

Charles T. Sheldon Room
Shorewood Historical Society
3930 N. Murray Avenue
Shorewood, Wisconsin

5

ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY OF SHOREWOOD, WISCONSIN

By

**Carol Lohry Cartwright
Historic Resources Consultant**

**Prepared for the Division of Historic Buildings and Public
History, Wisconsin Historical Society
and the Village of Shorewood
2011**

Village of Shorewood, Wisconsin

Architectural Survey of Shorewood, Wisconsin

Author:

Carol Lohry Cartwright

Assisted by William Carter

Prepared for the Division of Historic Preservation and Public History
Wisconsin Historical Society
Madison, Wisconsin

2011

Federal Acknowledgement

The activity that is the subject of this publication has been financed with Federal funds from the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, and administered by the Wisconsin Historical Society. However, the contents and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of the Interior or the Wisconsin Historical Society. Nor does the mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation by the Department of the Interior or the Wisconsin Historical Society. This program receives federal financial assistance for identification and protection of historic properties. Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1975, as amended, the U.S. Department of the Interior prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, or disability or age in its federally assisted programs. If you believe you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility as described above, or if you desire further information, please write to Office of Equal Opportunity, National Park Service, 1849 C Street NW, Washington DC 20240.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Contents:</i>	<i>Page</i>
Chapter 1 – Survey Methodology	1
Chapter 2 – Historical Background	5
Chapter 3 – Architecture	14
<i>Residential Architecture—Houses</i>	15
<i>Residential Architecture—Apartment Buildings</i>	40
<i>Commercial Architecture</i>	44
<i>Public Architecture</i>	46
<i>Church Architecture</i>	48
<i>School Architecture</i>	51
<i>Architects and Builders</i>	53
Chapter 4 – Results	55
Chapter 5 – Recommendations	84

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

CHAPTER ONE

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

The Division of Historic Preservation and Public History of the Wisconsin Historical Society received funding from a federal survey and planning grant to conduct an intensive architectural survey of Shorewood. The contract for the survey was awarded to Carol Lohry Cartwright, Historic Resources Consultant.

The intensive architectural and historical survey had four work elements: (1) a reconnaissance survey of the historic properties in Shorewood; (2) historical research for properties that were potentially eligible for the National Register and to provide historical context to evaluate surveyed properties and to prepare the chapters of the intensive survey report; (3) an evaluation of surveyed properties for their potential eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and/or their contribution to potential historic districts; (4) completion of the survey report.

RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY

The consultant surveyed the entire Village of Shorewood, using previously surveyed resources on file in the Division of Historic Preservation and a 2008 Section 106 Federal Highway Project architectural and historical survey completed for the reconstruction of East Capitol Drive as guides. Because the consultant had considerable prior knowledge of Shorewood due to the completion of the East Capitol Drive survey, it was determined that Historic Preservation Division staff review the community prior to the field work to identify potential National Register of Historic Places historic districts. Historic Preservation Division staff review of potentially eligible National Register properties and historic districts is required as part of the survey effort and given the prior knowledge that Shorewood had several potentially large historic districts, prior staff review was done to make the field work more productive.

The field work was completed according to the Historic Preservation Division's requirements for reconnaissance surveys. The consultant surveyed properties structure by structure and street by street for resources of historic and architectural significance as well as those resources included in the identified potential historic districts. Digital photographs were taken of all resources in accordance with guidelines from the Historic Preservation Division. The digital images were provided to the Division of Historic Preservation for placement in the Wisconsin Historic Preservation Database.



RESEARCH

The consultant undertook site-specific research for potentially eligible properties and properties included in the potential historic districts. The primary site-specific research tool used were the building records of the Village of Shorewood that date back to 1922. Other research tools included local history books and pamphlets, city directories, and the local Shorewood newspaper (Shorewood Record, North Shore Review, Suburban Herald, Shorewood Herald). Utilized extensively was the Shorewood Historical Society's *A Guide to Shorewood's Architecture*, printed in 2001, which has a wealth of information on Shorewood's architecture and architects and builders. This research was used to gather information for the Wisconsin Historic Preservation Database and for this report.

The consultant also conducted general historical research in order to help prepare this report. For this research, the consultant used the materials described above.

IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANT RESOURCES

As indicated earlier in this chapter, the consultant pre-reviewed the architectural resources of Shorewood with staff from the Division of Historic Preservation. Through this process, the boundaries of the potentially eligible National Register districts were defined and criteria for individually eligible properties were discussed. During the course of the project, the consultant utilized this pre-review to conduct the survey.

*The conclusions of what resources were architectural and/or historically significant and what resources were included in the potentially eligible National Register districts were based on the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places. The National Register criteria are used to guide state and federal agencies in evaluating nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. The criteria is described in *How to Complete National Register Forms* (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1991), and read as follows:*

“The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- “A. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- “B. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- “C. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

- “D. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

“Ordinarily, cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions, or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories:

- “A. a religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or
- “B. a building or structure removed from its original location, but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic period or event; or
- “C. a birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no other appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life; or
- “D. a cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
- “E. a reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
- “F. a property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with his own historical significance; or
- “G. a property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.

“As noted above, a historic district is placed in the National Register of Historic Places in a manner similar to individual properties; using essentially the same criteria. A historic district is comprised of resources; that is, buildings, structures, sites, or objects located in a geographically definable area. The historic district is united by historical factors and a sense of cohesive architectural integrity. District resources are individually classified as contributing or non-contributing.

- “A. A contributing building, site, structure, or object adds to the historic architectural qualities, historic associations, or archeological

values for which a property is significant because (a.) it was present during the period of significance and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time or is capable of yielding important information about the period, or (b.) it independently or individually meets the National Register criteria.

- “B. A non-contributing building, site, structure, or object does not add to the historic architectural qualities, historic associations, or archeological values for which a property or district is significant because (a.) it was not present during the period of significance [less than 50 years old or moved to the site], (b.) due to alterations, disturbances, additions, or other changes, it no longer possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time or is incapable of yielding important information about the period, or (c.) it does not independently meet the National Register criteria.”

WISCONSIN HISTORIC PRESERVATION DATABASE

The consultant entered the architectural and historical information for the surveyed resources into the Historic Preservation Division's database. This database is a custom application that was created for the Division of Historic Preservation. The general public can view information from this data base on the Wisconsin Historical Society's web site: www.wisconsinhistory.org, select Historic Buildings and Preservation, then select AHI.

PREPARATION OF THE SURVEY REPORT

The survey report is meant to provide architectural and historical context for surveyed resources, along with survey results and recommendations. The goal is to provide important and easily accessible information to the Shorewood Historical Society, Village of Shorewood officials and staff, local and regional planners, the Historic Buildings and Public History Division of the Wisconsin Historical Society and other interested parties so that they can make informed planning decisions regarding the village's architecturally or historically significant resources. The report is designed to be a working document that can become the basis for further research and can be updated and changed over time, as new information is revealed or historic resources altered.

The results chapter includes lists of properties in the National Register of Historic Places, properties that have been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, properties that are Milwaukee County Landmarks, properties identified in the survey as potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and properties identified in the survey within proposed historic districts.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

The development of Shorewood, Wisconsin from rural land to dense suburb is a brief, but intense, story. The bulk of the community developed between 1910 and 1930 as a primarily upper middle-class to wealthy suburb of Milwaukee. It was natural for citizens in the increasingly crowded city of Milwaukee to look to areas outside of the city limits for new housing and during the period 1910 to 1930, the rise in use of automobiles and the convenience of public transportation helped foster this movement. The north side of the city of Milwaukee was largely an upper middle-class to wealthy enclave during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and as this area of the city became more dense, upper middle-class to wealthy families migrated north into developing suburbs. As the first suburb north of the city limits, Shorewood filled up quickly after 1910. The northern migration of middle-class to wealthy families continued into other suburbs north of Shorewood, such as Whitefish Bay, Fox Point, Glendale, and Bayside well into the late twentieth century.

The rapid growth of Shorewood into a fashionable suburb is not only interesting from a local history standpoint, but also as a national example of historic suburban development during the first half of the twentieth century. How Shorewood developed during this short period of largely 20 years can shed valuable light on the overall history of suburban development in the United States.

SHOREWOOD BEGINNINGS

In 1939, the Federal Writers' Project, a component of the 1930s Great Depression-era work program, the Works Progress Administration, published a history of Shorewood. At that time, the community was looking back at its rapid, intense, development and probably wondering just how it all happened so quickly. The history, entitled *Shorewood*, takes a comprehensive approach to the development of the community from its pre-white settlement geological development to the then-current conditions in the late 1930s. A well-produced history, *Shorewood* will be used extensively in this chapter to explain the community's history.

Prior to the early twentieth century, Shorewood was rural and its history was dominated by its physical features. Located along Lake Michigan, the village sits atop bluffs that lead down to the lake. Prior to white settlement in the mid-1800s, these bluffs had large deposits of limestone. The land was primarily wooded with a large amount of sugar maples and white oak trees along with many native shrubs and wild flowers. Most of the wood was cleared during the mid-nineteenth century and agriculture was introduced. The two main defining features of the site were the previously-mentioned Lake Michigan and the Milwaukee River, which forms a western boundary of the community. All of these elements gave Shorewood a picturesque setting and prior to white settlement, these elements attracted Native Americans to the area.¹

¹ Federal Writers' Project of Wisconsin, *Shorewood* (Shorewood: Village Board of Shorewood, 1939), 15-22.

After 1900, another attempt at a real village began to materialize. It began when Zwietusch's Mineral Springs Park was purchased and developed into a lively amusement park the owners called Coney Island. Taverns were located near the park and their owners and others met in 1900 to incorporate a new village, East Milwaukee, primarily to promote better roads in this area that could improve their businesses. The new village did not immediately take off as most of the people settling there built cottages instead of permanent homes. But, in 1905, water and sewer service was extended from Milwaukee, cement sidewalks were built in 1911, and the first paved street was completed in 1913, events that coincided with people from Milwaukee becoming interested in suburban living along the north shore of Lake Michigan. East Milwaukee encouraged this suburban development by road paving; 12 miles of paved streets were completed by 1917. Home building followed as the 190 homes in East Milwaukee in 1913 became 470 homes by 1917.¹⁰

Coney Island Amusement Park, the catalyst for village incorporation and improvements, ironically, was not as successful as anticipated. In 1905 it was reincarnated as "Wonderland" and had some success, then was renamed Ravenna Park in 1909. But, in 1916, the park closed as the handwriting was on the wall; East Milwaukee was becoming a residential suburb not conducive to large summer crowds of amusement-park visitors. As a residential suburb that seemed to be developing as an upper middle-class to wealthy community, it was felt that East Milwaukee was not an appropriate name. So, in 1917, residents changed the name to the much more appropriate Shorewood.¹¹

At the time the village government changed the community's name to Shorewood, both the village government and land developers realized that to continue to attract well-to-do families, they needed to develop high quality subdivisions with larger lots and setbacks different from those found in crowded Milwaukee. Many subdivisions came with covenants as to the value of homes that could be constructed. These spacious subdivisions can be seen primarily in the eastern third to half of the village. As the village expanded during the 1920s, subdivisions with smaller lots were developed, particularly in the western part of the community, but even in these areas, it was clear that the housing developed was for middle-class families. Single-family homes dominated and the few, percentage-wise, duplexes that were built were done in a manner that suggested single-family homes. Even apartment buildings were "luxury" developments, not meant to house working class families.¹²

As the non-agricultural economy roared during the 1920s, so did development in Shorewood and subdivisions were platted in any areas still rural. By the late 1920s, the only area in Shorewood that was still open was in the northwestern part of the village near the Chicago & Northwestern Railroad tracks. Much of this land was taken up by an older rail line, the Lake Shore Division and its right-of-way. There was a considerable amount of right-of-way land between the two tracks. Both Shorewood and Whitefish Bay desired the removal of these excess tracks and the acquisition of the rights-of-way for development. This was accomplished in 1927 and tracks were removed by 1929. It was announced that this newly available land would be platted and a lively discussion took place about the type of housing citizens wanted built there. Some

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 51-53.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 53-55.

