1997, in committees of the U.S. House of Representatives as an extra incentive for people to buy and fix up properties in historic districts. It would provide a twenty percent tax cut to homeowners who buy and restore a historic home and then occupy it as their main residence. This would be beneficial for the revitalization of old neighborhoods say officials from the National Trust. Tamar Osterman says, “there are hundreds of historic districts in older towns where homes have suffered from decline and neglect.” This bill would enable both rich and poor families to buy and rehabilitate old homes. However,
rehabilitation projects must fall within national guidelines available through the state preservation office and the renovation must be greater than the value of the land. The homes would have to meet historic guidelines, like being on the National Register or be individually listed or located within historic districts in the national register. The National Park Service has estimated that over eight hundred buildings nationwide meet the criteria. The legislation provides for a certificate to obtain interest rate reductions on home mortgage loans in distressed areas to lower the buyer’s down payment. This legislation is predicted to bring people back to older neighborhoods, as lack of rehabilitation is a major reason that people will not buy older homes. Unfortunately, the Act was not passed, but was reintroduced into Congress in 2001. In 2004, it has been put on the backburner, awaiting a Congressional decision.19

As federal government involvement and law can only go so far, local laws and actions are the ones that make preservation worthwhile and effective. For example, in Waterville, the Village Council upon the recommendation of the municipal planning commission amended the zoning code that established a historic overlay district. Legislation allowed the village to implement sites’ specific public policies. Mayor Dave Myerholtz says that as the village grows and “develops as new people move in, it will try not to lose its historic identity and heritage.” In addition, legislation addressed the “establishment of historic districts in Waterville, acquisitions of resources for historic preservation purposes, preservation of historic and nonhistoric resources within historic districts, and establishment of a historic district commission.” The village council may “regulate the construction, addition, alteration, repair, moving, excavation, and demolition of resources in historic districts.” The ordinance is to safeguard Waterville’s
heritage through preservation of districts that reflect the elements of the village’s history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. It strengthens economy, promotes education, and civic beauty. The residents do not want to see buildings lost, they want to keep the complexion of the village and to keep the destroying developers of waterfront buildings out.\(^{20}\)

In Toledo, a Historic Overlay Districts Ordinance was adopted by City Council in 1980 as “Chapter 1153 of the City’s Zoning and Planning Code. At that time, the Old West End and Vistula neighborhoods were designated Historic Overlay Districts and separate Historic District Commissions established.” A Certificate of Appropriateness is a permit issued by the respective Historic Overlay District Commission for an environmental change. An environmental change is “any exterior alteration, demolition, removal, or new construction requiring a building permit.”\(^{21}\) In downtown Toledo the overlay districts were in place by 1990. The proposal required that demolition would be dependent upon whether rehabilitating a building would grant the owner a reasonable economic return. Unfortunately, demolition goes forth if such an economic return is not shown.\(^{22}\) One example of an area that has been saved by using this ordinance is the 30-48 block of South St. Clair Street. The Downtown Historic Overlay District review for this block allowed for renovation of these Warehouse District structures in March of 2002. The block was threatened with demolition several months before and the Landmarks Committee initiated the review.\(^{23}\)

Another piece of local legislation called property-owner grant programs are beginning to take affect in Toledo as a way to keep neglected homes from reaching the point of disrepair, where demolition seems the only cost efficient solution. This program
was established in 2003 by the housing court to help low income homeowners with maintenance. Mayor Ford believes that rehabilitation can be worthwhile if homes can be caught in time. However, the shrinking city budget is partly responsible for the demolition of many homes, as it seems cheaper than residential renovation.\textsuperscript{24}

The issue of the city’s shrinking budget is a major problem facing preservationists in Lucas County. Preservation organizations such as the Maumee Valley Historical Society and Landmarks Committee are at the mercy of private donations, fundraisers, and federal assistance to fund preservation projects. The federal government has decreased distribution of preservation funds in past years as conservation of the nation’s history has taken a backseat to domestic reforms and homeland security. As a result, funds from state and local governments have diminished. In many cases, local government funds were often reallocated to other projects, as preservation has not been the highest priority. However, this mentality is beginning to change in the twenty first century, especially in Toledo. Former director of the MVHS, Charles Jacobs has stated that, “the state of Ohio eliminated funding for regional preservation representatives, who were effective advocates for local historical preservation projects…as for Lucas County; there are no funds at this time.”\textsuperscript{25} However, local developers in Lucas County were taking funding issues into their own hands to stimulate preservation.

A new form of urban renewal has been used in the twenty first century as developers have united with preservationists to renovate older buildings for reuse, causing the slow revitalization of downtown. Ohioans are the nation’s leading users of federal income tax credit, “designed to stimulate private investment in preservation of historic properties.” These credits have aided the preservation and renovation of “nearly
one thousand buildings in Ohio.” In fiscal year 2003, the U.S. Department of the Interior statistics revealed “sixty two private rehabilitations of nineteen Ohio communities qualified for Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credits, resulting in a $228,206,429 investment in historic properties statewide, the largest number of such projects in any state.”

Urban renewal projects such as SeaGate Center may have demolished several historic buildings, but it also brought to the attention of Toledoans other historic sites that were saved. The opening of the Seagate Center in the early 1980s shifted the center of downtown and stimulated some downtown building renovations. Though to complete the building, several landmarks were razed for the site and for surface parking. In the early 1980s, the Vistula neighborhood was being restored with the assistance of federal renewal funds. Fort Industry Square was restored as well during this period as it was across from the SeaGate project.

In the summer of 1987, interviews were conducted by The Toledo Blade of owners, architects, and real estate developers on downtown renovation. The subject was of “red tape, surprise construction costs and financing difficulties that were frequently blamed for making renovation a frustrating, complicated, and time consuming venture.” Several developers said that appreciation of the significance of a historical building and the role that it has played in Toledo is very important in the reasoning for development. “It should not always be about turning a profit,” said Steve Welly of Gemerchak Realty, who has been managing the renovation of the Gardner building. “It takes a very long time to get a return on that kind of investment.” Renovation is quite costly as unexpected problems arise in construction and in design plans.
If there are so many problems that can come up, why renovate? Most developers say that old buildings have a uniqueness that people recognize and associate with the new business. Others enjoy the thought of being in touch with a city’s heritage and being a part of bringing a building back to life that once made the city an exciting place to visit and live.

Spurred by redevelopment successes near Fifth Third Field, such as the rehabilitation of Fort Dixon Block for restaurants, bars, and offices, developers have been eyeing empty downtown structures for possible development and many are important historical landmarks. In recent years, developers have taken advantage of federal tax credits for preservation to renovate buildings including the Ohio Building, the Bartley Mansion Apartments, and several homes in the Old West End. Bars, restaurants, apartments, and retail businesses are taking over historic sites in recent months. Developers continue to renovate areas in the Warehouse District and in other parts of downtown, seeing the successes of adaptive reuse in other cities, that older rehabilitated structures will bring more people back to the city than surface parking and corporate headquarter offices. Toledo is finally beginning to take its history seriously now that preservation has proved profitable.

Explained below are several extraordinary sites in Lucas County that have experienced forms of successful preservation efforts. These historically and architecturally significant sites, located in Toledo, Maumee, Waterville, Grand Rapids, and Oregon were designated by the federal government, local government, influential residents, or preservationists for survival. The reasons that these structures were chosen to be preserved are the key to understanding how people perceive these sites and what
criteria they deem worthy of reverence. The sites listed below were preserved due to their noted architectural styles.

The Oliver House was built in 1859 by famed architect Isaiah Rogers, who gained national attention for his “ingenious, bold hotel designs in hostleries such as the Astor House in New York. He was coined the “father of the modern hotel” and the Oliver House is the only surviving hotel in the nation that he built. It is also Toledo’s oldest structure. It was named for William Oliver, one of Toledo’s earliest land investors, who originally owned the site. The Oliver House was situated in the Middlegrounds overlooking the old Union Depot Station and the Maumee River, both of which brought rail and boat traffic to the hotel.\textsuperscript{30} As a result of the popularity of the Boody House, the Oliver House was converted into a rooming house in 1900. In the 1920s, the building was used as a warehouse. Traces of the original structure can be seen in 2004, as evidenced by the lobby, gentlemen’s parlor on the lower level, suites in the south wing, Greek Revival styling, windows, cornices, and rounded entry bay. The Oliver House is the only Toledo structure listed in the Smithsonian Institution’s “Guide to Historic America” series, published in 1989. In the 1990s, the Appold family purchased and renovated it as apartments, restaurants, and a Brewery Complex called the Maumee Brewing Company. It was added to the National Register in 1971.\textsuperscript{31}
The Christian Gerber House in the Old West End is Toledo’s most lavish example of French Second Empire style, forming the main entrance of the Ursaline Convent. Gerber, a Toledo merchant, built the structure on Collingwood in 1872. Architect Joseph Morehouse was asked to copy one of the houses on Cleveland’s Euclid Avenue. The massive forms, projecting, bays, and molded window lintels are characteristic “of high Victorian taste.”

The Bartley House, a mansion built in 1905 for Rudolph Bartley, a German immigrant and successful wholesale grocer, is based on the sixteenth century French Renaissance chateau. It is Toledo’s only intact example of the Chateauesque style. It was used as a funeral home for many years and then as offices until 1977. One of the stone parapets collapsed and the home sat vacant and prone to vandals. After many
threats of demolition, the home was renovated as part of the Museum Place redevelopment housing project in the 1990s. Run by the Wallick Company, Museum Place was a neighborhood of rehabilitated historic houses and apartments in the OWE, in the vicinity of the Toledo Museum of Art.  

(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The Berdan Building was constructed in 1901 for John Berdan, the first mayor of Toledo. The building was used especially for the grocery warehousing of Empire Tea. Built by George Mills, it is noted for its overall simplicity, terra-cotta ornament, and flaring roofline. It was added to the National Register in 1975.

The Berdan Building c.1910                       The site was vacant in 2004.  
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The Ohio Building at 420 Madison was designed by Charles Nordhoff in 1906 to represent a “return to neoclassic conservatism.” The details on this building are among the finest in twentieth century office buildings in the state. The terra-cotta ornament
features a repeating frieze above the second floor depicting the founding of Ohio. It was originally built for the Ohio Savings Bank and Trust Company, but was later known as the Edison Building when Toledo Edison occupied the site from 1935 to 1971. The nation’s first continuously broadcast radio program was beamed between the Nicholas and Ohio buildings in 1907. The Ohio Building had been mothballed for several years after 1971. It was bought in 1979 by New York developers Harlan, Betke, and Meyers, Inc., and renovated for 6.7 million dollars. The owners of the building ran into financial trouble in the 1980s and the site was sold at police auction in 1990. The “new” Ohio Building was renovated in 1993 including redecorated lobby, security features, and an adjacent city owned parking garage. The solid brass elevator doors were preserved as they were in 1906. Developers had claimed that this building “reflects the unusual style of engineering unlike any other downtown skyscraper resulting in a superior structure.” The building was acquired in a cooperative venture between Midland Title Security, Inc., Vistula Development Inc., and the City of Toledo. Midland Title moved its offices into the building and Libbey Inc., planned to establish their headquarters there.