¹² *Ibid.*, 60.

developers had advocated more apartment buildings, but many citizens feared an increase in apartment buildings would attract less desirable residents and lower the well-to-do ambience of Shorewood. The Great Depression of the 1930s intervened and over the next 10 years, most of the area was filled in with single-family homes. Only in the 1940s did apartment buildings get built in the area, and then only in the immediate area along Wilson Drive.¹³

The decade before the Great Depression of the 1930s saw the almost complete development of Shorewood into a well-to-do suburb of Milwaukee. Along with this development came institutions necessary to serve a large residential population. One of the important institutions was local government. At this time, suburban development was relatively new and citizens struggled with the issue of autonomy. Shorewood, having been incorporated as East Milwaukee, already had a village government structure in place, but as the closest suburb to the city of Milwaukee, it was dependent on many Milwaukee services. Over the years during the mid-twentieth century, Shorewood was also a target of Milwaukee's desire to annex suburban areas to the city.¹⁴

One of the ways that communities were annexed into larger cities was by popular demand. In 1928, a citizen group intensively lobbied for village annexation into Milwaukee and offered a slate of candidates for the village board who were in favor of this action. However, these candidates were defeated and Shorewood's citizens remained solidly in favor of independence from Milwaukee. Despite the community's growth into numbers that would qualify it for a city form of government, Shorewood retained its village status.¹⁵

A large residential population demanded a school system and in a relatively short period of time, Shorewood developed one of the most progressive school systems in Wisconsin. Small, rural schools served the tiny population of Shorewood until 1900. By 1908, it was clear a larger, more formal school was needed and a building was constructed to serve this need. Due to the rapid population growth of the 1910s and 1920s, though, this school was obsolete in only seven years and was altered into the village hall after 1915, when a large, modern school was built along East Capitol Drive, also known as Atwater Road. The school was named the Atwater School and originally had 11 rooms, but was doubled in size a few years later. Development of the north side of Shorewood resulted in another modern school, the Lake Bluff School, built in 1924, but enlarged twice in the late 1920s and 1930s.¹⁶

By the mid-1920s, there was an obvious need for a large high school building and in 1925, a building was completed. But, this was just the beginning of a notable scheme to develop a progressive educational complex, with separate buildings for different subject areas rather than one large structure. During the 1920s and 1930s, the campus of Shorewood High School took shape with the construction of a gymnasium, a manual arts building, a science building, and a separate auditorium and arts building meant to be used by the entire community. The original

¹³ *Ibid.*, 60-61.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 63.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 63-68.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 68-71.

building became an administration building and the concept of a high school campus has served the community for decades.¹⁷

The high school complex was also the site for the development of another progressive education idea, the Opportunity School for Adults. This program offered evening classes in broad areas including art appreciation, literature, languages, gardening, sewing, home economics, music, and social studies. The Opportunity School was an innovative program in adult education and advanced not only community knowledge and skills, but community unity.¹⁸

In any community, churches served as an important social outlet as well as providing for religious expression. Several major Christian denominations established churches in Shorewood. Catholics were well-represented in the community and developed St. Robert Church into a complex that contained an elementary school, convent, and distinctive church building between 1910 and 1940. The largest Lutheran congregation built the Luther Memorial Chapel, and a smaller Lutheran congregation established the Kingo Lutheran Church, as well. The other Protestant denomination established in Shorewood was the Shorewood Presbyterian Church.¹⁹

During the 1910s and 1920s, Shorewood did not develop industries, but, to serve residents in the new community, retail businesses were established. Most of these businesses were small, as it appeared that Shorewood residents largely patronized the professional offices, large department stores, and specialty businesses of downtown Milwaukee. However, a small commercial center did emerge along North Oakland Avenue and East Capitol Drive. Beginning at this intersection, and extending several blocks in each direction, retail buildings were constructed that were suitable for small businesses. Taking a cue from the residential construction of the community, these buildings were primarily built in the popular Mediterranean Revival architectural style. A few buildings were constructed in a less decorative Twentieth Century Commercial style, and one large combination commercial-apartment building was constructed in the Art Deco style. Many of the commercial buildings had extensive apartment space above commercial space and blended in with the large apartment buildings constructed primarily along East Capitol Drive and North Oakland Avenue during the 1920s and early 1930s.²⁰

Shorewood's community recreational activities also developed during the 1920s and 1930s, particularly at two village parks, Hubbard and Atwater. Located along the Milwaukee River, Hubbard park had been the site of early leisure and amusement parks in the community. During the 1930s, the village used federal government funding under its Works Progress Administration, a works program of the Great Depression, to improve this park and erect a set of rustic style facilities. Also located along the Milwaukee River in the northwestern part of Shorewood is Estabrook Park, a Milwaukee County Park available for use by Shorewood's residents. Originally, Shorewood Park and Bathing Beach (Atwater Park), at the head of East Capitol Drive, was a popular location for residents and included a fine bath house. However, the bath house was demolished in 1987. Hubbard and Atwater Parks are used extensively today.²¹

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 72-73.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 74-75.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 81-87.

²⁰ Information from results of this survey.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 87-95.

In 1939, Shorewood's population was around 15,000, almost all of whom entered the community during the 1910s and 1920s. Despite the economic depression of the 1930s, Shorewood was still an affluent community with subdivisions of middle-class to wealthy families and a very attractive appearance. In fact, at that time, Shorewood was ranked as the state's wealthiest village in terms of assessed valuation of property. The population was described in the 1939 guidebook, *Shorewood*, as well-to-do business and professional people; doctors and lawyers, large retailers and industrialists who do most of their business in Milwaukee. These largely business and professional people developed a system of good schools and small government, and despite the economic crisis of the 1930s, lived in a largely stable community where unemployment was lower than in other parts of Milwaukee County.²²

Despite the relative affluence in Shorewood during the 1930s, the village government made good use of federal work program money to make village improvements. The village government began hiring unemployed workers as early as December of 1930 to improve storm sewers and combat lake erosion. When the New Deal programs became available, Shorewood came up with dozens of projects to use this money, many of which included hiring large crews of non-residents. These programs resulted in more utility improvements, better park facilities, and recreational buildings.²³

It is often thought that housing construction stopped during the economic depression of the 1930s and the war years of the 1940s, but in many communities, some construction continued during these difficult years. In particular, in Shorewood, the northwestern area of the village, where the land was only obtained from the railroad in the late 1920s, saw some construction activity during the 1930s. Several local builders were responsible for the construction of much of the housing in this area during the 1930s. The houses, although generally smaller, still reflected the historic styles seen in the other parts of the village and appealed to middle-class families fortunate enough to have good employment during this decade.

By 1940, almost all land in the village was built on, so building development slowed. During the World War II years of 1942-1945, there were shortages of materials, so like the 1930s, when bad economic times resulted in fewer housing starts, there were fewer buildings constructed due to restrictions on materials. One exception was the construction of a large group of small apartment houses built between 1943 and 1947 along North Wilson Drive. These buildings have interesting stone veneer exteriors and little decoration, suggesting they were constructed, perhaps, of recycled materials or materials not necessary for the war effort. These buildings are the only significant construction in Shorewood during the war years.

After World War II ended there was a severe housing shortage brought on by the reduced rate of construction of housing during the 1930s and the early 1940s and the return of veterans, most of whom were eager to marry and have families. Of particular need were housing units these families. In Shorewood, only the area along North Wilson Drive was still available for building and two large developments continued the construction of apartment buildings along this street. The most prestigious was the Estabrook Homes, built from 1947 to 1949. These apartment

²² *Ibid.*, 11-14, 57-59.

²³ *Ibid.*, 66-67.

homes were built specifically for young veteran families. They all had spacious two-bedroom floor plans with modern appliances. Their appearance was Colonial Revival, again fitting in well with the overall architectural appearance in the community.

At the southern end of Wilson Drive another development, Ardmore Terrace, was built in 1949. Not as elaborate in size or scale as Estabrook Homes, Ardmore Terrace was another complex of apartment buildings in the Colonial Revival style.

In 1940, the population of Shorewood was slightly over 15,000. It increased to around 16,000 between 1940 and 1960, primarily due to the baby boom era. In a 1961 report, it was noted that Shorewood had little developable land after 1940 and that even Whitefish Bay was almost completely developed. Areas in Glendale, River Hills, Fox Point, and Brown Deer were now being quickly filled in with development. The report noted that these suburbs, including Shorewood, were considered prestigious suburbs and that many of the wealthiest families continued to move north into newer luxury subdivisions. The report also noted that the City of Milwaukee had grown up to the west of the east lakeshore suburbs.²⁴

The report for 1961 presents some interesting statistics that reflect the mature village. Of the almost 3,500 buildings in Shorewood, around 2,500 were single-family homes. Two-family houses were less than 900 and multi-family units were only 140 in number. Written in a period where most new development consisted of ranch-style houses on much wider lots, the report indicated that density was fairly high in Shorewood. The conclusion of the report was that now that Shorewood was a mature community with older buildings, it was imperative for the community to retain those factors that contributed to high property values to protect the desirability of the village.²⁵

And, for the rest of the twentieth century, Shorewood was a community that retained the factors that have made it a desirable place to live. A report by the League of Women Voters in 1978 called Shorewood, "stable and mature," with a location that was a major asset. The population of Shorewood had decreased to around 14,000, again probably due to the effect of the baby boom population coming of age. Population density was reported as a 2.2 average number of people per dwelling. Although not listed as having the highest income in the Milwaukee metropolitan area, Shorewood families still ranked high in income statistics. At that time, as well, property values were high in comparison to other communities. These statistics well illustrate the stable and mature community that was Shorewood in 1978.²⁶

Only a few significant physical changes were made in Shorewood between 1961 and 1978. One of these was the construction of the Shorewood Intermediate School on the campus of the Shorewood High School. This building was constructed to house seventh and eighth graders and

²⁴ Roy Wenzlick & Co., *Shorewood, Wisconsin Under a Microscope* (Report prepared for the Village of Shorewood, 1961) 11.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 24.

²⁶ League of Women Voters of the North Shore, *Profile of Shorewood Wisconsin* (Report published by the League of Women Voters of the North Shore, 1978), 8-10.

like the notable school architecture of the past, this building was given an innovative design, a circle, and was multi-story, unusual for the period of typical one-story school construction.²⁷

The other change was in the development of a large-scale housing project. Located at the far southwest corner of the village, the housing development was built on land that had been used for streetcar and bus facilities. These facilities were closed in 1968 and Shorewood purchased the land with assistance from a federal grant. The housing project was specifically designed to provide elderly housing, particularly affordable housing for the area's growing elderly population. Additional federal grants allowed for the construction of the two-building complex in 1976 and 1978 that was given the name "River Park."²⁸

"Urban Renewal" was popular in most communities during the post-World War II era and most communities in some sort of urban renewal project, generally in downtown areas. In Shorewood, this type of development occurred in the business district at North Oakland Avenue and East Capitol Drive. Between 1968 and 1972, what was thought to be a nearby area of substandard homes was purchased and cleared by the village. In 1974, a large multi-story bank building was constructed on the corner and some modern apartment buildings were also constructed nearby. Fortunately, little more in Shorewood has been found to be "substandard" and cleared for new construction. In general, most of what has been constructed in Shorewood's business district in recent decades has typical of modern construction.²⁹

In the last few decades, Shorewood has remained largely the stable community described above. What remains distinctive about Shorewood is the continued high quality of residential maintenance in the village, with a much smaller percentage of inappropriate remodeling than seen in other metropolitan Milwaukee areas. This gives Shorewood an historic ambience that continues to draw residents who are interested in maintaining the north shore suburban lifestyle that began back in the early twentieth century. It is still an enclave of wealthy families with homes along or close to the lakeshore, but it is also a middle-class community that appreciates the older homes, good schools, and convenience that living in Shorewood offers.

The business district along Oakland Avenue and Capitol Drive is also active, and in 2010-11, a major reconstruction of East Capitol Drive, a very busy thoroughfare, resulted in traffic amenities in the business district meant to slow down drivers for better safety, but also to make this area more attractive for businesses and pedestrians.

Today, residents in Shorewood continue to successfully meet the challenges of living in an older community. Aging housing stock and the pressures of a nearby university campus and its students often present issues needing solutions. Like the report from 1961 stated, if Shorewood is to retain its high property values and desirability as a residential community, it must continue to promote the factors that give it those qualities. One of these factors is historic preservation, which can be used as a tool to promote better neighborhoods and a stable community. It is hoped that this report contributes to the preservation of Shorewood's unique historic character and its reputation as one of Milwaukee's best suburbs.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 30.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 42-43.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 43.

CHAPTER THREE

ARCHITECTURE

INTRODUCTION

Shorewood developed as a well-to-do residential suburb during a short period of time and its historic architectural resources reflect this fact. Most of the resources in Shorewood are single-family homes. These homes reflect popular architectural styles from the period when the village developed, roughly 1910-1940, with the bulk of the buildings dating to the 1920s. The "luxury" apartment buildings constructed in Shorewood also reflect the general architectural styles of the community, as well as most of the historic commercial buildings.

Shorewood's neighborhoods were developed primarily for middle-class to wealthy families and almost all of the homes reflect architectural styles; in other words there are few buildings that could be categorized as vernacular forms rather than architectural styles. Even houses constructed primarily during the 1930s, when economic conditions were poor and houses were smaller than those built during the 1920s, were built with stylistic details, albeit in a stripped-down manner.

Many of Shorewood's neighborhoods were built with houses that are good examples of popular architectural styles. And, Shorewood's historic buildings have, in general, been well maintained and historic neighborhoods are largely intact. These two important factors effected the results of the survey. First, most of the village's significant historic resources can be included in very large historic districts. If there were large areas of less distinctive architecture or historic integrity loss, i.e., inappropriate remodeling, lack of maintenance, or modern intrusions, there would be smaller and fewer districts identified in the village. The high quality of Shorewood's architectural resources resulted in the identification of these large historic districts.

The second result of Shorewood's high quality of architecture and high level of historic character is that the standards for determining buildings that are potentially individually eligible for the National Register are also high. While large areas of the village are included in the above-mentioned potentially eligible historic districts, there are some areas of the village that have a slightly lesser quality of architecture and/or historic integrity that were not included in potential historic districts. In other communities, these neighborhoods might be potentially eligible as historic districts, but resources are evaluated within the local context, and in Shorewood, that context sets a high standard.

Also, individually eligible National Register properties, most of which are included in the potential historic districts, were also much fewer than might be found in other communities with so many fine examples of popular early twentieth century architectural styles. The architectural distinctiveness of Shorewood is not so much in its individual buildings, but in its intact historic neighborhoods, where numerous streets of high-quality Period Revival, Prairie, Craftsman, and Bungalow styled houses sit side-by-side, each one a good example of its style, but more importantly, each one adding to the overall historic character of the neighborhood.



The following review of Shorewood's historic architecture will showcase those individual buildings that are architecturally significant, but will also discuss how the individual styles can be evaluated as a group, from the most elaborate examples to the most simple. Much of the chapter will focus on houses, but other sections will discuss the distinctive architecture of apartment buildings, commercial buildings, public buildings, churches, and schools, most of which add to the overall high architectural quality of the village.

RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE

Houses

The discussion of architecture as it relates to houses will be done by looking at each popular architectural style seen in Shorewood. Although there are a few houses identified in the survey that suggest earlier styles, none of these buildings are potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, although if in an identified historic district, they are contributing. The architectural review will begin with styles popular beginning after 1900, when the vast majority of buildings in Shorewood were constructed.

There is one exception and that is the Benjamin Church House, also known as the Kilbourntown House, located in Estabrook Park. Built in 1844, it was moved to the park in 1939. It is a Milwaukee County Landmark and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. It is a fine example of a pioneer-era frame house with distinctive Greek Revival characteristics. It is currently being maintained and preserved by the Milwaukee County park system.

Period Revival Styles

The term "Period Revival" can be used to group together a number of historic styles popular during the first four decades of the twentieth century. Many styles and sub-styles can be included within this grouping and communities with a large number of these styles usually have examples that are as varied as the architect, builder, or original owner desired. Some period revival style examples closely mimic the original historic style, while others are wide interpretations of these styles.

In Shorewood, the latter is very evident. A number of high quality architects and builders worked in Shorewood and used their talents to create many, many interpretations of these popular styles. And, where there are many interpretations, there is much cross-over, particularly in the larger homes of the proposed North and South Lakeshore Historic Districts. Some large houses appear to be a mix between the Georgian and Mediterranean Revival or Italian Renaissance Revival styles. Tudor Revival houses often have elements that suggest the Norman or French Revival styles. Prior to the more specific delineation of revival styles into Georgian, Tudor, Mediterranean, and the like, a term known as "Eclectic Revival," was sometimes used to describe houses with historic revival details. In the case of Shorewood, this term could still be used to describe some of the more distinctive variations identified in this survey effort.

Georgian Revival

The Georgian Revival style borrows from the classical forms of the original Georgian style and the Federal style of the early 1800s. The style reflected America's interest in the early years of the United States and the classicism that became popular after the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893, an event that featured large, white-painted, classically-decorated exhibition buildings. The main hallmarks of the Georgian Revival style are formal, symmetrical facades, rectangular plans, and hipped roofs. Elaborate classical decoration of denticulated cornices, elliptical fanlights, sidelights, Palladian windows, broken pediments, and classical columns or pilasters. The Georgian Revival style also emphasized the main entrance by the use of large frontispieces or porticos.¹

There are several Georgian Revival houses in Shorewood that are potentially individually eligible for the National Register. One has been designated a Milwaukee County Landmark and is the finest example of the style in the village. It is also a contributing building in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District. This house is the Frederick Vogel house (3510 N. Lake Dr.), designed by Walter Judell & Harry Bogner. Vogel was an owner of the Pfister and Vogel Tannery, one of Milwaukee's large industries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The mansion-sized Vogel house, built in 1922-23, is an excellent example of the Georgian Revival style because its formal and symmetrical form and massing, its abundance of classical details such as prominent denticulated cornices and full pediments, and its elaborate limestone frontispiece decorated with an arched pediment, entablature, and pilasters. Its matching garage is larger than many houses in Shorewood and has similar details, including the denticulated cornices, pediments, and returned eaves. Both buildings have outstanding red brick construction with brick corbelled corner "quoins" that create an even more formal, classical appearance.

Contributing in the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District and also potentially individually eligible for the National Register are two other mansion-sized Georgian Revival homes. Similar to the Vogel house is the house at 4424 N. Lake Dr. with its red brick construction and formal, symmetrical form and massing. Its cornice features classical modillions and the main entrance is accented with a two-story limestone frontispiece that features a full pediment, a Palladian-like second story opening, and an entrance heavily accented with a limestone arch of massive voussoirs. Designed by architect Herman Buehning and built in 1917, the house has a high level of integrity.

The Claude Beebe House at 4470 N. Lake Dr., built in 1928, has a slightly different interpretation of the Georgian Revival style. This mansion has the formal plan of the style, but is not as elaborately decorated as the two previous examples. However, it is a fine example of a Georgian Revival house with a pronounced main entry featuring a portico. The main entrance is in a two-story shallow entry pavilion that features a large Palladian window on the second story over a round portico with large columns. Because it is a fine example of the style, it is potentially individually eligible for the National Register and contributes to the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District.

¹ Barbara Wyatt, ed., *Cultural Resources Management in Wisconsin, Vol. 2* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1986), Architecture, 2-28.

Another large mansion home is the residence at 2609 E. Olive St., contributing in the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District and potentially individually eligible for the National Register. This home, built prior to 1922, has the formal red brick form and massing of the Georgian Revival style with a modillion-accented cornice that adds classical detail. The round-arched dormers are of particular interest on this house, as is the main entrance with the stone frontispiece that features a scroll pediment, pilasters, and a decorative swag.

There are two contributing houses in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District that are smaller than the houses described above, but are still potentially individually eligible for the National Register as examples of the Georgian Revival style. The first is the Charles Davidson House, built in 1922 at 3631 N. Hackett Ave. The house has a large rectangular plan with a massive hip roof. Its red brick walls and symmetrical openings give it the formal appearance seen in the style. Of particular note are the first floor multi-light windows with heavy lintels and the entrance with a transom and sidelights. The house is dominated by a massive portico that has a large clapboard-clad pediment accented with an oculus window and supported by colossal columns. This portico makes this example of the style distinctive and important.

The second house was built at 2706 E. Beverly Rd. for Arthur C. Best in 1928. It has the rectangular, formal plan and massing with hip roof that is typical of the style, along with the cornices accented with modillions. What is distinctive about this house is the white-painted stucco exterior with corner quoins. The round-arched main entrance is accented with a fine portico with two columns under a wrought-iron balcony. The sun-room ell has distinctive round-arched Palladian windows, as well. Overall, this house shows a different, yet well-executed variation of the style.

There are dozens of examples of Georgian Revival houses in Shorewood, and in particular, some very good examples are common in the proposed North and South Lakeshore Historic Districts. While these examples are not potentially individually eligible for the National Register, they contribute to the overall architectural significance of these proposed districts. The following examples are typical of the contributing Georgian Revival houses in these districts and illustrate the high-quality of most of these designs.

A highly symmetrical and formal plan and massing are hallmarks of the Georgian Revival style. And, where the examples are medium to small in size and less elaborately detailed, it is important that they are well-proportioned if they are to be considered as good examples of the style. Six houses in the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District are, above all, well proportioned examples of the style and while they are not potentially individually eligible for the National Register, they add to the architectural significance of their historic district.