The Trinity Church looks today essentially as it did in 1866. It is significant as a distinctive piece of mid century Gothic architecture and also has “a history and tradition
which parallels closely that of the city itself.” It was designed by C.C. Miller, one of Toledo’s first important architects and this building is rumored to be his only surviving works locally. A smaller limestone addition was built in 1953 connecting the buildings. In 1948, the mortar in the tower of the Trinity Episcopal Church was replaced. The contractors offered to make the church look like new, but the parishioners rejected this as they liked the familiar antiquated look.\textsuperscript{37} The gothic interior has been restored and the adjacent parish house built in 1875 was renovated and joined at the second story level to Trinity Plaza, which connects to COSI and the Webstrand Building. Major sanctuary renovations were completed in 2003. It was listed on the National Register in 1983.\textsuperscript{38}

![Trinity Episcopal Church c. 1870](image1.jpg) ![Trinity Episcopal Church in 2004.](image2.jpg)

Trinity Episcopal Church c. 1870
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The Ashland Avenue Baptist Church was erected in between 1892 and 1895 by David L. Stine. The design was considered Romanesque Revival in style with arched stone entrances and massive tower. The church still houses the congregation with only minor renovations. It was listed on the National Register in 1980.\textsuperscript{39}
The Reynolds-Secor House is the most complete example of the shingle style and Queen Anne architecture. Its highly irregular outline, intersecting gables, and pyramidal roof forms make it a significant piece of Victorian architecture. It was built by Edward O. Fallis in 1887 for Fred Reynolds, a flour and grain merchant. In 1914, the house was bought by J.K. Secor. This house had close connections with two of Toledo’s leading business families. The Reynolds-Secor House took new ownership and was renamed the Mansion View Inn. In the late 1980s, the inn was converted into a bed and breakfast under the owners, Gagen, Jasina, and Oller. Restoration efforts were costly as apartments were turned into elegant rooms keeping in style with the house. The Mansion View holds an award for its historical value and quality of preservation by the Landmarks Committee. In the 1990s, the home was owned and operated by volunteer members of the OWEA. In 2004, it was operated as a special events and conference center.
The Reynolds-Secor House c. 1887 (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The Reynolds-Secor House in 2004, under the name Mansion View.

The Pythian Castle was built in 1890 for the Knights of Pythias by architect Henry Hobson. It was built in the Romanesque Revival style characterized by the rough hewn stone and general massiveness. It resembles a fortified castle with a Gothic tower and irregular rough line. The Knights held meetings there until 1951. The bottom floor was occupied by Green’s music store from 1890 to 1960.42 It had lost most of its tenants by the 1970s and apparently became a gathering place for young people to experience art and music. Only a few years later, the structure was abandoned and fell into disrepair. Thieves have stripped much of the interior of the Pythian Castle and weather has eroded much of the structure. In 1997, the site was purchased by Brian Uram, a residential developer who began restoration. The castle was in such deterioration that it had landed on former Mayor Carty Finkbeiner’s list of the “Twelve most offensive commercial and industrial properties.” Brian Uram has kept the site from demolition through his personal funding in rehabilitation and with the help of the Historic Overlay District Commission. Uram has kept many of the original pieces to be incorporated into a new design on the interior. Auditoriums, stages, ballroom dance floors, and sweeping staircases were repaired at Uram’s expense. Uram claims, “if someone had just taken care of the little things years ago, none of these damages would have happened.” Advocates for the
building say that one of the architectural features that make the Pythian Castle worth saving is the “high arched entrance to the grand ballroom on the fourth floor.” Inherent love for the building is evident among developers and the public. Executive director of Neighborhoods in Partnership, Kathleen Kovacs has said that the Pythian Castle was “one of those buildings that I’d chain myself to if there was ever any threat to tear it down.” The site remains vacant until downtown developing picks up for the building to become useful once more. Parking seems to be the main problem around the site that deters other developers from building around it. However, in 2004, it is being protected from demolition by the Historic Overlay District Commission until it can be adapted for use. It was listed on the National Register in 1972.

The Lucas County Jail and Sheriff’s Residence was built in a more domesticated version of the early Renaissance style, with “a lightly proportioned portico and third floor arcaded gallery.” It has been pointed out that the facility is inadequate by today’s institutional standards. Other than the courthouse, the Sheriff’s Residence is the only remaining David Stine county building. The structure was built in 1897 as a refined
example of the Second Renaissance Style. The county jail originally adjoined the rear of
the residence, but it was demolished in 1978 when the new jail, visible behind the
building was completed. The residence was renovated as a cooperative venture of Lucas
County and the Landmark’s Committee. The sheriff’s residence has been reused several
times, serving as the County Commissioners offices from 1979 to 1982 and the Sixth
District Court of Appeals from 1983 to 2003.45

The Lucas County Jail and Sheriff’s Residence c. 1920  The Sheriff’s Residence in 2004.
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The Lucas County Courthouse was placed on the National Register of Historic
Places in 1973. It is an excellent example of nineteenth century architecture. This
present courthouse was the fourth built in Lucas County, the third having previously been
built on the southeast corner of the present site in 1853. In the 1890s, the demands of a
growing population required a larger facility, so the old courthouse was razed in 1897
after the present one was built. Noted Toledo architect David Stine designed the
courthouse in the Italian Renaissance style on the old site of the Miami-Erie Canal.46 The
courthouse was designed in the Beaux Arts style, replacing the Greek Revival style of the
earlier courthouse. The entire exterior of the building was restored in the 1980s. In
2003, the city of Toledo wanted to clean up and renovate the Courthouse, but the
renovation plan nearing forty million was too steep. It was decided that offices would be
rearranged to make more space inside the building for less money. Eventually the site will be renovated to preserve the structure’s historic integrity.\textsuperscript{47}

Father Hanin built St. Patrick’s Church on Avondale Avenue in 1901. It was Toledo’s last great Gothic style church built in the nineteenth century. It served the large Irish Catholic population in Toledo. The area around the church was considered slum like as original parishioners moved to other parts of the city. The slums were cleared during the Depression, but the large structure remains with a small parish, still evoking strong Irish pride within the city.\textsuperscript{48} The exterior of St. Patrick’s Catholic Church was power washed in 1988, the first cleaning it had experienced since its erection. The four year face lift of the church was funded by the Ohio Building Restoration Inc., which raised funds locally each year with the help of parishioners.\textsuperscript{49} The church had undergone repairs in 1993 when lightning had struck the building for the third time in its history. The tower was also hit in 1954 and 1980. The latter lightening strike caused the steeple to burn down and it was never replaced, due to lack of funds and fear of being struck once more. This last lightening strike dislodged several stones that crashed through the roof and damaged areas of the interior.\textsuperscript{50}
Salem Lutheran Church was built in 1871, essentially keeping the original exterior throughout the years. It was constructed in the Gothic Revival style and served the Germans of Vistula. During the twenty five years between 1942 and 1967, many physical improvements and changes were made in the church building. New organs were installed in 1900 and 1967. The change in color of the brick in the tower suggests an interruption in construction. It still serves its congregation in 2004.\textsuperscript{51}

Burt’s Theater was built in 1898 by architect George Mills, designed after the fifteenth century Ventian Gothic palace, the Ca D’Oro (House of Gold). The site was popular for live theater and music, but closed in 1917 as motion pictures were introduced
to Toledo. Later known as the Country Palace, the building gained notoriety as the setting of the famous country song, “Lucille.” In 2004, the building houses Caesars Showbar.\textsuperscript{52}

Fort Industry Square, a block bounded by Jefferson, Summit, Monroe, and Water Streets has a good collection of Victorian facades. This block of early commercial brick buildings was built between 1862 and 1897. Toledo’s first harbor and shipbuilding began in 1820 at the foot of the site and the Erie Canal brought much shipping and commerce. The block contained numerous kinds of businesses throughout the years including hardware, liquor, leather, and transportation dealers.\textsuperscript{53} All of the ground level storefronts have been modernized and the buildings provide a variety of Victorian design. Fort Industry block was designated for clearance and redevelopment as a parking lot by the Toledo Urban Redevelopment Association. However, as local developers were urged to move in by preservationists, these plans were amended. The block was restored in the 1970s, as one of Toledo’s first major renovation projects, removing most of the twentieth century alterations. The buildings were leased commercially to be used as restaurants, entertainment, and retail shops. The stone front on the building near the Monroe Street corner was re-erected here after its removal from the historic Brand building on St. Clair,
which was demolished to make way for the SeaGate Center. The block is now being renovated once more as a result to the finished construction of the Fifth-Third Field Stadium. In 2004, it housed Murphy’s, a popular eatery; a radio station; and real estate firms inside the structures. The top floors are used as offices and studios.  

Fort Industry Block c.1890
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The Dixon Block, located in the St. Clair District, was built for the “fancy ladies” in 1885 and has intricate designs on both the exterior and interior. St. Clair Street was the hot spot during the prohibition era due to numerous secret saloons and prostitution. Charles Dixon opened his saloon and hotel in 1885 and operated it until prohibition forced him to close. It is one of the best examples of early commercial structures in downtown Toledo. It has been renovated for offices, restaurants, and bars.  

Dixon Block c. 1900
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The renovated Dixon Block in 2004.
The Weber Block was the home of G.C. Murphy Co. until 1952. It also housed several saloons, drug, shoe, and clothing stores. At one time the building was a hotel for railroad men. The first owner was a Toledo clothing merchant named Gustave Weber, dating the structure to 1888. The upper floors were used throughout the early years as a “recreational, educational, cultural, fraternal, union, and entertainment center” for many East Side residents. It served as a dance hall, theater, labor temple, Business College, hotel, and offices. It was rumored that Jess Willard used the facilities to train for his championship fight in Bayview Park in July of 1918. The second and third floors have been unoccupied since 1936 and blocked off from public use. During the 1920s, it was known as the Columbia Hotel. Despite four decades of disuse, the upper part of the Weber Block is solid and woodwork is in good condition. In 1976, it was listed as a historical landmark by being placed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is one of the “only remaining commercial structures of the once vital downtown area of East Toledo. It also represents an excellent example of the 1880s’ exuberant Victorian-Italian commercial architecture.”

The Weber Block c. 1900
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).


The Pioneer Inn located in Grand Rapids, was built in 1832. It was originally known as Howard’s Pioneer Inn and stood of the foot of the bridge in Grand Rapids. The
nineteenth century inn is a good example of the Greek Revival style. On the inside, the fireplace is still useable and the solid walnut staircase is still maintained. However, several dormers were added when the house was turned into a residence. It was moved to its 2004 location a few miles Northeast of Grand Rapids in 1902, virtually intact. It was used as a residence in 2004 according the nameplate on the iron fence.\textsuperscript{57}

\begin{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{pioneer_inn_1910.png}
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{pioneer_inn_2004.png}
\caption{The Pioneer Inn c. 1910. The former Pioneer Inn in 2004. (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).}
\end{figure}

The B.F. Kerr House in Grand Rapids was built in 1885 by Kerr, a leading merchant. The home was designed by E.O. Fallis as one of the finest styles of Queen Anne in Ohio. This is noted in the irregularity of the design and the multiple gables. Renovations in the 1970s turned the home into a health retreat and spa, a most unique adaptive reuse.\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{b_f_kerr_house_1950.png}
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{b_f_kerr_house_2004.png}
\caption{The B.F. Kerr House c. 1950. The B.F. Kerr House in 2004. (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).}
\end{figure}
Grand Rapids’ Town Hall was built in 1898 by Charles Patton in the late Romanesque Revival style, as evidenced by its arches. In addition to being a meeting place and public building, the second floor of the hall was an opera hall. The Town Hall was used for graduations, vaudeville shows and the Farmer’s Institute. The entire project has been a community wide effort that included many volunteers. Restoration efforts began in the 1970s with donated funds from the Grand Rapids Historical Society. The site is very dear to the hearts of those in the community. Grand Rapids Township renewed a levy in 2002 that helped pay for the ongoing restoration work at the local Town Hall. It pays for the historically accurate, energy efficient windows, shingles, and ceiling repairs. The Hall was placed on the National Register in 1975.

The Gillet-Shoemaker-Welsh House in Waterville was erected in 1883 by Orrin Gillet, owner of the village’s General Store. This site is a good example of a middle Victorian farmhouse, portraying a large mansard roof and detailed roof brackets. It was suspected by Theodore Ligibel that the porch was a later addition as the original’s brackets matched the roofs.
The Isham Farm was constructed in 1853 on the outskirts of Waterville. It is one of the finest Greek Revival farmhouses in the Maumee Valley. The owner, John Isham was the superintendent of the Northern Division of the Miami-Erie Canal. The exterior façade is mostly unchanged and the home is still the family’s residence in 2004.62

The Wabash Hotel in Waterville was built in 1835 across from the Columbian House by Lyman Dudley. In 1854 when the hotel did poorly against fierce competition, the new owner, Lorenzo Morehouse moved it to its present site at South Second Street. It is a good example of the Federal and Greek Revival styles as seen under the remnants of the eaves. The structure was used as a residence and later abandoned.63 It has been restored as a residence in the 1980s.
The Liberty Haskins House in Waterville was erected in 1878 by Haskins, a successful businessman. The home is designed in the distinctive Italiante style as can be seen by the heavy ornamentation over the windows and doors. The mansard roof has been redone and rebracketed, the porches slightly altered, and the interior completely renovated.  

The Old Plantation Inn (as named on the National Register designation), known in 2004 as Linck’s Inn was built by Levi Beebe in 1836. It was built in the Greek Revival style, popular during that period. First used as a commercial building, repairs were made in the 1840s after a tornado struck and the structure was converted into a hotel. It was the leading hotel in Waterville until the Miami and Erie Canal opened and businesses moved toward the canal. The hotel was purchased by Joseph Langley in the 1920s and
redecorated; yet preserving much of the original materials. The hotel was no longer used as it could not compete commercially, but it was still used as a restaurant. Donald Bruckhout bought the site in 1951 and capitalized on the historical potential of the building. He refurnished the building to reflect the days before the Civil War. In 1974, the site was listed on the National Register and renovations continued until the 1980s. A cocktail lounge was added and replaced the third floor after fire damage in 1975. The site was used as a restaurant until 2003 when the site became vacant.65

A sketch of the Old Plantation Inn c. 1860
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

Linck’s Inn in 2004.

The next structures were preserved to recognize important people in the area’s history. Either as a city founder or prominent individual that contributed much to society, these people had a great deal of influence on the community who preserved their homes as a tribute.

The Valentine Building and Theater was built between 1892 and 1895 by wealthy businessman George Ketcham. He named the building after his father Valentine Ketcham, one of Toledo’s first pioneers and the city’s first millionaire. Designed by
architect, E.O. Fallis, the building was quite innovative and featured one of the earliest uses of a cantilevered balcony in the nation. Over the years, the Valentine has served as City Hall and as the Willard Hotel. Samuel “Golden Rule” Jones and Brand Whitlock, former nationally known Toledo mayors had their offices in the Valentine building. The Valentine Theater inside the building is the oldest extant theater in Toledo.\footnote{66}

The Arts Commission of Greater Toledo felt that the Valentine Theater represented a wealth of cultural opportunity for the community of Toledo showing that it was a prime location for restoration efforts. The preservation of the building aroused interest in the community and showed Toledo “why you don’t discard your architecture when there is no immediate use for it,” as explained by Paul Sullivan, past chairman of the Landmarks Historic Preservation Council. Efforts to save the Valentine began in the 1980s when a group called the Friends of the Valentine formed to save the site from demolition.\footnote{67}

The Theater, though it faced destruction for several decades, had several backers such as the Toledo Cultural Arts Center, MVHS, and the Friends of the Valentine to provide funds to keep the hope of revitalization alive. Even several corporations, foundations, and politicians donated to the cause. This allowed the building to be mothballed though it stood in the way of other development. In 1983, co-publisher of the Blade, Paul Block Jr. wanted to tear down the Valentine so that Toledo may be revitalized. Toledo had many new buildings along the riverfront, and the new government center virtually emptied the Renaissance Building that surrounded the Valentine. The Valentine almost joined the fate of several other buildings in a hurried attempt to bring Toledo back to prosperity. It was the only historic theater left standing.
Paul Block’s son John saw the beauty of the Valentine and wrote an editorial that relived the opening of the Valentine. This editorial touched many people’s hearts, ultimately saving the building. City Council was persuaded to stop demolition and repairs were made to the theater and it was set aside until conditions were right for renovation.\(^{68}\)

The Renaissance Building was renovated for 3.9 billion dollars, converting the former hotel into an apartment building for low and moderate income residents. Council approval for this project came after eight years after a grassroots effort saved the site from demolition. The second phase of the project was estimated at twelve million dollars to restore the Valentine to a performing arts center and theater. Reynold Boezi, executive director of the Toledo Arts Center said, “I think we’ve saved an important building for the city. City Council members reflected they were doing it not only for senior citizen housing, but also to preserve the theater.”\(^{69}\) Renovation of the theater as a cultural arts center was completed in 1999 with the backing of the city and significant funding from the state. The historic entrance and lobby were recreated in its Victorian style with restored main staircase, ceiling and balcony. All alterations made through the years were changed back to the original Fallis design.\(^{70}\) The site was listed on the National Register in 1987.

The Valentine Theater c.1900  
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).  
The Libbey House, built by David L. Stine in 1895 incorporates the Colonial Revival and Shingle styles. It was inhabited by Edward Drummond Libbey, founder of the Toledo glass making industry. The “bowed extension on the south side and the great attic gables reflect some of the irregularity and beauty of the previous decade.” The house was used until the late 1970s by the Toledo Society for Crippled Children. It was a residence in 2004.71

The Raymond-Ketcham house in the Vistula District was built by William Raymond in 1851 and later sold to prominent Toledoan Valentine Ketcham in 1854. A series of alterations were made to the home under Ketcham to enlarge the structure. Architect E.O. Fallis redesigned the home in the Queen Anne style.72 In the 1990s, owner, Susan Burkett, president of the Historic Vistula Foundation restored the Ketcham home on Chestnut Street, winning a preservation award from the Maumee Valley Landmarks Committee.73
The Pray-Stark-Weather House is a beautiful example of the New England architecture brought to Waterville by its earliest pioneers. The fanned entrance way is the only one of its kind in Waterville. The house was built in 1837 by one of Waterville’s earliest citizens, Oliver Pray and used as a hotel. Though Oliver Pray built the house, there is no evidence that he actually lived in it. Tax records show that John Pray sold the home to Abigail Cole, the niece of Oliver Pray. In 1854 the home was purchased by R. Starkweather. In 2004, it remains a residential structure.

The Columbian house in Waterville, Ohio has been noted as one of the most architecturally and historically significant structures in the Maumee Valley. John Pray, the founder of Waterville, constructed the building in stages between the years 1828 to 1837. It is a three story Georgian designed inn located within the original plat of
Waterville. “Due to a fortunate lack of alterations, the structure retains its character intact and represents a particularly fine interpretation of Georgian style in provincial America.” This designation of significance placed the site on the National Register in 1969 and a plaque was awarded in 1973 by the Landmarks Committee of the MVHS in honor of preservation efforts to save the structure.  

The Columbian House has been a source of “community pride”, raising the historical consciousness of Waterville residents. The exterior retains the original wood siding. The first floor contained a general store. The inn declined as new inns and taverns came with the advent of the canals, making competition too fierce. In later years it held a doctor’s office, dressmaker shop, millenary, elementary school, antique store.

By 1920 the inn was left vacant and was deteriorating. Demolition was considered when a petroleum company wanted to place a service station on the site. Charles Capron bought the building in 1927 and made it an antique store. He renovated the building, repairing the roof, replacing windows, and repainting. In the 1930s, HABS provided important preservation efforts to the site by employing architects to measure the site and prepare architectural drawings for public and federal government records. The Columbian House was the only site in the lower Maumee Valley to be measured and drawn through this program.

The Arnold’s bought the house in 1943, turning it into a restaurant. The first two floors had been restored by 1945. The Arnold’s were not able to maintain the property efficiently and considered selling the site, so the Waterville Historical Society established a committee for the “preservation of the Columbian House” in 1991. They knew that this site was a viable landmark and they could not let it ruin. They aided the Arnold’s in the
preservation of the house. The only major change within the original structure was the conversion of the old kitchen into an open porch and making the dining room into a kitchen. In the 1980s, the porch was enclosed to resemble the original structure. The owners in 2004, Peggy and Tom Parker run the restaurant and are continuing restoration work on the house.

The Columbian House c. 1900
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The Columbian House in 2004.

The founder of Waterville, John Pray, built his home in 1854. It was the final residence of the early pioneer. The Greek Revival style of the home is very similar to the early commercial buildings in the village. The structure was used as a residence in 2004.

The John Pray House c. 1950
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The John Pray House in 2004.

The Thomas Merrell House in Maumee was erected in 1870 as an early inn. The owner was a member of city council, and Lucas County Commissioner. The design
shows the High Victorian Italiante style with heavy ornamentation, and large wraparound porch that was a later addition.\textsuperscript{80}

The Morrison Waite House in Maumee was built in 1845 for Morrison R. Waite. Waite was the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1874, served on the Ohio Legislature and was one of the early mayors of Maumee. The House was designed in the Greek Revival Style and serves as a residence in 2004.\textsuperscript{81}

The Forsythe-Puhl House in Maumee was constructed in the mid 1820s and has been one of the most prominent landmarks in “Northwest Ohio’s earliest permanent settlement.” The house was built by Robert Forsythe, Indian agent, first mayor, and merchant in Maumee. The house is also a good example of Midwest frontier, vernacular architecture, influenced in the Federal and Greek styles. Doric columns replaced wooden
ones and a concrete porch floor replaced an earlier wooden one. There was a removal of the first floor east wing. The Forsythe family owned the home until 1864 at the death of Robert Forsythe. The house was vacant for several years and was later purchased by the Puhl family in 1871. The home had previously held a mercantile business, but Peter Puhl converted an east front room into a photography studio. The family lived in the home until the 1970s and left vacant for a few years after. The Maumee Board of Education purchased the site in 1977 and made it a rental property. They sold the house in public auction in 1988 to the current owners in 2004, Mr. and Mrs. Mayo Roe. They have made efforts to restore the home. The house begins the row of residential housing, thus holding the residential neighborhood in place. It was added to the National Register in 1989. It was used as a residence in 2004.

The Forsythe-Puhl House c. 1930  The Forsythe-Puhl House in 2004.
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The House of Four Pillars is both architecturally and historically one of the most significant homes in Maumee. It is the only existing Greek Revival Temple style home left in Maumee. The home, constructed in 1835 has been rumored to be a “station” on the Underground Railroad. Runaway slaves were said to have hidden in the basement and fled to freedom in the back yard towards the Maumee River. The home also claims historical significance as the residence of Arthur Henry, Toledo newspaperman in the
early twentieth century. His friend, author Theodore Driesier wrote his novel “Sister Carrie” while staying at the home. It was also home to General James Steedman, hero at the battle of Chickamauga. James Knagg, an important individual in the Maumee area, purchased the home in 1849. After Arthur Henry, the house was vacant for nine years and was bought by William Hankins in 1941. His son was the owner in 2004. The only major alteration was the addition of a screened porch in the rear in 1941, which was later converted in the 1960s into a glass observation room.83

The Wolcott House was erected in 1827 in Maumee. The builder of the home, James Wolcott and his descendents represented the diverse heritage of the Maumee Valley. Wolcott established a profitable merchant and shipping business. He then was a leading merchant and later became probate judge in Maumee. He was an early mayor of Maumee, president of the City Council, and founding member of the Lucas County Whig Party. His wife, Mary Wells, was the granddaughter of the Miami Chief, Little Turtle. The Wolcott House is one of the best examples of Federal architecture in Northwest Ohio. In 1964, the Wolcott House was restored by the MVHS, converting the site into a house museum and headquarters for the organization. Wallpaper, flooring, and electric wiring were replaced and the basement was renovated. Money was raised for these
ventures through yard sales, donations, and auctions. It is the only “authentically furnished home of this early period in the Northwest Ohio. It is constantly being restored. The Wolcott House Museum complex grew during the 1970s and added a log cabin in 1961, a depot and 1840s house in 1971, the Flannigan home in 1977, and a privy in 1981. These additions have somewhat altered the site’s historical integrity by adding structures that were not original to the area. This affected the impact of the structure’s historical character, as it would be more difficult to place it on the National Register. However, the addition of these structures have aided in the positive attitude and attendance of tourists as they can explore historic buildings that were contemporary to the era of the Wolcott House.