The Georgian Revival residence at 4049 N. Lake Dr. has the important symmetrical fenestration of multi-light windows, pedimented dormers, and pedimented portico that make it a good example of the style. Similar features are found on the house at 2630 E. Capitol Dr. The windows of the first house are more distinctive, but the addition of the modillions on the cornice and brick corbelled corner quoins add their own distinctive appearance to the second house.

And, the portico on the example at 2630 E. Capitol Dr. is more elegant with its heavy entablature, pediment, and columns.

The distinctive features of the William Kaumheimer House at 4025 N. Lake Dr. is the unusual white stucco covering on the main elevation. It contrasts heavily with the red brick walls of the rest of the house. The red brick round-arched reveals over first story windows are also distinctive, as is the flat-roofed sun room, also with round-arched reveals.

Most small to medium-sized Georgian Revival houses in Shorewood, no matter where they are located, have a basic rectangular plan and red brick walls. Their form and massing is symmetrical and they have distinctive porticos or frontispieces usually decorating central entrances. Two houses exemplify this version of the style. The house at 2601 E. Olive St. has these details and a decorative portico with columns and a denticulated cornice. The house 2619 E. Wood Place is a bit more square in its form, but features a distinctive sunroom with a wooden balcony that surrounds the flat roof and a smaller portico with returned eaves. Both houses feature entrances with transoms and sidelights.

The last example (4464 N. Prospect Ave.) from the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District is even more simple. Its features include primarily symmetrical fenestration of multi-light sashes and a central entry with a frontispiece consisting of a pediment, entablature, and pilasters. Many houses in this district, and throughout Shorewood, illustrate the Georgian Revival style primarily in these simple, but distinctive details.

In the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District, the contributing Georgian Revival houses have similar details to those described above. But, the better examples have some distinctive variations. For example, the house at 3528 N. Hackett Ave. is a large painted brick building with the typical symmetrical form and massing and hip roof of the style. The paired multi-light windows are the building's most distinctive detail, but the central entrance is accented with a fine elliptically-arched broken pediment, an urn finial, and heavy pilasters that adds to the building's classical motifs.

A more typical variation of the style is the house at 3957 N. Lake Dr., with its red brick exterior, brick corbelled corner quoins, symmetrical form and massing, and denticulated cornice. The windows of the first story are an unusual tripartite form, more common on Classical Revival apartment buildings, but the dormers with returned eaves and the portico with denticulated cornice and Ionic columns are common features of the Georgian Revival style.

The example at 2710 E. Newton Ave., built by George Schley & Sons in 1922 has a fairly plain façade with less distinctive windows than the other examples described above. But it has a round portico with columns, a detail that is often seen on houses of this style, but not typical in Shorewood, whose builders seemed to favor rectangular porticos and frontispieces.

The proposed Downer West Historic District contains primarily examples of the Craftsman and related styles, like the Bungalow and Prairie Style. But, its proximity to the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District means that several of the houses were also built in the Georgian Revival style. The houses tend to be small to medium-sized examples and none are potentially

individually eligible for the National Register. However, they do add to the over architectural significance of the proposed district.

One of the best examples of the Georgian Revival style houses in the proposed Downer West Historic District is at 2501 E. Newton Ave., a pre-1922 example. Its distinctive appearance is the result of a well-proportioned design with symmetrical fenestration, red brick walls, pedimented dormers, and a frontispiece with an elliptically-arched pediment and columns. The scale of the details on this house are perfectly matched to its size and although it is not a Craftsman design, it adds to the architectural quality of the proposed district.

Finally, two houses in the proposed Ardmore Avenue Historic District represent how the Georgian Revival style could be used to decorate what are primarily simple square houses. These houses date from 1936 and 1939 and are typical of the less elaborate period revival houses built during this time for largely middle-class families. While the period revival styles were still very popular in the 1930s, the poor economy resulted in smaller, less decorative houses. Yet, middle class families still wanted style and the Ardmore Avenue Historic District is filled with houses from the 1930s that reflect how builders met this challenge with houses that still reflected the larger, more elaborate historic styles seen elsewhere in the village.

The two examples of the Georgian Revival style are at 4444 and 4480 N. Ardmore Ave. and are nearly identical. Their main style details are in the houses' formal and symmetrical form and massing and their frontispieces with broken scroll pediments, urn finials, and pilasters. They are not individually eligible for the National Register but add to the architectural significance of the proposed district.

Colonial Revival

The Colonial Revival style is related to the Georgian Revival style in that examples usually include many of the same classical elements, but in a less formal, less decorative manner. The Colonial Revival style was the earliest of the revivals to become popular after 1900, and it has also been one of the most long-lived styles. When other revival styles faded after 1950, the Colonial Revival style remained a very popular housing style during the 1950s and 1960s. Hallmarks of the style include clapboard or wood shingle walls and symmetrical fenestration of multi-light sash windows that are accented by shutters, pilasters, and returned eaves.²

In Shorewood the most formal, classically-derived revival houses relate to the Georgian Revival and Mediterranean/Italian Renaissance Revival styles. As such, there are no significant individual examples of this style. However, throughout the village, there are many good and well-preserved examples, many of which contribute to the architectural significance of potential historic districts.

Three of the best examples of Colonial Revival style houses are contributing to the architectural significance of the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District. The houses at 2114 E. Kensington Blvd. and 4410 N. Prospect Ave., built in 1926 and 1927 respectively, are almost

² *Ibid.*, 2-29.

identical. They have rectangular plans with gable roofs and are both clad with wood shingles. Fenestration on both houses is symmetrical with multi-light windows decorated with shutters. Central entrances are accented by arched transoms with fanlights and frontispieces with returned eaves and pilasters. The house on Kensington has a frontispiece that is a bit more formal with dentil decoration and fluted pilasters with Corinthian capitals.

Slightly smaller is the house at 4477 N. Prospect Ave., built in 1927. It has the same plan, wood shingles, and symmetrical fenestration as the above examples, but is slightly smaller. Its frontispiece features a broken scroll pediment with pilasters. It also contributes to the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District. In the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District, the house at 2634 E. Newton Ave. is a similar example done with a light brick veneer. The light bricks give the house a less formal appearance and the bulk of the details are in the symmetrical fenestration of multi-light windows with shutters. The round arched entrance is accented by a small portico with modillions that is supported by Ionic columns. The house was built by popular builder George Schley & Sons in 1930 and while not individually eligible for the National Register, it contributes to the architectural significance of the district.

Like the Georgian Revival style, the Colonial Revival style is also seen in smaller houses throughout Shorewood, but most prominently in the proposed Ardmore Avenue Historic District. This district of houses primarily from the 1930s has many small, less elaborate examples of the popular architectural styles seen in the proposed North and South Lakeshore Historic Districts. Again, these houses are not individually eligible for the National Register, but do add to the overall architectural significance of the proposed Ardmore Avenue Historic District.

Two almost identical designs represent a house type that is frequently seen in the proposed Ardmore Avenue Historic District. These houses at 4248 and 4476 N. Ardmore Ave. were built in 1927 and 1931 and have simple rectangular plans, brick walls, symmetrical fenestration of multi-light openings and off-set entrances. One house features a simple classical frontispiece, while the other has a simple portico with narrow columns. Even though they are small, they are well-proportioned houses with high levels of historic character.

A similar small Colonial Revival house in the Ardmore district, 4240 N. Ardmore Ave. is also typical of the colonial style houses that have wide clapboard siding. This type of siding is early for 1927, when this house was built, but became pervasive during the 1930s into the 1950s, especially on houses with colonial mannerisms. Like the above houses, it has a rectangular plan, symmetrical fenestration, and an off-set entrance with hip-roof portico supported by heavy square posts. A later example of a simple Colonial Revival house is at 4304 N. Ardmore Ave., built in 1942. Stone veneer was a popular building material for large revival houses in the earlier twentieth century, but it became very popular in the mid-twentieth century for small houses as well. Often called "lannon stone" for the area around Lannon, Wisconsin, where much of this limestone veneer came from, this material gives this small colonial house a distinctive appearance. Its rectangular plan, symmetrical fenestration and off-set entrance are typical of most other variations of this style in this proposed district, but the use of the large bay window suggests a trend that would appear more frequently in post-World War II examples of Colonial Revival houses. Both of these houses contribute to the architectural significance of the proposed

Ardmore Avenue Historic District as good examples of how the Colonial Revival style was used in simple houses to make them stylistic and reflect the overall appearance of the community.

Two houses that contribute to the architectural significance in the proposed Ardmore district represent another simple variation of the Colonial Revival style. The house at 4212 N. Ardmore Ave. was constructed in 1926, while the house at 4470 Ardmore Ave. was built in 1937, yet they both represent a style variation called the "Cape Cod." A popular style of the 1930s through the 1950s, this small colonial-appointed house was economical while giving homeowners maximum flexibility. These one and one-half story houses have the typical Cape Cod features of steeply-pitched gable roofs, dormers, and symmetrical fenestration popular to this house type. These small houses were very popular for the rapid post-World War II construction boom, as they often had plans with one to two bedrooms on the first story with an uncompleted second or attic story that could be expanded as a family grew. But, as seen in this district, the style had its beginnings in the Colonial Revival popularity of the 1920s and 1930s.

Dutch Colonial Revival

The Dutch Colonial Revival style is related to both the Georgian and Colonial Revival styles. Most examples of the Dutch Colonial Revival style have very similar details to these styles, but the defining element is always the use of the Gambrel roof, usually with a wide, continuous dormer. The style is seen with brick, clapboard, wood shingle, and stone walls and was a very popular variation of the classical-based revival styles.³

Like the Colonial Revival style, there are no Dutch Colonial Revival houses that are individually eligible for the National Register, but they add to the overall architectural significance of proposed historic districts. In the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District, the house at 4091 N. Lake Dr. is a good example of the style with two large distinctive multi-light window bands filling up most of the main elevation. The entrance is formal, with a sidelights and a transom recessed behind pairs of heavy columns. The typical Dutch Colonial details are shown in the gambrel roof and wide dormer. In the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District, an identical house sits at 2727 E. Shorewood Blvd. Both built around 1925, they well represent this style in their proposed districts.

Also in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District is a less elaborate example at 2637 E. Shorewood Blvd.. It has the same details as the houses above, but lacks the large windows on the main elevation. It has a formal entrance with portico that features returned eaves, an entablature, and columns along with a fanlight transom over the main entrance.

One of the more distinctive examples of this style is in the proposed Downer West Historic District. This house, built in 1913, sits at 2401 E. Newton Ave. and presents its gambrel side as its main elevation. The house has unusual lap siding, but also the typical gambrel roof and wide dormers. There is a small porch at the corner of the main elevation that features a heavy column, and two smaller columns support a small portico over the entrance at the other corner of the main elevation. In between is a large bay window. This interesting interpretation of the style is not

³ *Ibid.*

individually eligible for the National Register, but adds to the architectural significance of the proposed district.

Like the other period revival styles, small versions of the Colonial Revival style were built elsewhere in Shorewood, especially in the proposed Ardmore Avenue Historic District. An example from 1935 at 4254 N. Ardmore Ave. shows how the gambrel roof, wide dormers and simple classical features of the style could be used to accent a small home. This and other similar examples contribute to the architectural significance of the district.