The Wolcott House c. 1950
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).


These last few sites were preserved, as they were the best, first, and earliest examples of their kind. The citizens of Lucas County realized their uniqueness to the community and urged preservationists to save them to exhibit the most important parts of the area’s past.

The Brandville School and portable building at 1133 Grasser Street in Oregon “represents the evolution of pre-consolidation public education facilities in a township which was then growing from a rural to suburban community.” The school is the only
two story, two teacher masonry school building ever constructed in Oregon. It is also the oldest nonresidential structure remaining in Oregon that has not been dramatically altered. The school was built in 1882 and the portable in 1918. In the 1980s, the original plaster walls were restored and blackboards removed in 1926 were reinstalled. The building originally had two separate entrances, one for boys and one for girls, each of which led to a separate stairway to the second floor. In 1899, the entrances were taken out and replaced with windows. A single front entrance was added, replacing the side entrances. The portable school behind the property is in excellent condition with walls and ceiling refinished in the 1990s. The school was closed in 1926 when eleven small school districts in Oregon were consolidated. The building was vacant until 1977 when it was purchased by the Oregon-Jerusalem Historical Society and restored as a school museum and meeting facility for the society. In 1994 it was listed on the National Register.\textsuperscript{86}

![Brandville School c. 1888](image1)  ![Brandville School in 2004.](image2)

(Courtesy of the Center for Archival Collections at Bowling Green State University’s Jerome Library).

The First Church of Christ Scientist, now the United Missionary Baptist Church, is located on 2705 Monroe Street. The current congregation renovated the building in 1986. It was the first Christian Science church in Toledo and the third in the country.\textsuperscript{87}
St. Mary’s Church at 219 Page Street is Toledo’s second oldest parish. It was built in 1902 by Bacon and Huber. In 1989, there was $65,000 worth of interior renovations that included removed pews and the installation of congregational chairs. It is owned by the Catholic Diocese of Toledo.  

St. Francis de Sales Catholic Church on 501 Cherry Street is the oldest Catholic Church in Toledo and was the first permanent edifice of the first Catholic parish in the city. It was erected from 1862 to 1869 and served early German, French, and Irish worshipers. When the Toledo diocese was created in 1910, St. Francis served as the cathedral until a new one was built on Collingwood Boulevard in 1931. When fire gutted the interior of the church in 1931, the hand carved alter fell through the floor and
the organ was ruined by water. After the fire, the apse was rebuilt and wooden paneling was applied to the walls. It still serves as a small Catholic parish.

German immigrant Francis J. Grasser joined up with Henry Brand in 1860 to form the Grasser and Brand Union Brewery. In 1866 they occupied the brewery building until 1905 when a merger of several breweries into the Toledo-Huebner Breweries absorbed the Grasser and Brand Company. In 2004 the site serves as storage for a rubber company.

The Secor Hotel was built in 1908 as a ten story brick building, with an interior structural frame of reinforced concrete. The two large windows to the left of the entry have been altered. George S. Mills designed the structure and claimed to be one of the finest hotels in Toledo and was seen as an example of the city’s progress. The Secor
originally had a high ceiling lobby, four hundred rooms with three hundred baths, large meeting rooms, dining rooms, billiard hall and waiting rooms. Despite the interior changes in the building, the exterior remains nearly unchanged. The simplicity of the design and the character of the local architect make it one of Toledo’s outstanding examples of twentieth century architecture. In July of 1934, the hotel was closed for renovation and remodeling by Cleveland architects Walker and Weeks. The interior of the Secor Hotel was remodeled in 1947, and in 1970-1. The lobby was redone in the classical style, the skylight from the original lobby was removed, and the ceiling was lowered. Ohio Bell filled the bottom floor for several years in the 1970s and renovated the building. In 1992, the owner of the former Secor Hotel wanted to give the building to the city of Toledo to house the Department of Public Utilities and other offices. However, the city found alternative uses for their offices that could accommodate more space. The owner in 2004, Jim Zaleski, used the building for office space and for the headquarters of the Toledo School of Art. The building is also is on the National Register.92

The Nicholas building was constructed in 1906 at 606 Madison Avenue. It was long occupied by Toledo’s First National Bank, but the site now is the headquarters for
the Toledo offices of Cincinnati based Fifth Third bank. The Nicholas was the tallest, largest office building in Ohio at the time of its completion. It was built by the Spitzer family and designed by Thomas Huber. The lower floors were modernized in 1954, destroying the original arched entrance that harmonized with the entrances of the neighboring buildings. In 2004, the neighboring structures still had their original arched entranceways. 93

The Nicholas Building c. 1915
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The Nicholas Building in 2004.

The Gardner building, designed by Charles Gardner in 1893 was built on the site of his family’s former homestead. It was constructed of reinforced concrete and was one of the first structures in the nation to employ this experimental technique that made buildings stronger and more fire resistant. It is designated as a civil engineering landmark. In 1901, the building was the first site of the Toledo Museum of Art. 94 The Gardner building was threatened with demolition in 1985 and the announcement rallied support from such people as Mike Young, of the MVHS Landmarks Committee and preservationist Ted Ligibel. Their involvement, along with a moratorium on downtown demolitions and a “subsequent demolition review law,” were among the key factors that saved the Gardner. 95
The Gardner Building c. 1895
(Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).

The Spitzer Building was constructed and designed by Thomas Huber in the Chicago Commercial Style. Erected in 1896, the building featured a sky-lit arcade on the first floor, a Romanesque arcade on the ninth floor, and developed technology in steel frame construction and the use of vertical ranks in the bay windows. This was one of the earliest steel frame designs in Toledo. An addition in the rear was made in 1904 that once connected the Lasalle and Koch Department Store. It was listed on the National Register in 1983.  

St. Hedwig was erected in 1892 as the first Polish parish in Toledo. This church was a sign to the city that the Polish immigrant population was going to stay in the area. St. Hedwig still serves its large congregation, holding a monthly mass in Polish.
The Issac Hull Store was built in 1835. It is significant as one of the first commercial buildings in Maumee, one of the first brick buildings in Lucas County, and home of one of Maumee’s most prominent early citizens. Issac Hull came to Maumee in the 1830s and was a builder, politician, and merchant. He was responsible for building the first “courthouse, jail, and bridge in Maumee.” The store became a major trading and meeting place for “city fathers, masons, river travelers, and area citizens.” Peter Puhl bought the store in 1882 and used it as rug weaving factory. The structure has been a residence since the early 1900s.98
The congregation of the First Presbyterian Church in Maumee was organized in 1820 by eleven charter members. The structure was completed in 1837 on land reserved for religious purposes in the first Maumee plat. The First Presbyterian Church of Maumee was the first church to organize in the lower Maumee Valley. The church was built on the corner of East Broadway and Gibb on historic ground. The site holds historical significance as Indians held the ground until their defeat at the Battle of Fallen Timbers and British batteries stood there during the War of 1812. The original building was a result of an economic boom due to the construction of the Wabash and Erie Canal. The members of the congregation were prominent members of Maumee, which included Horatio Conant and Amos Spafford. In 1922, the congregation had grown and wanted to expand the building, which reflected the population and economic escalation of the church and the city. They accepted plans from architect David Stine for remodeling the original structure as well as an addition in the rear for a meeting room. Siding, an organ, new light fixtures, new pews, an extension to the sanctuary, and heating were installed. It was remodeled again in the 1950s and more extensively in the 1960s. The congregation had grown and the small original structure no longer met their needs, showing the necessity of a larger building. In 1967, construction began to expand the church. The original church now serves as the congregation chapel.99
The Ludwig Mill was built in 1843 by Peter Manor. In 1865, Issac Ludwig bought the Manor mill site and worked to complete its construction, “taking advantage of the area’s growth in agricultural production.” Ludwig was a man of many trades in Providence, working as a farmer and carpenter. Ludwig owned and managed the mill until 1886 when he sold it to Augustine Pilliod Jr. After fire burned the mills third floor in 1940, the owner, Cleo Heising rebuilt the mill with only two floors and later added “a new water turbine, office, supply room, warehouse, and feed mixers.”

In 1971, Heising sold the mill to Cleo Ludwig, who donated it to the Toledo Metropark District. The site was renamed “Ludwig Mill” in honor of Cleo’s great-grandfather, Issac Ludwig. The Metroparks opened the mill to the public in 1975, retaining most of the mills 1940s equipment. Renovation of the mill began in 1974 and continues to the present day. The mill equipment interprets a “timeline of technological change” with machinery from different eras. The Ohio Historical Society and The U.S. Department of the Interior provided grants to renovate the mill to put it back in working order. The mill was placed on the National Register in 1974 due to its significant association with the Miami and Erie Canal. The Metroparks restored one and half miles of the canal in 1986. It brought a working lock and horse drawn canal boat rides as
an additional attraction to the mill. In 2004, the Ludwig Mill serves as a working museum, “dedicated to interpreting the role of the miller and his trade in the growth of American settlement.” Visitors can observe flour being milled as it was done in the nineteenth century as water from the “the only section of the Miami and Erie Canal still in use in Northwest Ohio” flows to power the mills machinery.\footnote{102}
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\caption{The Ludwig Mill in c. 1890 when it was known as the Pilliod Mill (Courtesy of the Local History and Genealogy Department of the Toledo-Lucas County Public Library).}
\end{minipage}
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\caption{The Ludwig Mill in 2004.}
\end{minipage}
\end{figure}

The way that the community perceives these sites and general preservation efforts has changed over time, often determining the fate of historic buildings. In the city of Maumee, preservation efforts have most often been effective as the residents give preservation laws and initiatives strong backing. Preservation organizations have applauded Maumee for its financial support of historic preservation. Charles Jacobs once again admits, “in a period of financial austerity, the city of Maumee has responded positively to society’s needs and have provided crucial support for building maintenance, and have allocated funds for operating expenses.”\footnote{103} Residents of Waterville and Grand Rapids also exhibit strong support for preserving their community’s heritage as many have volunteered to work with the town historical societies and have supported Historic Overlay District ordinances in their cities to rehabilitate and preserve significant sites. As a result of their positive attitudes toward the support of local preservation legislation and
their willingness to educate others on the importance of saving sites for future revitalization through home tours and historical society programs, many sites in these areas of Lucas County have been preserved.  

Even in twenty first century Toledo, it is evident that downtown was looking more like a suburban area as the destruction of buildings continued and the addition of parking lots followed. It happened little by little over the past thirty years. “People don’t realize it and then suddenly notice that downtown is gone.” That seems to be the popular view of most people in Lucas County. They do not realize what their heritage has meant to them until they realize that it is gone. To explain this accusation, it has been a trend in Lucas County and in the nation that local support to save sites was not popular until a site was threatened with demolition. Under this pressure, residents comprehend that if a certain site is gone; a part of history vanishes as well. This mindset is quite common as the general public often places historic preservation low on their lists of priorities, until destruction of sites disillusion their thoughts that significant sites will be around forever.