Tudor Revival

The Tudor Revival styles was one of the most popular of the revival styles and was based on historic English architecture. One of the common details of the Tudor Revival style is ornamental half-timbering that is made with applied vertical, horizontal, or diagonal boards placed over stucco or other materials to suggest the structural half-timbering of historic English houses. Houses of this style also commonly were faced with brick or stone and often this material was used on the lower levels, while the ornamental half-timbering was applied to the upper levels. There are usually some grouped casement windows with leaded glass, often in a diamond pattern. These windows sometimes make up large window banks that are then elaborately trimmed with stone. Simpler examples of the style often have multiple-light sash windows set in groups. Some large examples of the Tudor Revival style have almost all stone exteriors and "castle-like" details such as towers and bays with battlements and other heavy ornamentation. Small variations of the style can include scaled-down versions of these style elements, or can be cottage-like, sometimes with asphalt shingles that are rolled over the roof edges in a thatched roof effect. These houses are sometimes known as "Cotswold Cottages."⁴

Because there were so many Tudor Revival style houses that were identified in the survey, a very high standard was set for those resources that could be determined potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Fortunately, the vast majority of high-quality examples of the style are located within the proposed North and South Lakeshore Historic Districts and are architecturally contributing to districts. But, there are several distinctive Tudor Revival houses that merit mention as potentially individually eligible for the National Register. Except for one house, they are all in the proposed North or South Lakeshore Historic Districts.

One of the most outstanding of the Tudor Revival mansions along Lake Drive (4430 N. Lake Dr.) in Shorewood is the Walter Harnischfeger house, designed by the noted Milwaukee architectural firm of Eschweiler & Eschweiler and built in 1926. The sprawling house has all the typical Tudor Revival details, including a largely brick first story with ornamental half-timbering on the second story. The main entrance is "castle-like" with stone buttresses and a stone arch decorating the round-arched wooden door. The windows are grouped, with a large window bank on the first story that features transoms and stone decoration. A fine home designed by a fine architectural firm makes this house potentially individually eligible for the National Register.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2-30.

Another sprawling mansion is the house at 4496 N. Lake Dr., built in 1929. It, too is a combination of brick veneer, in this case a light brown color, and ornamental half-timbering. Large, multi-light, grouped windows add to the Tudor Revival style, as does a massive chimney on the main elevation. Three other houses in the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District are potentially individually eligible for the National Register. All built prior to 1922, they have primarily red brick exteriors with little or no ornamental half-timbering. The house at 4447 N. Lake Dr. has a bit of half-timbering in a side ell, but the style is seen mainly in the grouped leaded glass windows and stone trim. A distinctive feature of this house is the combination entry pavilion and portico in front of the main entrance. The upper level is enclosed and accented with a decorative window band, while the open lower level features elaborate stone trim around arched openings.

The house at 4232 N. Lake Dr. has no obvious half-timbering and is dominated by stone trim that includes tabbed window surrounds, carved stone panels and a Tudor-arched entrance accented with stone tabs and a stepped stone arch. The windows are a significant design feature and are all grouped on the main elevation. Of various sizes, the windows are leaded glass casements or multi-light sashes. The red brick mansion at 4400 N. Lake Dr. expresses its Tudor details in castle-like form and massing, its large hip roof with slate tiles, and a two-story tower with a second story half-timbered effect.

The four houses described above are all distinctive and illustrate variations of the Tudor Revival style. Because of their size, high level of integrity, and overall fine design, they are potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. There are 10 houses in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District that are also potentially individually eligible for the National Register. Like the houses listed above, they have distinctive Tudor Revival designs that make them stand out even in the rich architectural character of Shorewood.

One of these notable designs is the house at 3590 N. Lake Dr., designed by the firm of Eschweiler & Eschweiler and built in 1922-23. The mansion-sized house is an unusual variation of the style. Its steeply pitched roof covered with slate tiles and leaded glass windows are often seen in Tudor Revival houses, but the overall form and massing and stone veneer exterior with little additional heavy stone detailing, bays, or half-timbering is unusual and seems an almost "modern" interpretation of the style. The separate large garage, with its half-timbering, dormer and clipped gable seems to reflect more traditional Tudor Revival details. In any event, this house is a notable design by a master architectural firm and is distinctive in Shorewood.

An almost completely stone veneer covered Tudor Revival house sits nearby at 3575 N. Lake Dr., built in 1929. It has a much more conventional Tudor Revival form with a two-story "castle-like" bay and large sets of leaded glass windows. Massive chimneys dominate the two side elevations and there is some half-timbering over brick veneer over the garage wing in the back of the house. It is primarily distinctive for its overall form and massing and its design that attempts to be a variation on an English castle.

A Tudor Revival interpretation that seemingly has all the correct elements is the Harry S. Johnston House at 3515 N. Lake Drive, built in 1927 and designed by Richard Philipp, a noted Wisconsin architect. The mansion has stone veneer and smooth stone wall surfaces, a castle-like

bay and oriel, massive chimney with large pots, brick and stucco surfaces with half-timbering, and grouped casements with leaded glass windows. Richard Philipp is considered a master architect and this is one of his fine designs.

A lesser known architect, Thomas Van Alyea, was responsible for many well-executed Period Revival houses in Shorewood, and the example at 3701 N. Lake Dr. is one of his finest designs. It is a classic variation of the Tudor Revival style with brown brick walls heavily accented with rough and smooth stone including tabbed window surrounds, corner quoins, and lintels. Two fine two-story castle-like bays project from the house, one used as a main entry pavilion. This bay is more elaborately accented with stone and features two massive twisted rope pilasters with finials flanking the main entrance. Half-timbering over stucco is used on the back ell of the house as an accent, adding more Tudor detailing to the design. The most decorative windows are grouped casements with leaded glass and transoms. This is a very well executed and high quality Tudor mansion that is potentially individually eligible for the National Register.

A somewhat similar, but less decorative design at 2621 E. Menlo Blvd. is also potentially individually eligible. Of darker red brick, this rambling mansion also features much of its detail in stone accents, including unusual irregular tabbed window surrounds and corner quoins. There are grouped casements of leaded glass and a small bay, but the distinctive feature of the house is the round tower entry pavilion, a castle-like detail with two fine arched leaded glass windows and a round-arched entry door with an irregular tabbed stone surround. The round tower also suggests a Norman Revival detail, but the overall effect is Tudor.

Two houses (3565 N. Lake Dr., 1927-28 and 3823 N. Lake Dr., 1929-30) that were built by prolific builder George Schley and Sons also use a tower in their designs and their overall form and massing is also suggestive of the Norman Revival. As indicated in the introduction, many large houses in Shorewood have mixed style elements that could be termed "eclectic." George Schley's son Perce was known to have designed for his father's building company and the influence of a single designer can be seen in these two examples of the firm's work. Both houses have brown brick exteriors and generally rectangular forms with projecting ells and towers that are also entry pavilions. Massive chimneys, grouped windows, some with transoms are scattered throughout, but primarily on first stories. Stone trim and elliptical arches are used in both designs in a similar manner. The house at 3823 N. Lake Dr. has a small amount of half-timbering, almost hidden, as an added detail and both houses have a high level of integrity and elegance that befit their potential eligibility for the National Register.

A 1914 design by the firm of Eschweiler & Eschweiler (3600 N. Lake Dr.) illustrates another interesting variation of the Tudor Revival Style that is potentially individually eligible for the National Register. This house has a red brick first story and is primarily covered with stucco and half-timber decoration on the second story. It has a complex hip and gable roof that is unusual when compared to other distinctive designs of this style. An almost Craftsman-like element are exposed roof ends, but the round-arched opening and buttresses on the main elevation are Tudor style elements. This unusual house executed by a noted architectural firm bears further study to determine how it both resembles and does not resemble other Eschweiler designs in this style.

One of the most unusual examples of Tudor Revival style is at 3916 N. Lake Drive. This house has a stucco exterior with half-timbering in the gables. Its banded windows have transoms but are a modern interpretation of the Tudor window bands seen in other examples. An oriel with leaded glass is the most typical Tudor detail of the house. This house is individually potentially eligible for the National Register for its unique interpretation of the style.

There is one house that sits outside of any of the proposed historic districts that is potentially eligible for the National Register for its unusual interpretation of the Tudor Revival style. The house at 3508 N. Prospect Ave. was built in 1924 and also has an unusual all stucco wall covering and unusual window sizes and placements. Its Tudor details include two tall, very narrow round-arched openings, a Tudor-arched entrance with a distinctive surround, and a fine wood door with large strap hinges. This design is like nothing else in the Tudor Revival category and its size, good integrity and unusual details make it stand out in the village.

As noted earlier, the size of the resources that reflect the Tudor Revival style is quite large and houses that might be potentially individually eligible for the National Register in other communities do not meet the criteria when placed in a context like Shorewood's. But, many of these examples are located within the proposed historic districts and add considerably to the district's architectural significance. Like the individually eligible properties, they have varied designs, buildings materials, and size, but are all well-preserved and express the wide variety of house designs that an architect or builder could execute using elements of the Tudor Revival style. The following houses represent the "best of the rest" in many cases, as well as representing many other buildings with similar characteristics.

One of the Tudor Revival variations seen not only in large houses, but in smaller houses as well, is the castle-like design. This design emphasizes a stone veneer wall covering, towers, and heavy stone accents. Two houses in the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District show this variation and contribute to the architectural significance of the district. The house at 2613 E. Wood Pl. was built in 1926 and has a stone veneer covering on the main elevation. Its distinctive details include grouped casements with transoms and a tower-shaped entry pavilion with battlements, pointed arch openings and smooth stone accents. The house at 4444 N. Farwell Ave. was built in 1931 and is also covered with stone veneer. Its tower entry pavilion also has battlements, a set of paired leaded glass casements with a tabbed surround, and a Tudor-arched entrance with a tabbed surround and lintel. Battlements accent the large one-story bay that features casements with transoms. Some ornamental half-timbering accents the second story.

Another house with a tower entry pavilion is at 4098 N. Lake Dr., built in 1925-26. The house is primarily covered with brown brick, but there is an abundance of stone trim. The tower features battlements and round-arched openings with stone tabbed surrounds. A large chimney accents the main elevation and extends up a second floor stucco-covered wall. Another brown brick house sits at 520 E. Kensington Blvd. It was built in 1929 by prolific builder George Schley & Sons. It is also accented with stone veneer, including parts of the wall surfaces on the main elevation. This house includes some ornamental half-timbering and a gable-roofed entry pavilion with round-arched openings accented by stone veneer. A large set of casements with transoms dominates one side of the main elevation, while a tripartite set of large casements

accents a hipped-roof ell on the other side. Both of these houses are good examples of variations of the style and contribute to the architectural significance of the historic district.

Two unusual houses, both from the 1930s, show how the style could be used in different ways. The house at 4469 N. Maryland Ave., built in 1930, has Tudor half-timbering, stone tabbed surrounds accenting openings, and grouped windows with transoms typical of the style, but it is how these elements are used on this house that is unusual. The house has a very square form with hip roof and conical tower entry pavilion. The form suggests the Norman Revival style, but the heavy Tudor details are more dominant. The half timbering is applied to brick that has been laid in a herringbone pattern, an unusual technique and the upper level tends to dominate the lower level. In the house at 4108 N. Lake Dr., built in 1934, the plan and form are more standard to the Tudor Revival. What is distinctive about this house is its multi-colored red brick and red and tan stone veneer. It gives the house an almost polychromatic appearance that makes the house stand out even though it has very simple Tudor details.