The sites that have been saved in Lucas County have been preserved due to strong willed preservationists physically showing the public through tours, books, festivals, websites, and television that certain sites are important. Imaginative developers also entice county residents into preservation by rehabilitating a historic building to be used in a way that they can appreciate. When sites reach residents on a personal plane, they connect emotionally with them and want to save them to show others what was important to those in the past. Only when an individual comes face to face with a site can one truly appreciate its importance.
The preservation movement in Lucas County has followed closely the nation’s experiences in historic preservation. Both the nation and Lucas County preserved in times of prosperity and focused on sites that honored significant individuals and events, had architectural merit, and represented important ideals that the community wanted to remember. In the twenty first century, preservation was not the highest priority in either area as evidenced by funding, but private developers and preservationists have been working hard across the nation and in Lucas County educating and funding preservation projects so that more sites may be saved in the future.
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Chapter Five: Case Study

Lathrop House: Contemporary Controversy in Preservation

“Don’t it always seem to go, that you don’t know what you’ve got till it’s gone. They paved paradise and put up a parking lot.”

-Joni Mitchell, “Big Yellow Taxi”

The concept of historic preservation is thriving in Lucas County, most recently in the city of Sylvania. Public controversy has erupted over the removal of the historic Lathrop House, which has been rumored to be a stop on the Underground Railroad. Heated conflicts between St. Joseph’s Catholic Church, the city of Sylvania, citizens of Sylvania, preservationists, and concerned citizens from the outlying areas of Lucas County have spawned much publicity over the fate of the house. The local press is primarily used in this chapter to describe the controversy surrounding the preservation of the Lathrop House. Located at 5362 South Main Street, the Lathrop House is a fine example of historic preservation in contemporary terms as it portrays the indecision of local government involvement, lack of federal funding, the danger of losing a historical landmark, a strong grassroots movement to preserve a community’s heritage, public perceptions, and the difficulties of learning who decides what should be saved.

As the historical and architectural significance of a site are often the main determinants in establishing whether a site should be saved, placed on the National
Register, or destroyed, the significance of the Lathrop House must be explained to understand the heightened tensions that surrounded this historical residence. “The Lathrop House is one of the oldest document able residential structures in Lucas County and in Sylvania.” In addition to its antiquity, the Lathrop House has great architectural worth. The house exhibits numerous architectural details of the Greek Revival style which was popular in this nation at the turn of the eighteenth century. The wide frieze boards at its roofline, the classically inspired entablature, and the original windows in the rear of the structure clearly portray this architectural style. The house is one of the few remaining structures in Sylvania that exhibit this type of architecture.¹

This particular site also derives importance due to the prominent citizens of Sylvania that once owned the site. Previous owners such as abolitionist Miles Lathrop, president of the George A. Fuller Company John A. Crandall, and artistic director of the Toledo Ballet Marie Vogt brought national recognition to the city of Sylvania and to their famous home.²

However, the historical significance of the Lathrop House is what local preservationists in Lucas County deem important enough to preserve the site. Elkana Briggs built the original house in 1835. This structure, which is a story and a half, now stands at the rear of the house where the kitchen and den are located. Attached to this earlier portion is the two story structure built around 1850 by the Lathrop’s. When Briggs died in 1847, his widow sold the house to Lucian Lathrop to pay off his debts.³ In 1860, the site was home to Lucian’s son Miles Lathrop. Oral traditions have indicated that both Lucian and Miles were abolitionists.
Based on oral traditions, in the years that Lucian and Miles Lathrop owned the home, it was regarded as a station for the Underground Railroad, which supposedly hid fugitive slaves in the basement. Local “historian” Gaye Gindy believed that she had gathered enough history from the descendants of families that have lived in the house, combining their accounts to the written history of the Harroun family and house to provide solid documentation of the Lathrop House’s connection with the Underground Railroad. Unfortunately, in looking at Gindy’s evidence, there are several overgeneralizations and drastic leaps in reasoning when she describes the abolitionist activities of the Lathrop’s and the connection of the Main Street home to the Underground Railroad. A few pieces of evidence to support the alleged involvement of the Lathrop House and the Lathrop family in the Underground Railroad, researched by Gaye Gindy are listed below.

Gindy uses a 1939 article published in the Quarterly Bulletin of *The Historical Society of Northwestern Ohio* saying that Toledo was an important station on the Underground Railroad and that a house known as the “Old Colonial House” a few hundred yards from the Harroun farm was recently (in 1939) purchased by Linton Fallis, remodeled and was thought to be a station in the Underground Railroad. When remodeling, Fallis found a concealed room in the cellar, formerly reached by an outside stairway that held beds and a room for slaves to hide. She uses Lucian Lathrop’s obituary to find out that Lucian Lathrop was a preacher for the Universalist Church in Sylvania and makes the generalization that since the Universalist Church took a strong stance against slavery and many Ohio ministers aided fugitive slaves, that Lathrop must have been involved in the Underground Railroad due to the convictions of his profession.
Clark Waggoner’s *The History of the City of Toledo and Lucas County* indicated that Lucian Lathrop was a member of the Free Soil Party. The party opposed the extension of slavery in the territories and the admission of new slave states into the Union. Gindy asserts that Lucian Lathrop was nominated as a Democratic candidate to be a Representative in the Ohio State Legislature and attended both the 1850 Democratic Convention in Maumee City and a protest against the Fugitive Slave Law. However, Gindy gave no documentation for these sources. This information indicates that Lucian Lathrop may have had anti-slavery sentiment, but it still provides no proof that he used his home to aid in the escape of fugitive slaves. In addition, Gindy utilizes interviews from Lathrop descendants that lived in the home to describe the oral histories that they have heard and how they could relate it to the home on Main Street. Interviewees such as Helen Fallis Pomeranz, granddaughter of James Fallis, who lived in the Lathrop House from 1915-1934, claimed that when viewing the present day basement, there was a distinct change of brickwork where, according to oral tradition, two large, built-in ovens played essential roles in hiding fugitive slaves. One was used for cooking and the other was used as a doorway to temporary safety. In addition to the accounts researched by Gaye Gindy, an interview of Theodore Vogt by *The Toledo City Paper* states that in 1955, homeowner Vogt used an iron rod to test for soft spots in backyard. In a long stretch of the yard, the rod fell five feet below surface. Several citizens and local historians believed that this piece of evidence indicated that there was a tunnel reaching from Ten Mile Creek to the basement of the Lathrop House.

Dr. Michael Pratt, professor of archaeology at Hiedelberg College in Tiffin, Ohio performed an archaeological study at the Lathrop House. His findings have identified
evidence that supports some of the Underground Railroad legends, but falsifies others. In
the fall of 2002, an agreement by the St. Joseph’s Catholic Church and the Friends of the
Lathrop House authorized an archeological dig led by Pratt in order to save any historical
remnants of the house before it was to be moved to a different site. In removing the
garage and a large enclosed porch that extended from the north façade of the 1835 house
addition, the team met with a large reinforced concrete slab constructed in the 1960s.
The removal of the concrete exposed the perimeter wall of a cellar stairwell, filled with
“rock rubble.” An exterior entrance and stairs were built into the crawl space/foundation
of the original 1835 structure when the main portion of the house was built in 1850. Thus
the stairwell and walls were original to the 1850 addition. After about fifty years of use,
the stairwell was “improved” with a covering of poured concrete from the early twentieth
century and a concrete wall was built dividing the stairwell and used as a support for the
addition of an overhanging porch. Past the concrete was a small crawl space, most likely
used as a cellar.

The archaeological survey of the eastern side of the Lathrop House showed that
there were no hidden or secret rooms existing beneath the twentieth century porch. Oral
histories that describe such rooms as “exterior” to the east side of the house appear to
have no basis in fact. The crawl place and cellar were too small to hold “beds” but they
could have held a few people. Legends tell of the secret Dutch ovens and separate rooms
for holding slaves, but there were no evidence of these items. There were brick
foundations in the basement that may have been mistaken for ovens, but they were not
contemporary to the period of the Underground Railroad. The two sides of the cellar
stairwell blocked off by concrete may have been mistaken for separate rooms. There was
no indication of a tunnel reaching from the Lathrop House to Ten Mile Creek. The hollow voids in the back yard that Theodore Vogt experienced were actually sand deposits. However, the exterior staircase and cellar entrance appear to be original to the 1850 addition, and based on the date of the concrete improvements and the artifacts associated with the filling of the stairwell, the stairway remained in use well into the twentieth century. Therefore stories that escaped slaves were kept in the basement/cellar and taken out through the stairs cannot be ruled out based on archaeological evidence.¹¹

![The concrete stairwell leading to the cellar and crawl space (Courtesy of Michael Pratt).](image1)

![The concrete wall dividing the stairwell into two separate “rooms” (Courtesy of Michael Pratt).](image2)

However, the Lathrop House’s deficient documentation in its identification with the Underground Railroad has kept it from being nominated on the National Register or any other federally recognized list. The only organization that lists the house as a historic property on its register, according to its website, is Friends for Freedom. The lack of historic recognition might have to do with the process in which homes become historic landmarks. Usually homeowners seek identification and provide the necessary documentation so that their sites can receive funding. However, if one receives this historic label, it could cause problems for the homeowner such as prohibitive rules
restricting what renovation and remodeling can and cannot be done to the house. The Toledo City Paper has mused “apparently Vogt did not care if the home was nationally identified as a historic structure as she did not take the time to nominate it, nor did she agree to display the red flag that was given to her by the Friends of Freedom to display in her window.” In turn, the house was not nominated as a historical site by the government because the owners (The Catholic Diocese of Toledo or the Vogt’s) did not agree to the evaluation/inclusion process. Without the legal owner’s permission, “no group, entity, or individual can put the Lathrop House on any register.” Even if the site had been nominated, it has been difficult to produce evidence that the Lathrops were operators in the Underground Railroad. This lack of written evidence has kept the home from being documented as a national historical site recognizable by professional historians. Local historians in Sylvania and other interested citizens have tried to find official documentation, but in their defense, it is hard to expect the Lathrops to have kept records of these activities in the Underground Railroad as it was against the law. They would have been accused of assisting in the stealing of “property” and thereby subjecting themselves to stiff fines and imprisonment under the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. However, it is possible to find documentation for sites related to the Underground Railroad if one knows were to look. The National Park Service has published a guide to “Researching and Interpreting the Underground Railroad” on their official website. The NPS stresses that oral histories should be supplemented with documentation that “supports local accounts and places the Underground Railroad in a broader context of slavery and American history.” The NPS suggests using oral histories as a starting point to lead to other documentation such as archaeological evidence, memoirs, local histories,
scholarly secondary sources, county and township records, city directories, photographs, church and organizational records that may have been benevolent to anti-slavery, contemporary newspapers, legal documents, maps, manuscript collections, and spirituals.  

Public controversy over the future and preservation of the Lathrop house arose when Marie Vogt put the property up for sale in 2001. Marie Vogt approached the Sylvania City Council, requesting seven hundred thousand dollars for the property, but was rejected. The *Sylvania City Newsletter* states that City Council declined Vogt’s offer for the house because they already had a historical village and had considered the difficulty of moving it to that location. At that point in time, the “cost of the property, renovation, preservation, and operation of the home as a historical landmark was not sound financial management.” A local couple, Nan and Neil Buehrer bid three hundred thirty thousand dollars for the house in order to turn it into a bed and breakfast. They had researched how to convert the house into a bed and breakfast without altering the historic structure or the value of the residence. Following this bid, St. Joseph’s Catholic Church bid three hundred fifty thousand for the property, wishing to expand its church and school facilities. The Buehrer’s knew that Vogt wished to keep the house intact and figured that she would take their offer, but later found out that the church had unlimited funds and would continue to outbid them. They expected Vogt to counter their offer, but they were never contacted.

The debate over the Lathrop House’s fate divided the community and produced hard feelings as the church soon learned that it was to obtain a bad reputation for pursuing this venture of purchasing and demolishing the site. Within weeks, St. Joseph’s
Parish purchased the property on four acres on North Main Street across from the church and school. They intended to raze the house and combine the land with eight acres that the church owns just east of the newly acquired property. Larry Floyd, business manager for the parish has said that other uses were explored for the house, but “no viable alternatives were found.” The twelve acre site is to include “classrooms, a senior center, youth meeting rooms, space for preschoolers, and a gym.”

After hearing about the demolition, preservationists picketed the church parking lot during services. Parishioners became divided over the issue of demolishing the Lathrop House, some even leaving St. Joseph’s in protest. Father Wurzel and members of the church’s Finance Committee were confused about the picketing and the anger of several parishioners, as they had been very upfront about buying the property. The purchase was common knowledge to anyone that was interested. Others in the community, including several City Council members were shocked that Vogt sold the house to the church as she had given tours of the site to school children, teaching them of its relationship to the Underground Railroad.

It had been claimed by Gaye Gindy that Marie Vogt sold the house knowing that it was to be demolished. This comment was particularly significant as Gindy used accusations such as these to incite Sylvania residents into supporting her in the preservation of the Lathrop House. This demolition permit also elicited complaints throughout the city.

Strangely, Mayor Stough and the city were suddenly prepared to buy the ravine acreage of the Vogt property to add to Harroun Park. The Sylvania City Council approved this action as an emergency measure to save the house from demolition. However, St. Josephs had already put in an offer, thus purchasing the site. City Council later claimed that it was not afforded the same opportunity to buy the house at the price the church
Citizen organizations formed to save the Lathrop House from demolition and soon united with preservationists and concerned citizens throughout the county. Organizations such as the Friends of the Lathrop House joined forces with the Sylvania Historical Society and local preservationists in picketing St. Joseph’s Church to show their opposition to the demolition of the Lathrop House. When city council learned of the demolition permit, they immediately passed a resolution calling for the preservation of the house and asking the church to hold off demolition to consider other alternatives. Resolution No. 28. 2001 and Resolution No. 8. 2002 were passed for the preservation of the house on its present site. The mayor then announced the formation of a Blue Ribbon Committee to study preservation uses and funding sources for the house. Following these incidents, Father Wurzel and other church representatives were persuaded not to destroy the house, as they believed that the site might have the historical integrity from the Underground Railroad that the protesting citizens had been declaring since the issuance of the demolition permit. However, as one of the largest parishes in Toledo, St. Joseph needed the land to expand and there was no use for the Lathrop House in its construction plans, thus leaving the only alternative, moving the house from its original location. The Lathrop House sat vacant with windows boarded awaiting its fate. This arguable national historic site faced an uncertain future.

The preservation organizations may have won a small battle in saving the Lathrop House from demolition, but they had lost some ground as they also opposed removing the house from its historical site. It had been remarked by preservationists such as Dr. Ted Ligibel that the historical value of the home would plunge if it were removed from site. Moving the home would “alter its integrity because it would no longer be on
its original site and that would preclude it from being designated on the National Register or other historical designations” said Ligibel. The church and its supporters replied to this comment by proposing to move the house about two hundred yards to the north, to the northeast corner of a parking lot along Harroun Park. The home would still be on the ravine, which is historically significant to its alleged participation in the Underground Railroad. Eventually, an agreement was reached between church officials and those seeking to save the house, saying that St. Joseph’s would delay demolition to give the group time to raise funds so that the house could be relocated.

The groups, however, were still under the impression that they were raising funds to keep the house where it was, as they did not really have intentions of moving the home. Relocating historic homes is something preservation groups around the state have fought against. Steve Gordon, survey and national register manager with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office said that he sympathizes with the groups trying to save these homes. “Funding is hard to come by in these hard economic times. Without documentation to prove the site was part of the Underground Railroad, the home can’t be protected on the National Historic Registry and it would be hard to convince owners to save it.” The preservation groups made a community effort in raising money for the house, which showed long reaching interest throughout the county in saving the structure. The Friends of the Lathrop House led the way in fundraising provoking other groups to contribute to the cause. Sylvania City Council committed fifty thousand dollars to moving the house and was later asked by the church to provide a site, which took almost two years. There were also donations from others in the community such as the pupils of Fall-Myer Elementary School and from the Dever’s Family Foundation. Similar to the problems on
a national scale, the fundraising effort did hit a snag when The Friends of the Lathrop House with Ligibel as co-chairman found themselves in the awkward position of trying to obtain corporate, foundation, and grant funds without a definite site or commitment from local governments. Another problem occurred when the Sylvania Townships Trustees were asked to match the fifty thousand dollars committed by the city council. The Trustees usually supported the Friends of the Lathrop House but they would not agree to donate a specific amount of money to the cause. They wanted more input from the community before committing the money.

Moving on with their crusade to save the Lathrop House and to preserve it on its original site, Sylvania City Council, with the support of the preservation groups, voted in March 2003 to appropriate the Lathrop House. They offered to buy the property from St. Joseph’s Church for four hundred thousand dollars and gave them a day to decide if they would accept or reject the offer. The church refused and stood by a previously mentioned March 31 deadline to move the house. The council felt that they had no choice but to seize the property by eminent domain. To exercise eminent domain, a “municipality must show a public purpose for a property” and the city intended to have the Metroparks manage the property and present programs concerning the Underground Railroad. They took this action after negotiations fell apart and they thought the church might still use their demolition permit, which they had kept for over a year. The Sylvania City Council formed Resolution No. 10-2003, officially announcing their intent to appropriate the Main Street property. In turn, the church Finance Committee and church officials were surprised at the city’s action, as the city had known about the deadline since early 2002. In an effort to stop this action, a group called the Citizens for Sylvania, acquired over
eight hundred signatures on a petition opposing the use of eminent domain by the city to take the Lathrop House. This group was made up of Sylvania residents that supported the preservation of the Lathrop House and those that opposed it. Issue 16 was placed on the ballot and eminent domain was voted down in the November election. Letters of protest and a public forum website called *Electronic Countermeasures* indicated that though a number of citizens in Sylvania opposed the movement of the Lathrop House, they still understood that the church’s rights would have been infringed upon if the site was taken by eminent domain. The council had more than enough time to gain the property before the church had purchased it.

The Sylvania Historical Society has led opposition to the proposed demolition and moving of the house, but they resigned themselves to seeing the Lathrop House removed from its site. During a meeting, preservationists reluctantly agreed that moving the structure was better than losing it altogether. Moving it would lose its historical integrity, but it seemed that there was no other option. Disgusted by this decision, Sue McHugh resigned from co-chair of Friends of Lathrop House, as she did not want part in moving the house from its original site. McHugh believed that the organizations and the council settled too easily. The Friends of the Lathrop House was formed to save the house where it stands, not to be removed from its “land, from its history.” The church did take steps to preserve the Lathrop House before its final move to Harroun Park. They agreed to let Dr. Ted Ligibel, a preservationist and professor at Eastern Michigan University, inspect the house for items of historical significance and to allow the structure to be winterized to prevent deterioration. As a result of this reluctant move, the city wanted to make sure that they could protect other historical buildings in the future. Sylvania city council
voted for a 120 day moratorium on issuing demolition permits on buildings that could be considered historical. Unfortunately, this did not affect the Lathrop House.36

In compliance with the move to Harroun Park, the Toledo Area Metroparks formed a partnership with the Friends of the Lathrop House and the city of Sylvania to preserve and provide long term use for the site. The house is a potential tourist attraction with its history and relationship to the Underground Railroad. It would be appropriate for historical programs. The Metroparks agreed to run educational programs and renovate the site.37 Jim Speck, the director of planning for the Metroparks indicated “there was a desire for programming that described the life of abolitionists in the mid 1800s and would also give accounts from the perspective of escaping slaves.”38 Father Wurzel and planning committees consisting of parishioners said that they also had strategies to help the Metroparks to refurbish the house at its new location, “giving the home a life that it never had before.”39 The house was virtually ignored on its original site, but with proper programming and recognition at Harroun Park, the Lathrop House could finally be treated as a site worthy of emulation.

When it seemed that a compromise was finally reached regarding the preservation of the Lathrop House, protests erupted once more as several citizens, organizations, and preservationists renewed their intentions to keep the house on its original site near Ten Mile Creek and the ravine. In a last ditch attempt, a group of Sylvania residents urged people to contact Bishop Leonard Blair to ask him to stop the move of the Lathrop House. They felt that his influence might sway the parish’s plans and allow the house to stay. However, the diocese has said that the bishop had little say as the “issue was to be decided by the parish.”40
The City Council and the church officials agreed to a land swap on the Main Street parking lot across from the church. The city and the church both owned portions of the parking lot and have shared it in an agreement since 1989. The house was to be moved into Harroun Park as the agreement stated that the city would give the church land fronting Main Street and a narrow strip along the lot’s south border in exchange for land along the eastern end of the lot and an easement for the property along the northern edge. This would allow access to the lot and for parking for those who want to visit the park and house.\textsuperscript{41} Despite this agreement, rallies were held by the black community, including members of African American organizations, longtime Sylvania residents, and St. Joseph parishioners in an effort to keep the Lathrop House where it was. The late involvement of the black community is most likely contributed to the endemic mindset that plagues most local residents when they consider historic preservation; they think that preservation will take care of itself and they do not need to be involved until drastic measures need to be taken. The black community decided that this was the time to play their “race” card to save a site of supposed significance to them. The house was to be moved to Harroun Park by May 15, 2004, but the deadline could be extended as long as the city was working toward the move. There were countless rallies sponsored by Alpha Phi Boule, a black fraternity in Northwest Ohio, the Friends of the Lathrop House, and various area churches that were held in vain in attempt to persuade St. Joseph’s to change their minds about the house.\textsuperscript{42}

The Alpha Phi Boule fraternal organization had been trying to gain national attention to the plight of the Lathrop House in order to save it and to show how it is linked to the heritage of African Americans. The church had held meetings with the
fraternity with no avail. The fraternity claimed, to the agreement of preservationists, that
the ravine behind the house and the basement were just as important as the house in the
Underground Railroad.\textsuperscript{43}

Alpha Phi Boule began making the move of the Lathrop House a race issue
directed angrily at St. Joseph’s Church.\textsuperscript{44} To further provoke the community, Keith
Mitchell, an attorney and member of the Alpha Phi Boule fraternity filed a complaint
with the Ohio Civil Rights Commission contending that St. Joseph’s Church actions in
moving the house violated the right of public accommodation. He claimed that he was
denied access to the house because of his race. He had hoped that the commission would
take the matter to the Ohio attorney general to seek an injunction against moving the
house. The house had been fenced off to the entire public as a safety precaution while the
house was in the process of moving. As evidenced, no one was allowed on the property,
regardless of his or her race. The Ohio Civil Rights Commission decided that no civil
rights laws were violated, but the commission did add that they “questioned the morality
of the decision because they felt that the house should have stayed where it was to
preserve its legacy.”\textsuperscript{45} Following this judgment, several more protests were held in
attempts to delay the movers, but these efforts were made in vain. Alpha Phi Boule has
since realized they could do nothing to save the site from its move, but they did find that
they could offer their involvement in making the site educational for the public to enjoy,
albeit on a different site than where the events occurred.\textsuperscript{46}

As the community prepared the Lathrop House to be moved to its new location,
efforts to preserve certain aspects of the structure were undertaken, but many were also
destroyed in the moving process. Demolition workers dismantled two porches, the
garage, and exterior chimney in front of the house. They also dismantled other additions 
that were made to the house throughout the years. This was supposed to return the 
building to its original state, allowing the building to be easily moved, and to allow 
access by archaeologists to portions of the house’s exterior walls. A contractor hired by 
the church moved the house a short distance. While it was moved, portions of the 
basement’s walls collapsed. However, the walls were photographed before the move and 
stones from the walls were taken to storage to be placed at the new location. Though 
many of the blocks from the walls of the vital basement were preserved, much of the 
basement where allegedly fugitive slaves were hidden would be constructed from 
materials that were replicas of the original site. Volunteers sifted through dirt at the old 
site to look for artifacts that would help explain the history of the house. Further 
archeological work would also enhance historic programming for the Metroparks when 
showing the house. Artifacts such as dishware, buttons, coins, and kitchen utensils will 
be displayed in the house to help show how life was for abolitionists in Northwest Ohio 
and for the fugitive slaves that they encountered.
In looking at editorials written in the public opinion pages from Toledo and Sylvania newspapers, public perceptions could be partially viewed concerning the preservation efforts surrounding the Lathrop House. As most of these opinions were published in the fall of 2001, many featured the patriotism of residents toward their own history and their personal connections to the past, their families, the house, and the heroic idea of the Underground Railroad. This was most likely due to the deep emotional feelings for all things lost, both past and present in the wake of September 11, 2001. Residents demonstrated their familiarity to the national past by taking a moment from this history and personalizing them to make them easier to live with. For these citizens, the past exists now and has become an identity that they take pride in. As one woman noted, “too often we throw things aside that we feel have no use for us, only to later wish that we could take back our actions.”