One of the most common forms used with the Tudor Revival style is a gabled ell form. The house at 4429 N. Maryland Ave., built in 1928, illustrates this form very well. A simply decorated home, it has all the key elements of the style; half-timbering, stone veneer, leaded glass casements, and grouped windows. It represents many similar houses found throughout the proposed North and South Lakeshore Historic Districts that contribute to the architectural significance of their districts.

The proposed South Lakeshore Historic District also has good examples of the Tudor Revival style that while not potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places do contribute to the architectural significance of this district. They also represent the wide variety of this style as seen in Shorewood and represent many other houses with similar style details and/or unusual features.

The house at 2648 E. Newton Ave., built in 1923, has some interesting details packed onto a relatively small form. The brown brick building is heavily accented with stone veneer and features a small projecting round tower, a two-story bay dominating the main elevation, a gable-roofed entry pavilion with recessed entrance and even a bit of half-timbering peaking out from the irregular roofline. The windows of the two-story bay are grouped leaded glass casements with transoms on the first story and there are arched windows decorated with heavy stone rope pilasters in the ell that projects from the main block.

A bit less detailed is the house at 2703 E. Newton Ave. just down the block. Built in 1928 by George Schley & Sons, the design is typical of the high quality work done by this firm. The house is well proportioned with red brick walls that are accented with smooth limestone. These accents include tabbed window surrounds and quoins on the large chimney on the main elevation, a large set of grouped casements with transoms, and a heavy frontispiece decorating the arched entrance. Half-timbering on the second story wall above the garage adds to the Tudor detail of the building.

An unusual variation of the style is seen at 2728 E. Newton Ave. Built in 1922 this house has the typical brown brick exterior with stone veneer accents seen on many Tudor houses in the

neighborhood. But, its distinctive features include a wood-shingled bay on the main block that is flanked by raised oriels at each corner. Paired round-arched windows accented by round pilasters sit in the ell projecting from the main block. The stone veneer accents in the brown brick walls also give the house a polychromatic appearance that is unusual.

A more traditional interpretation of the style is the house at 2709 E. Menlo Blvd., built in 1926. In this design, there is a more typical brick lower story with a half-timber and stucco upper story. An oriel-style bay, stone lintels decorating first story windows, and an entry pavilion with battlements are all typical Tudor Revival details. A large chimney with tall chimney pots adds to the historic English look of the house.

Also traditional in its appearance is the house at 2722 E. Newton Ave., built in 1928. A generally gabled ell form with a stone veneer exterior on the main block, stone veneer on the first story of the ell, and brick half-timbering on the second story gives this house a distinctive appearance. The large bay in the ell also features an unusual brick and stone panel at the top.

A small, but unusual example of the style is at 2811 E. Menlo Blvd., built in 1926. Basically a square form with a clipped gable roof ell, the house has a simple plan, but is loaded with interesting details from the stone veneer first story that is "cut-away" and filled in with stucco on the ell, to the half timbering of the second story with its herringbone brick pattern, to the large bank of casements topped with brick panels, this house is one of the more unusual in the group of houses that contribute to the architectural significance of the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District.

One of the unusual houses with a Tudor Revival style is the Henry Meyer House at 3559 N. Summit Ave. built by Arnold F. Meyer & Co. which constructed houses using Ernest Flagg System designs. Although not significant for its style, this house was listed in the National Register of Historic Places as part of a group of Flagg System houses in Milwaukee County, five of which are in Shorewood.

Like the Georgian Revival and the Colonial Revival styles, the Tudor Revival style was used extensively in Shorewood for small houses. One of these houses was built by architect W. G. Herbst at 4314 N. Stowell Ave. in 1928. Herbst's architectural firm was responsible for the design of most of the buildings in the Shorewood High School complex (see school building section). These buildings were designed in the Classical Revival style and are some of the best examples of this style in southeastern Wisconsin. Herbst chose the Tudor Revival style for his own home and it is a good example of the use of Tudor Revival style details on a smaller or medium-sized home. Like most of the Tudor Revival houses mentioned above, this example has a brown brick and stone veneer exterior with a small amount of half-timbering in the upper level. A grouped casement bay sits in the main elevation and there is an unusual small loggia with a round-arched opening. While not potentially individually eligible for the National Register, the house has some extra interest for its design by a local architect.

Again, most of the best examples of small Tudor Revival houses contribute to the architectural significance of the proposed Ardmore Avenue Historic District. Two of the most stylistic of these houses are at 4395 N. Alpine Ave. and 4531 N. Ardmore Ave. Built in 1935 by local

builder Harry Mews, the house at 4395 N. Alpine Ave. is basically a small version of houses described above from the proposed North and South Lakeshore Avenue Historic Districts. With its stone veneer wall covering, half-timbered gable ornament, large chimney and multi-light windows, the house has all of the features of the large examples, just in a smaller package. The house at 4531 N. Ardmore Ave. is even more simple, with only a small amount of half-timber decoration on the stone veneer covered main elevation. But this house has grouped multi-light windows and simple buttresses on the side walls that the other example does not have.

Most of the houses of the 1930s were smaller than these examples, but they often featured as much Tudor detail as possible. A fine example of this is the house at 4426 N. Ardmore Ave., built in 1931. It has a small rectangular form with a basic gable roof, but on the main elevation, there is a large multi-light window sitting in a raised roof section that suggests the towers of more elaborate Tudor Revival designs. The window has a tabbed surround and the main entrance is in a steeply-pitched gable-roofed entry pavilion with two small openings that also mimics the entry pavilions of larger Tudor houses. Altogether, this is a charming cottage that reflects an innovative interpretation of the style on a small house.

More typical of Tudor Revival-influenced houses from the 1930s is the house at 4412 N. Ardmore Ave. Essentially a "Cape Cod" form, this house shows its Tudor Revival style in its steeply-pitched gables, windows with tabbed surrounds, and its multi-hued brick exterior. The main entrance has a nice stone lintel and tabbed surround, as well.

Mediterranean Revival/Italian Renaissance Revival

In communities with fewer examples of these styles, the general term Mediterranean Revival is used for houses that reflect historic and classical Italian revival style elements. Italian Renaissance Revival is often associated only with large mansions or institutional buildings, while Mediterranean Revival covers a wide range of houses. In Shorewood, historic and classical Italian revival designs are so numerous that some delineation in both large and small houses was made, but all are included under this general heading.

The Mediterranean Revival style is based on historic Italian house designs and has several hallmarks. Almost all examples have expansive brick veneer wall surfaces, round-arched openings, classical details, and tile roofs. The Italian Renaissance Revival style is more formal and more classical, but its main detail, as well, is the tile roof. In fact, except for the tile roof, many Mediterranean Revival or small Italian Renaissance Revival style houses could be mistaken for the Georgian Revival style. As best as possible, an attempt will be made to show how these differences are seen in Shorewood's many historic Italian revival house types. The study of Shorewood's historic Italian-derived revival houses can be useful in an effort to better categorize them as they appear in Wisconsin.

Like the Tudor Revival above, the vast number of houses with these styles means that there was a high standard in identifying those that are potentially individually eligible for the National Register. The following examples, like those of previous revival styles, are found in the proposed North and South Lakeshore Historic Districts.

One of the best examples of the Mediterranean Revival styles in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District is the George Uihlein House at 3562 N. Lake Dr., built in 1931. This long rambling mansion has the distinctive red tile roof of the style, the long tan brick wall surfaces associated with the style, and the round-arched windows common to the style. The main entrance is distinctive, with a smooth stone frontispiece of thin pilasters and medallions. Other distinctive details include the Spanish style arched windows on the main elevation and the large loggia with round-arched gated opening.

Another distinctive mansion in the Mediterranean Revival style is the house at 3601 N. Lake Dr. built in the mid-1920s from a design by Thomas Van Alyea. Again, its distinctive features include a multi-colored red tile roof, large expansive brick wall surfaces and round-arched windows. The main entrance has a classical frontispiece with entablature and pilasters and there is wrought iron trim on the south elevation.

A house designed by LaCroix and Memmler in 1927 sits at 3525 N. Lake Dr. and is also potentially individually eligible for the National Register. Its Mediterranean Revival style details include a multi-hued red tile roof, large brick wall expanses, and round-arched openings on the first story. The small rectangular casements of the second story add to the Mediterranean appearance of the house. The main entrance has a classical frontispiece of smooth limestone that features brackets and pilasters and a round-arched transom over the entrance. Projecting loggias on each side of the building add interest to the design.

Built by George Schley and Sons in 1927, the house at 2733 E. Newton Ave. also has a large loggia on one end of the main elevation and very tall round arched openings on the first story with brick corbelled reveals and tall and narrow paired windows. Wrought iron decorates openings of the second story and the entry pavilion is also decorated with wrought iron. A red tile roof tops off the design.

The proposed North Lakeshore Historic District has three potentially individually eligible houses with traditional and distinctive Mediterranean Revival details. The house at 4136 N. Lake Dr. was designed by Thomas Van Alyea in 1926 with a multi-hued red tile roof, multi-hued brown brick walls that have expansive spaces between openings, and an arcaded porch with thin stone columns covering the main entrance. The house is large and sprawling like several other examples that face the lakeshore.

Builder George Schley and Sons constructed the house at 2216 E. Lake Bluff Blvd. in 1928. The house features an irregular plan with a red tile roof and brown brick walls. Distinctive details include a gable-roofed entry pavilion with large round-arched windows over the main entrance that is decorated with a frontispiece of stone cornice and rope columns. Thin columns decorate the tripartite window on two elevations in the projecting rectangular block of the house. Although more formal in its execution, this Mediterranean Revival house has the distinctive details that make it potentially eligible for the National Register.

At 4500 N. Lake Dr., the E. W. Hoffman House, built in 1929, is a large sprawling Mediterranean Revival mansion. The white-painted building features a red tile roof, round-

arched openings and grouped windows. The main entrance is in a one-story entry pavilion behind two large arches supported by columns. The size and large-scale details of this house make it distinctive as an interpretation of this popular Shorewood style.

The remaining houses to be discussed under this style category are related more to the Italian Renaissance Revival style. They are much more formal than the houses described above and have far more heavily classical details. The best examples and the houses that are potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places are found in the proposed North Lakeshore Drive Historic District.

The Franklin L. Weyenberg House at 4320 N. Lake Dr., built in 1915-56 and designed by Charles Valentine, is one of the best examples of this type. The heavily-detailed rectangular form house has brown brick walls with the distinctive red tile roof of the style. Windows of the first story are all primarily large and round-arched. The main entrance sits behind a very heavy classical frontispiece with full pediment, denticulated cornice, and Ionic columns.