Letters to the editor and interviews at the Lathrop House protests indicated that a number of the residents from throughout Lucas County were in agreement that the Lathrop House was a historic structure that should be preserved on its original site as a station on the Underground Railroad. Members of Friends of the Lathrop House wrote that they admired the home as part of Sylvania’s rich heritage. They felt that it would be most tragic if the house were moved or destroyed, as it was an “irreplaceable mansion dating back to the earliest days of the city, holding close ties with many Sylvania families.” Patricia Ligibel, wife of preservationist, Ted Ligibel noted that she was disturbed that so few were bothered by the lack of preservation efforts of a home that was home to prominent families and believed to have sheltered fugitive slaves. This letter indicates that Sylvania residents “supposedly” did not care about their local histories, especially when connected with national events. A few former St. Joseph
parishioners, such as Jim Smythe pointed out that “enlightened communities try to save buildings and use them for other purposes, so it is astonishing to think that the church would want to clear the property.” They also wrote in protesting that moving the house comprised its historical significance as it would no longer be near the ravine, nor would the basement be entirely intact. Supporters of the Underground Railroad legend even went so far as to cite the arrogance and elitist nature of the church as they attempted to trivialize history by simply placing a marker on the moved Lathrop house showing blatant disrespect for African American history, as well as their community’s past.

Parishioners that doubted the authenticity of the site supported the church’s move of the Lathrop House, and its preservation at a new site. Skeptics claimed that the supporters of the Lathrop House never made a strong case that historically the house was anything more than a symbolic representation of the Underground Railroad. There never has been documented proof that the house was a station. Sylvania resident John Yates felt that the “symbolic nature of the house could be represented in its present site, or as in the case of many other historic sites in the U.S., it could be moved and still be honored.” A Citizens Committee formed from St. Joseph’s parish made a strong point about how Sylvania residents perceived the house before it was threatened with demolition. Before there was a thought that this nationally significant historical site would be faced with the wrecking ball, hardly anyone cared or even knew about the site and its supposed role in the Underground Railroad. The Toledo Catholic Diocese was responsible for the demolition of several older buildings in downtown Toledo. It took the Diocese threatening to take away a local landmark for residents to finally realize what they were losing. An ex-Toledoan now living in Texas touched upon this point in her
letter. When the press asked if the Lathrop House would have made the grade, had it
been evaluated as a “sanctioned” historic site, she scoffed, “Buildings of historic
importance are moved and preserved all the time,” she said. “Sacred site? Give me a
break! I bet most people didn’t even know that it existed until recently. I didn’t, and I
lived in Toledo for almost forty years.”56 Another point was made that neither the
Sylvania Historical Society nor the Sylvania City Council had the “intent or money to do
anything for the house or the property, but now that someone else has made the purchase;
they have been very interested and vocal about saving the property.” Several others
defended allegations against the church, understanding its need for expansion. Though
many were sympathetic about the preservation of the Lathrop House, most thought that
the historic home would be better viewed and appreciated if it was moved to Harroun
Park. 57 Overall, the public perceptions toward the Lathrop House have favored
preservation, but in different ways. Idealistic residents will regard the home as a station
on the Underground Railroad without documentation or recognition. Hopefully their
admiration for the home will continue when it is turned into a museum in 2005.

The voter’s initiative was another way to measure the public perceptions
concerning the preservation of the Lathrop House. When the Sylvania City Council
attempted to take the Lathrop House away from St. Joseph’s by eminent domain, the
public spoke through a legal petition and ballot that the Council had overstepped its
bounds. The majority of voters went against the use of eminent domain, not because they
were not in favor of preserving the Lathrop House, but because they did not like the way
that the City Council was handling the controversy. The overwhelming vote shows that
the issues surrounding the Lathrop House were important to the public.
The controversy that the Lathrop House has aroused has been duplicated in numerous other cities throughout the nation over the preservation of a historical site. The fight to save this landmark has shown us many aspects of how the historic preservation movement has evolved in this contemporary era. Unlike the national trend, the federal government had very little say in what would be preserved in regards to the Lathrop House. Through lack of documentation, the federal government could not recognize the site, but it was still somewhat preserved by politicians and high ranking individuals, and through the urgings of concerned residents. This fight showed the indecision of local government as it attempted to gain control over the preservation of the house. It also illustrated the lack of federal funding, as a grassroots movement of local organizations pulled together to raise money to preserve what was important to their pasts, though not sanctified by the federal government. It also portrays the emotions that run when a community is faced with losing a piece of their heritage, whether they were aware of it or not. The theme that usually stays the same throughout the historic preservation movement and is certainly exhibited here is that people do not know what they have got until it is (almost) gone.
2 “On Target…With the Interest of Community First,” The Sylvania Herald, 10 October 2001, letters to the Editor.
4 The term historian is used loosely as Gaye Gindy is not an academically trained historian.
7 Obituary, Lucian Lathrop, The Toledo Blade, 10 May 1873.
8 Clark Waggoner, ed., The History of the City of Toledo and Lucas County (New York: Munsell & Company, 1888), 400.
10 Reiter, “This Old House,” The Toledo City Paper.
12 Reiter, “This Old House,” The Toledo City Paper.
13 Ibid.
15 “The Vogt House…if the walls could talk,” The Sylvania Herald, 5 September 2001, Publisher’s Commentary.
17 City of Sylvania Newsletter, July 2003.
18 Reiter, “This Old House,” The Toledo City Paper.
20 Reiter, “This Old House,” The Toledo City Paper.
22 City of Sylvania Newsletter, July 2003.
23 Ibid.
24 “Site’s Role in History is Obvious; Fate Unclear,” The Toledo Blade, 4 January 2002.
32 “Group fights Lathrop House acquisition, Sylvania residents threaten to take issue to voters,” The Toledo Blade, 17 June 2003.
37 “Metroparks mull role in Lathrop House, district would link with citizens, city of Sylvania to preserve historic structure,” The Toledo Blade, 17 July 2002.


“Civil rights panel questions,” *The Toledo Blade*.


Premove demolition work to start at historic dwelling,” *The Toledo Blade*, 13, August 2002.

Lecker, “Homes on slaves’ trips to freedom neglect working with history,” *The Toledo Blade*.


Concluding

The historic preservation movement was an essential factor in helping the nation realize that their heritage was important and that the past should be saved so that it may not be lost forever. The most integral part of the movement was the cooperation of the federal government with the state and local factions. This is why the study of Lucas County, Ohio’s part in the preservation movement is so important in linking the trends of national versus local preservation to see how Americans made historic preservation a successful venture. It has been made evident in this study that the experiences of Lucas County closely paralleled the nations in the area of historic preservation issues and planning. This study also answers several questions that were posed throughout this thesis in relation to specific issues concerning the historic preservation movement on a national and local level.

Throughout each era of the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty first centuries, both the nation and Lucas County went through periods of successful preservation and decline, depending on social, political, and economic circumstances. To explain the periods of decline, the nation and Lucas County had comparable experiences starting in the nineteenth century. Towards the end of this century, there was a building boom that influenced the construction of new sites and in turn demolished old landmarks that were
no longer useful or modern. Sites were destroyed due to a progressive mindset of the citizens, both on a local and national stage. As notions of progress changed in each generation, so did the idea of what should be preserved. When organizations did form to help save certain sites from facing demolition, they found that the lack of involvement and funding from the federal government kept them from achieving a majority of their goals. Turning to the twentieth century, after WWII, Lucas County and the nation were experiencing mass migrations out of the city due to the promise of a better quality of life in the suburbs. This era moved industry and retail out of the city, leaving vacant buildings to deteriorate. As middle class whites moved away, poor minorities moved into older neighborhoods bringing a perceived attitude of crime, racial rioting, and blight, which kept wealthier homeowners away from historic neighborhoods and from restoration efforts that the poor inhabitants could not afford.

The period of the 1950s to the 1970s brought urban renewal efforts to both national and local realms. Federal legislation, though more helpful toward preservation than in previous years, also encouraged cities to remove unsightly homes and landmarks so that new construction, highways, or needed surface parking could be permitted to promote retail in the deserted cities. Political agendas were a major influence in preservation during these eras as mayors and councils on the local level and Congress on the national determined which sites were significant enough to save depending on how much revenue the site brought, or if the site would bring pride and recognition to the area. Otherwise, as controllers of the finances, it was thought more often than not, that new construction was much cheaper than the rehabilitation of historic sites. Even in private funding, local citizens that provide money for preservation efforts often expect their own
political biases to be present when sites are interpreted to visitors, despite what is historically accurate. Money is power in many decision making processes in historic preservation.

Another period of decline was seen in several years throughout the 1980s and into the twenty first century. According to the observations made in this thesis, though many Americans in both the national and local realms felt a connection to their pasts and thought that preservation efforts were extremely important, it still was not a top priority to them or to public officials. As a result, government funding was cut for historic preservation and local organizations experienced the effects of these cutbacks in their lack of preservation resources. They continually rely on support from the private sector to meet economic needs that are required to document and rehabilitate historic sites.

However, throughout these eras, there were phases of successful preservation that were experienced in Lucas County and the nation. Lucas County seemed to be on the cutting edge as local efforts in preservation predated the most significant efforts on a national scale. The early organizations that formed to promote historic preservation were formed by the community’s white elite most often led by women. These organizations focused on stimulating patriotism and saving sites related to national and local figures that embodied the ideals of the past. In Lucas County, sites that were saved often were linked to town founders, prominent pioneers, or significant individuals or events that influenced the course of history. In addition, sites that were architecturally significant, or unique to the era, or exceptional in function were saved.

During the Depression, mass unemployment allowed people to cling to the past as it was perceived as being safe and unchanging. They feared what the future would bring
in a time of uncertainty and pending war. This fondness for the past stimulated preservation on a national and local level, leading to increased cooperation of the public and private sectors. The federal government became directly involved with the historic preservation movement and instigated several national organizations and programs that would provide funding and documentation of historic sites. One program to stimulate employment was the HABS, which was used in Lucas County to document historic sites, such as the Columbian House in Waterville, Ohio.

A majority of the thriving efforts in historic preservation that were displayed in the nation and Lucas County took place in response to the destruction caused by urban renewal. The federal government implemented new legislation, such as the NHPA of 1966 that was to protect historically significant sites and created a National Register with specific criteria that communities could use to designate which sites should be saved and which should not. As a result of the NHPA of 1966, many more grassroots preservation organizations and professional agencies formed to educate the public on the benefits of historic preservation and to work with federal, state, and local governments to protect significant sites, while still creating new construction. In addition, developers made a cooperative agreement with preservationists to use historic buildings for adaptive reuse projects, thus motivating preservation. The incentives of using preservation became cost efficient, increased tourism, raised property values, and brought people back to historic areas.