Three very similar examples reflect the characteristics of the Weyenberg house and are distinctive for their heavily classical detailing that is suggestive of the Italian Renaissance Revival style. They all have rectangular plans, but only one, the house at 4442 N. Lake Dr. has the distinctive red tile roof. However, they are all dominated by classical details that include frontispieces decorating main entrances. The houses at 4217 N. Lake Dr. and 4411 N. Lake Dr. are constructed of brick while the house at 4442 N. Lake Dr. has a stucco exterior. The only house with round-arched windows is 4411 N. Lake Dr. The windows at 4442 N. Lake Dr. are heavily decorated with stone architrave moldings and arched pediments. All of these houses were constructed prior to 1922 and they have high levels of integrity and illustrate the elements that suggest the Italian Renaissance Revival style.

Two houses have similar plans and reflect another variation of the Italian Renaissance Revival style, as seen in Shorewood. They are located at 4162 and 4408 N. Lake Dr. Both houses have rectangular plans and hip roofs. Shallow eaves project from each end of both of these houses. The house at 4162 has a green tile roof and a large front porch also with a tile roof and round columns. Both buildings have walls of brick veneer, one red and one tan brick. Their openings are rectangular and little decorated. The house at 4408 has first story windows with stone trim in a classical manner. What is interesting about both of these pre-1922 houses are their hip roofs with wide, somewhat flared eaves, a more elaborate eave treatment not seen in other potentially individually eligible examples of the style.

Two other houses in the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District have unusual interpretations of the Italian Renaissance Revival style. The first house at 4425 N. Lake Drive has an overall appearance that is similar to some Georgian Revival houses, and like the Tudor Revival style houses in Shorewood that wander into Norman Revival territory, these Italianate Renaissance Revival houses are, in many ways, difficult to categorize. In any event, this potentially individually eligible house has fine classical features, large, paired windows, and a red tile roof that make it distinctive.

One of the most distinctive houses in this category is the house at 4226 N. Lake Drive. Smaller than other examples, this house is covered with fine classical details that suggest the Italian Renaissance Revival style. The roof is very classical with a balustrade of turned posts and paneled bases accented with statuary. The roof eaves are decorated with modillions and dentils. The main elevation features elaborate window surrounds, round-arched openings, an oriel, and two wrought-iron balconies with brackets. The main entrance has a classical frontispiece, as well. The heavy classical details of the roof, along with the statuary, also suggests the influence of the Beaux Arts classical style. Overall, this is one of Shorewood's architectural gems.

Two houses in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District have the distinctive qualities of the Italian Renaissance Revival style and are potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. One, the house at 2805 E. Menlo Blvd. has the rectangular plan, brick walls, red tile roof, and round-arched windows seen on many of the other houses of this type. One distinctive characteristic of this house is the abundance of wrought iron on the second story, including a very decorative balcony over the main entrance that sits on a limestone base with elaborate brackets.

The second house is a large mansion built for Dr. Charles Albright (3534 N. Lake Dr., 1927) and designed by the architectural firm of Eschweiler & Eschweiler, one of several known Eschweiler designs of lakefront mansions in Shorewood. Like some of their other designs, this one is not typical of the style and is as much Mediterranean and it is Italian Renaissance influenced. The house has the rambling plan, multi-colored tile roof, and large expansive wall spaces of the Mediterranean style. The small, nondescript windows also suggested the Mediterranean. Yet, the main block, with its stone construction and heavily classical frontispiece also suggest the Italian Renaissance Revival. Like most of the Eschweiler designs, it is unusual, showing their talent for creating non-traditional designs for their wealthy clients.

As stated earlier, Shorewood has an abundance of houses in the proposed North and South Lakeshore Historic District that reflect the Mediterranean and Italian Renaissance Revival styles. Most of these houses have rectangular forms, tile roofs, and classical details. Some examples have round-arched windows, wrought-iron decoration, and heavily detailed classical frontispieces decorating main entrances. Most examples have brick walls, generally brown or tan, and some examples have rough or smooth stone details. All have a high level of integrity and all contribute to the architectural significance of their districts. Because of the large number of these examples, they will not be individually described, but are listed within their proposed districts. They represent the best examples of the many similar houses found in these areas of Shorewood.

In the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District, these examples include the houses at 4085, 4303, 4308, 4467, and 4473 N. Lake Dr.; 4480 N. Maryland Ave., and 4477 N. Farwell Ave. In the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District, these examples include the houses at 3715 and 3947 N. Lake Dr.; 2621 and 2726 E. Beverly Rd., 2724 E. Menlo Blvd., 3514 N. Shepard Ave., and 3521 N. Summit Ave.

Like all the other revival styles, much smaller versions are found throughout Shorewood and, of course, the best of these smaller versions are found in the proposed Ardmore Avenue Historic

District. Two of the best examples in this district were constructed by local builders who helped develop much of this area in the 1930s. The house at 4379 E. Wildwood Ave. was built in 1930 by William Thalman and the house at 4385 N. Alpine Ave. was built in 1935 by Harry Mews. Although built in the economically depressed 1930s, both houses are surprisingly large for this neighborhood. They both feature rectangular plans, tile roofs, round-arched openings, and classical features. The house built by Thalman in 1930 has a brick veneer, a massive stone frontispiece with brackets, rope pilasters, and other details that would rival any house in the more luxurious lakeshore districts. The rope pilasters decorating tripartite arched windows are also a fine detail of this house. Mews' example has a stone veneer covering and is a bit less elaborate. But, it, too has fine arched openings with stone veneer surrounds and wrought-iron detail.

One of the most interesting houses that is not in a proposed historic district is the diminutive Mediterranean Revival bungalow house at 4224 N. Prospect Ave., built in 1921. The tile roof and round-arched openings give this small house a much more decorative appearance than the other bungalows in Shorewood and is a good example of how these revival details influence many houses in the village, including bungalow styles.

Spanish Colonial Revival/Mission Revival

The Spanish Colonial Revival style is rare in Wisconsin, seemingly not at home with snow and ice. But, there are some examples that are notable. They have primarily stucco wall surfaces, red tile roofs, large wall expanses and wrought-iron detailing. In this respect they have similarities with the Mediterranean Revival style, but the form and massing of the Spanish Colonial Revival style is much different than the Mediterranean Revival. Related to this style is the Mission style, which has a distinctive curved gable detail. In Wisconsin, these terms are used interchangeably since there are few good examples and categorization is more difficult.⁵

Three examples of this style category exist in Shorewood and one is potentially individually eligible for the National Register, while the other two illustrate variations of the style. The Samuel Austin House (2700 E. Edgewood Ave.), built by George Schley & Sons in 1925 leans more toward the Mission style with its abundance of curved gables. It also has the red tile roof, the wide wall expanses, stucco wall covering, and simple windows indicative of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Overall, it is a fine example of a rare style in Wisconsin and in Shorewood and also contributes to the architectural significance of the South Lakeshore Historic District.

Similar in its use of curved gables is the house at 2643 E. Shorewood Blvd., built in 1925. The red tile roof and curved gables are more from the Mission Style, while the brown brick walls and arched openings on the main elevation are more typical of Mediterranean Revival houses. Not potentially individually eligible, the house does contribute to the architectural significance of the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District.

More typical of the Spanish Colonial Revival style is the house at 3900 N. Prospect Ave., not located in any proposed historic districts. It has the red tile roof of the style and wide expansive

⁵ *Ibid.*, 3-32.

stucco walls. The pair of tall, narrow round-arched windows under a stucco reveal accented with wrought iron is a typical Spanish Colonial Revival detail. While this house has some architectural interest to add to the context of this rare style in Shorewood, it is not potentially individually eligible for the National Register.

French/Norman Revival

Like the Spanish Colonial and Mission Revivals, the French and Norman Revival styles are not common, although there are more examples in Shorewood than the aforementioned styles. Like other revival styles, the French or Norman Revival takes its style elements from rural French manors or farmhouses. The hallmarks of the style include tall, very steep, hip roofs with flared eaves. Brick, stone, or stucco wall coverings are common and sometimes there is ornamental half-timbering. Some French Revival houses have basic rectangular plans and give the impression of a massive form, particularly if they have large roofs. Many houses identified as Norman Revival have a prominent round tower with a conical roof. These towers usually act as entry pavilions and this subtype often has the most half-timbering as they are based on the farmhouses of Normandy in northwestern France.⁶

Two of the most unusual French Revival houses are listed in the National Register of Historic Places as part of the group of Flagg System houses in Milwaukee County, five of which are in Shorewood. One of these houses is at 2614 E. Menlo Blvd. in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District. This house, with its main block with high, massive hip roof, flanking towers, and stone veneer exterior, is one of the most interesting variations of the French Revival style. Another Flagg System house with French Revival details is the much smaller house at 4448 N. Maryland Ave. in the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District.

There are several houses with the French or Norman Revival style that are potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. They are all in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District. One of these houses is the Leo Goldman House designed in 1926 by architect Thomas Van Alyea at 3541 N. Lake Dr.. Not only does this mansion-sized house have a main block with the massive hip roof, it features an ell with a French-influenced mansard and dormers. The entire house has a stone veneer wall covering and there is a Norman Revival style one-story tower that serves as an entry pavilion.

The house at 3615 N. Lake Dr. was built in 1928-29 and possibly designed by Eschweiler & Eschweiler. It has the form and massing of the French Revival style with the massive hip roof and stone veneer exterior. There is a rear wing featuring some Tudor Revival style ornamental half-timbering and the main entrance is decorated with a classical stone frontispiece. There is a note suggesting this was an Eschweiler design in the building permit files, and if so, it is another one of their unusual variations on the revival styles.

The last potentially individually eligible house in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District is the 1930 building at 3709 N. Lake Dr. This house has a more distinctive Norman Revival appearance with a prominent round tower with conical roof that acts as entry pavilion. It has

⁶ Virginia and Lee McAlester, *A Field Guide to American Houses* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), 387.

some half-timbering and some unusual Tudor-arched windows on the main elevation. It is also clad mostly in stone veneer. It is a very fine and interesting example of the style.

Several other houses are in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District that although not potentially individually eligible for the National Register are of interest and add to the architectural significance of the district. The Charles Valentine-designed house at 3801 N. Lake Dr. is a good example of the Norman Revival. Its large round tower dominates the design and in a different take on the style, is not an entry pavilion. The entrance is in an attached ell and is decorated with a tall, smooth stone frontispiece.

An interesting interpretation of the Norman Revival style is the house at 2711 E. Newton Ave., built in 1923. It has a main block with hip roof and large tower-shaped entry pavilion with conical roof typical of the style. The red brick walls are nicely accented with stone veneer. A mansard-roofed ell adds some additional interest to the style.

One of the less elaborate examples of the style sits at 2621 E. Shorewood Blvd. Built in 1940, this house represents a more stripped down version of the French Revival style. It has the hip roof of the style and the overall form and massing, along with stone veneer exterior and elegant windows. It, too, adds to the overall architectural significance of the proposed historic district.

Like the Georgian, Tudor, and Mediterranean Revival styles, the French Revival style is seen in many smaller houses in Shorewood. They add to the architectural context of the village, and like the other styles mentioned, the best examples fall in the Ardmore Avenue Historic District. These houses include a small, but elegant house at 4353 E. Wildwood Ave., built in 1935 with a tall hip roof with inset dormers, stone veneer exterior, and first story openings decorated with heavy stone arches and a tabbed entrance surround.