National legislation stimulated local communities such as Lucas County to execute laws of their own, such as zoning ordinances, demolition ordinances, and historic district overlay laws to protect areas of local significance. The impact of these laws have
saved many sites, but much of this legislation provided loopholes that failed to protect other sites at the hands of developers or government officials that found demolition costs efficient.

As laws were created to protect sites, both nationally and locally, questions were raised on determining the historic designation of sites. Who decides what sites should be saved? Also, how and why are sites designated as historically significant? To answer the first question, this study indicates that anyone can nominate sites to be recognized on the National Register of Historic Places to receive funding and protection. However, the forms filled out go to the state preservation office and are evaluated using the criteria established by the National Park Service and Secretary of Department of the Interior. For local designation, city councils also evaluate sites based on the federal criteria that being the uniqueness to the area, age, historical integrity, historical environment, and architecturally unaltered state. These factors all play a role in the process of designation. All in all, the officials of the federal government decide for their nation what is important enough to be saved. Local communities need to make convincing arguments to their preservation officers as to why sites should be preserved; otherwise, the political and economic agendas of federal officials will determine how these individuals in positions of power will evaluate sites.

There are several different reasons as why sites are designated as historically significant. In the early years of the preservation movement, patriotic criteria were used as a means of designation. Historically and architecturally significant sites as evaluated by the criteria composed by the National Park Service also had a very good chance of being preserved. Most likely, especially on a local level, sites were saved that
personified ideals that communities cherished and felt a personal connection to. Ancestry, historical events, infamous deeds, aesthetic architecture that reflect certain periods, innovative designs and functions, the ability to become economically viable in rehabilitation, and community pride are all factors in why sites are preserved in the nation and in Lucas County.

Public perceptions concerning the historic preservation movement and specific sites that are to be saved are vital in the decision of the success rates of preservation efforts. If American citizens, either nationally and locally feel a personal connection, a memory, or is invoked by pride, a historic site is more likely to be rehabilitated and preserved for future generations. If their expectations are met concerning what they think certain sites represent or convey to the community, they are less likely to be demolished or neglected over time. However, these perceptions change over certain eras, which explains why in particular time periods there are successful efforts in preservation and in other times there are very few. The mentality of the public changes constantly as they re-evaluate what the past means to them. In early years, modernization and progress was the key, and sentimentality of the past was not fashionable. In other years, idealized images of the past brought communities together in times of crisis, clinging to a time when things were less complicated. They focused on particular sites that epitomized their present needs and gave them designation to be saved. Sites that are labeled as significant are given notice by the residents and their outlook is good in keeping a good physical condition. The public that is spoken of in this study involves not only individuals of prominence and power (though they often have the most say in preservation), but of the everyman or woman that wants to save a part of themselves and their nation to be
remembered and experienced again. The public perceptions of individuals in Lucas County were measured by news articles, editorials, support for preservation legislation, and general observation.

It has been a trend in the historic preservation movement both nationally and locally, that the public (including organizations, federal officials, professional preservationists, and local citizens) often does not take the time to preserve a significant site until it is about to be demolished or lost forever. Though Americans think that preservation is a good idea, it will be taken care of over time and they need not bother with it unless it is absolutely necessary. There is something about the mindset of Americans that allows them to be blasé about preservation and to become actively involved overnight when they feel that a part of their pasts (in these cases, the historic sites) are in danger of being lost. Though there are some preservationists that are consistent about their involvement, it seems that a majority of Americans take this viewpoint and later action when it comes to preserving landmarks. This mindset needs to be changed for historic preservation to become completely successful, along with effective planning. Preservation organizations, programs, and government leaders need to educate the public on the benefits of preservation and of the importance of having a relationship with one’s past.

This study shows that though the designation and preservation of sites is usually federally dictated, it is the private sector and the public that give the preservation movement effective legislation, funding, and meaning. It is hoped that understanding of the historic preservation movement and the perceptions that others have regarding it will influence others to look at all aspects of preservation, and take into account the benefits,
failures, and tactics to improve upon for the future. The past might be remembered for what it was, a window into the present and to the future.
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Appendix A: Preserved Buildings List

* National Register Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Date</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1892-5</td>
<td>Ashland Ave. Baptist Church</td>
<td>Ashland &amp; Woodruff St. (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-9</td>
<td>Oliver House</td>
<td>27 Broadway (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862-9</td>
<td>St. Francis De Sales Catholic Church</td>
<td>Cherry &amp; Superior (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1863-6</td>
<td>Trinity Episcopal</td>
<td>316 Adams &amp; St. Clair (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Grasser &amp; Brand Brewery</td>
<td>228 S. St. Clair at Williams St. (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Gerber House</td>
<td>2413 Collingwood (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Reynolds-Ludwig-Secor House</td>
<td>2035 Collingwood (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1890</td>
<td>Pythian Castle</td>
<td>801 Jefferson &amp; Ontario (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Gardner Bldg.</td>
<td>506 Madison &amp; Superior (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1893-96</td>
<td>Spitzer Bldg.</td>
<td>520 Madison &amp; Huron (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1892</td>
<td>Valentine Theater</td>
<td>St. Clair &amp; Adams (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1897</td>
<td>Lucas Co. Courthouse (2(^{nd}) bldg)</td>
<td>Adams &amp; Erie (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Jail &amp; Sheriff’s Residence</td>
<td>Jackson &amp; Spielbusch (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-3</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Church &amp; School</td>
<td>219 Page (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1893-95</td>
<td>Libbey House</td>
<td>2008 Scottwood (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Nicholas Bldg.</td>
<td>606 Madison &amp; Huron (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Date</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Ohio Bldg.</td>
<td>Madison &amp; Superior (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1906-8</td>
<td>Hotel Secor</td>
<td>425 Jefferson &amp; Superior (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1901-2</td>
<td>Berdan Warehouse</td>
<td>601 Washington (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Bartley House</td>
<td>1855 Collingwood (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1899</td>
<td>Bronson Place (historic district)</td>
<td>Cherry &amp; Central (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-2</td>
<td>St. Hedwig’s Church</td>
<td>2916 Dexter &amp; Lagrange (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1894-1901</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s Catholic Church (rebuilt)</td>
<td>130 Avondale (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1898-9</td>
<td>First Church of Christ Scientist</td>
<td>Lawrence &amp; Monroe (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1897-8</td>
<td>Burt’s Theater</td>
<td>719-23 Jefferson (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1890s</td>
<td>Old West End (historic district)</td>
<td>Collingwood, Scottwood,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robinwood, Bancroft (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1830s</td>
<td>Vistula (historic district)</td>
<td>Huron, Summit, Lagrange, Superior (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Raymond-Ketcham House</td>
<td>329 Chestnut (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Salem Lutheran Church</td>
<td>1123 Huron (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1870s</td>
<td>Ft. Industry Square (pieces of original)</td>
<td>Summit &amp; Monroe (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Weber Block</td>
<td>Main &amp; Front (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Fort Dixon Block</td>
<td>S. St. Clair (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>St. Clair District (historic district)</td>
<td>St. Clair (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Warehouse District (historic district)</td>
<td>St. Clair, Washington, Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Pioneer Inn (moved 1902)</td>
<td>21171 Rte. 65 (Grand Rapids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>B.F. Kerr House</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; Beaver (Grand Rapids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Front (Grand Rapids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1843</td>
<td>Ludwig Mill</td>
<td>Mill Rd. (Providence Park Gate) (Grand Rapids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1853</td>
<td>Isham Farm</td>
<td>8460 S. River Rd. (Anthony Wayne Trail &amp; Howe) (Waterville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1883</td>
<td>Gillett-Shoemaker-Welsh House</td>
<td>133 N. 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St. (Waterville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1837</td>
<td>Pray-Stark-Weather House</td>
<td>144 N. River Rd. (Waterville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Wabash Hotel (moved)</td>
<td>19 S. 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; St. (Waterville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1828-37</td>
<td>Columbian House</td>
<td>3 N. River Rd. at Rte. 64 (Waterville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-4</td>
<td>John Pray House</td>
<td>11 N. 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St. (Waterville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1878</td>
<td>Liberty-Haskins House</td>
<td>625 Canal (Waterville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Thomas Merrell House</td>
<td>231 W. Broadway (Maumee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Morrison-Waite House</td>
<td>301 W. Harrison (Maumee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Union School</td>
<td>102 E. Broadway (Maumee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1836</td>
<td>Old Plantation Inn</td>
<td>301 River Rd. (Maumee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1820s</td>
<td>Forsythe-Puhl House</td>
<td>106 E. Harrison (Maumee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1835</td>
<td>House of Four Pillars</td>
<td>322 E. Broadway (Maumee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1837</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Presbyterian Church of Maumee</td>
<td>200 E. Broadway (Maumee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1835</td>
<td>Issac Hull House &amp; Store</td>
<td>114 E. Harrison (Maumee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1827</td>
<td>Wolcott House</td>
<td>1031 River Rd. (Maumee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1820s</td>
<td>Brandville School</td>
<td>1133 Grasser (Oregon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Demolished and Neglected Buildings List

*National Register Sites*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Date</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Destruction Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1891-5</td>
<td>Nasby Bldg.</td>
<td>(altered)</td>
<td>Madison &amp; Huron (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Ketcham-Morton House</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Madison &amp; St. Clair (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>First Church</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Cherry &amp; Superior (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Trinity Church</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Adams &amp; St.Clair (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Lucas Co. Courthouse (1st)</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Adams &amp; Erie (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Madison &amp; St. Clair (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-6</td>
<td>Island House Hotel &amp; R.R. Station</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Middle Grounds (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Morris Block</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Jefferson &amp; Summit (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-7</td>
<td>Lucas Co. Jail &amp; Sheriff’s Residence</td>
<td>1900-1</td>
<td>Erie, Adams &amp; Jackson (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862-4</td>
<td>St. Patrick Church &amp; School</td>
<td>1892 (1st)</td>
<td>130 Avondale (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>St. Francis de Sales Parish House</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>513 Cherry (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Fitch House (Smead School)</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2017 School Place (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1866</td>
<td>Phillip’s House</td>
<td>1980 (fire)</td>
<td>220 Columbia (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-2</td>
<td>Boody House Hotel</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>405 Madison at St. Clair (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-80s</td>
<td>Lenk Wine Company</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Detroit &amp; Phillips (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Date</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Destruction Date</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Fire Station #7</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Franklin &amp; Bancroft (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>St. Vincent Hospital</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2213 Cherry (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Congressional Church (fire)</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>227-9 St. Clair (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Cummings House</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1505 Jefferson (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883-8</td>
<td>Toledo State Hospital</td>
<td>1970s-1980s</td>
<td>S. Detroit between Arlington &amp; Glendale (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Colton House</td>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>450 W. Woodruff (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Lucas Co. Armory</td>
<td>1934 (fire)</td>
<td>Orange &amp; Spielbusch (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Toledo Club</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Madison &amp; Huron (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1896</td>
<td>Wheeler Block</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>407 Monroe &amp; St. Clair (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Secor Bldg.</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Superior &amp; Jefferson (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Tiedtke’s &amp; Todd</td>
<td>1975 (fire)</td>
<td>406 Summit (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Jail &amp; Sheriff’s Residence</td>
<td>1977-8 (jail)</td>
<td>Jackson &amp; Spielbusch (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895 &amp; 1902</td>
<td>Lake Erie Park &amp; Casino</td>
<td>1901 (fire) &amp; 1910 (fire)</td>
<td>Summit (Toledo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>