A very plain example of the style is at 4609 N. Ardmore Ave. Its main architectural detail is the stone surround decorating the main entrance. But the hip roof and high-quality stone veneer give this house the very "historic" appearance of a small French manor house. The house at 4528 N. Ardmore Ave., built in 1941, has a light red brick appearance that also gives it an "aged" look. It is a bit more formal with a larger plan, including a shallow hip-roofed ell, and larger inset dormers. Brick corbelling also gives the house a more decorated appearance. Two houses along Ardmore Avenue, 4455 and 4481, built in 1940 and 1939 by local builders Mehrlik Brothers are simple rectangular buildings with hip roofs that suggest the form and massing of the French Revival style more than any specific details. But, they add to the variety of this style in this district. A small Norman Revival house sits at 4346 N. Ardmore Ave.. Built in 1930, the house has a large tower that is used as an entry pavilion and features a stucco exterior with minimal decoration. It is a good example of how this interesting style could be used to give even the smallest homes a distinctive appearance.

One house that is not in any proposed historic district also adds architectural context to this style category. The tall, elegant house at 1214-21 E. Kensington Blvd. is unusual. Its roof is more similar to a mansard than a hip and includes projecting dormers. It is the unusual brick striped pattern and heavy corner quoins on the main elevation that makes this house of interest in the architectural context of Shorewood.

Prairie Style

The Prairie Style was developed in the architectural firms of Chicago. Young architects, such as Frank Lloyd Wright, began to develop a radical new style of architecture at the turn of the twentieth century. The new style was called "Prairie" because its long and low form seemingly echoed the prairie landscape of the Midwest. The Prairie Style was unlike anything developed in American architecture and, like the Craftsman and Bungalow styles, it was related to the Arts and Crafts movement. But, Prairie Style buildings are much more radical in their horizontal emphasis, with low rooflines, wide overhanging eaves, and windows grouped in horizontal bands. Due to Frank Lloyd Wright's affiliation with Wisconsin, and his influence on Midwest architects, this state has many good examples of the style.⁷

Shorewood has several good examples of the Prairie Style, mainly due to Whitefish Bay architect Russell Barr Williamson. Williamson worked with Frank Lloyd Wright and oversaw the construction of Wright's Bogk House in nearby Milwaukee. Williamson's many designs in Shorewood resemble the work he did on the Bogk House, but they have differences that show the range of work he did in this style. Williamson went on to design well into the mid-twentieth century, working in contemporary designs of that era. He is a master architect in Wisconsin and all of his designs in Shorewood are potentially individually eligible for the National Register as examples of his work in the Prairie Style.

The two houses that best resemble Williamson's work on the Bogk house are at 3934 and 3965 N. Harcourt Place, also in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District. These houses have a similar form and massing, including low-pitched hip roofs with wide eaves, recessed entry ells and window bands on the main elevation decorated with narrow piers and prominent lintels. These houses are very good examples of one of the important variations of the Prairie Style, one that Russell Barr Williamson helped define; that is, the form and plan of the important Bogk House.

Another house in Shorewood reflects the Bogk plan in its form and massing, but is a fine variation of this house type. Sitting at 4137 N. Farwell Ave., in the proposed Prospect Avenue Historic District, this house has the rectangular form with hip roof typical of this variation of the Prairie style. But, this house features a distinctive off-center shallow bay of banded windows accented with a stucco panel on the main elevation. This is different from the window bands Williamson designed on the previous two houses mentioned. A stucco panel also sits under the wide eaves where second story windows are set. The house has a fine round-arched entrance that is seen in some of Williamson's designs, but is not common to the style.

Two Williamson designs are very different variations from his Bogk House work. A Bungalow type house sits at 4323 N. Stowell Ave. in the North Lakeshore Historic District that is only one-story in height with a very shallow hip roof and very wide overhanging eaves. Dominating the front elevation is a bow-shaped casement window band flanked with concrete capitals that have Prairie Style decoration. The house has a very horizontal form and its diminutive size does not detract from its high quality of design and construction.

⁷ Wyatt, *Cultural Resource Management*, 2-21.

A very interesting house that is also bungalow sized sits at 2101 E. Newton Ave. It is not in any proposed historic district and is individually potentially eligible for the National Register as a work of Williamson and for its unusual design. In some ways, the house seems a miniaturized version of the Bogk house, with the window band on the main elevation interrupted by brick pilasters and the small piers sitting in front of the house that are similar to his designs on Harcourt Street. Because of its size and unusual characteristics, including its concrete block building material, it is a significant house executed by an important Wisconsin architect.

Two duplexes designed by Williamson sit at 4155-57 N. Farwell Ave. in the proposed Prospect Avenue Historic District, and at 3921-23 N. Downer Ave., not in any proposed historic district. These duplexes have hip roofs with wide eaves and windows placed in bands on both the first and second stories. Not only do they show the work of Williamson in the style, they are good examples of how the duplexes in Shorewood reflect the architectural styles of the community and look more like single-family homes than duplexes.

There are several other Prairie Style houses in Shorewood that are significant and not the work of Russell Barr Williamson. One of these is the house at 4163 N. Stowell Ave., in the proposed Prospect Avenue Historic District. This stucco-clad house has an almost flat hip roof with very wide eaves and is a good example of the horizontal emphasis of many Prairie Style designs. The windows of both the first and second stories are in bands and accented by narrow lintels, sills, and belt courses, all adding to the horizontal emphasis. Local architectural historians have suggested this might also be the work of Williamson, but it is not verified.

A fine Prairie Style house is also the August Gebhardt House at 2700 E. Shorewood Blvd., another potentially individually eligible building. The house has been attributed to local architect Clare Hosmer. This house also has a very strong horizontal form and massing with window bands and a hip roof with wide eaves. It is typical of the work done by many Prairie Style architects in the 1910s and is a significant building in Shorewood and in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District.

The Prairie Style is also well executed on a small house located in the proposed Downer West Historic District. Built for John and Evelyn Walbridge as a "cottage" in 1910, the house is simple, yet expresses the main characteristics of the Prairie Style. Its hip roof with wide overhanging eaves, window bands, and change in siding materials to accent the area just under the eaves are all elements the style. This interesting house is also individually potentially eligible for the National Register.

In the proposed Prospect Avenue and Downer West Historic Districts, there are many houses that reflect or were influenced by the Prairie Style, although they not fully developed examples. They are not potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places but contribute to the architectural significance of these proposed districts. Of these houses, the best examples are as follows, 4151 N. Prospect Ave. (Prospect Avenue Historic District), 2507 E. Beverly Rd., 2321 and 2424 E. Menlo Blvd., and 2514 E. Shorewood Blvd. (Downer West Historic District). These houses have the horizontal emphasis, modified window bands and other details that suggest the Prairie Style and represent the many other houses in these districts that also were built with influences from this important style.

Arts and Crafts, Craftsman, Bungalow

These three related styles competed with the period revival styles during the first few decades of the twentieth century for popularity. In Shorewood's most fashionable neighborhoods, the period revival styles won out, but in many other areas of Shorewood, these styles are pervasive. The best examples of the Craftsman and Bungalow styles are found in the proposed Downer West Historic District, with good examples also found in the proposed Prospect Avenue Historic District. It is the numerous examples of these styles in these proposed districts that help make the districts architecturally significant.

These styles are all related to the Arts and Crafts movement that began in the late nineteenth century and promoted a return to individual craftsmanship as a rejection of the increasingly mass-made objects available at the time. In particular, medieval crafts were revived and the movement had a significant effect on art and interior design. The movement extended into architecture, where progressive architects rejected the historical styles and their decoration in favor of buildings that were only decorated with necessary structural materials. Of course, like any movement, manufacturers and mass market builders began producing goods and houses that were actually factory made or mass produced only to look like they were hand made.

The Prairie Style was one of the architectural styles that was influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement. More directly were the Craftsman and Bungalow styles. Craftsman and Bungalow style houses were largely built for the masses and entire neighborhoods of, in particular, Bungalow houses, were built in larger cities. The hallmarks of the bungalow style are wide, often sloping roofs, large porches and details like knee-brace brackets, exposed rafters, and natural materials. Craftsman houses have similar characteristics in terms of the use of natural materials and "structural" elements that are exposed, but these houses are generally more vertical in their form and massing and often have more creative Arts and Crafts influenced elements.⁸

Two houses are potentially individually eligible for the National Register as high-style examples of the Arts and Crafts movement. The first is a design by Eschweiler & Eschweiler, a firm that specialized in unusual style variations for the mansions they designed in Shorewood. Located at 4200 N. Lake Dr., this house is no exception. Its very tall and massive hip roof is intersected by a gable at one end and slopes down to form a shed roof at the other end. Much of the house is constructed of brick, while the very top of the walls have a narrow stucco covering. Windows are in bands similar to the Prairie Style, but they are not typical of Prairie Style window bands. Very little excess decoration is on the house, as in keeping with the idea of "honest" construction with none of the historical details seen on period revival houses. That Eschweiler & Eschweiler could design in both this type of house and in period revival houses in Shorewood shows their expertise and creativity as architects.

The other Arts and Crafts house is located at 3937 N. Lake Dr. and is a Milwaukee County Landmark. Designed by Elmer Grey and built in 1916, the house is a large and rambling interpretation of an English cottage with clipped gables and roofing that extends over the eaves to suggest a thatched roof. Unlike the Tudor Revival style buildings that were based on English architecture, this house has none of the excess decoration of examples of that style.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 2-24 and 2-26.

The best examples of the Craftsman style in Shorewood are located in the proposed Downer West Historic District. In fact, this neighborhood appears to have been built as a showcase for Craftsman style houses. Most of the houses are pre-1922 and pre-date extant building permit records, and extensive research on these houses could not be done as part of this survey effort. However, if National Register listing was approved for this district, an intensive research effort to identify the dates of construction and builders of these houses should be undertaken to shed important light on the neighborhood's development.

Listing a few examples of the unusual Craftsman houses in this proposed district is useful in showcasing the wide variety of this style as seen in this area. The houses at 2514 and 2517 E. Beverly Rd., 2225, 2304, and 2506 E. Menlo Blvd., and 2215, 2416, and 2425 E. Newton Ave. illustrate both typical and unusual variations of the Craftsman style.

The Bungalow style is seen in large numbers in Shorewood, but there were no examples that were identified in the survey as individually eligible for the National Register. In two proposed historic districts, the Downer West Historic District and the Prospect Avenue Historic District, bungalow designs play a role in their architectural significance, but do not dominate these districts. Outside of these districts, a number of Bungalow style houses were included in the survey as context for early twentieth century architecture in Shorewood. Of these surveyed properties, some groups of bungalows stood out.

In the 4300 block of both North Maryland Avenue and North Farwell Avenue, are bungalows that may have been constructed back-to-back by the same builder. These bungalow designs have good, intact, historic features, and while not a group that is potentially eligible for the National Register, they reflect typical bungalow designs in the community. They are at 4300, 4304, 4312, and 4320 N. Maryland Ave. and 4317, 4321, and 4325 N. Farwell Ave. Another area of high quality bungalow designs is in the 3800 block of North Murray Avenue. These designs, at 3820, 3824, 3828, 3832, and 4301 are also of interest for the Bungalow style in Shorewood.

Another group of interesting bungalows are found in the 4300 block of N. Woodburn St. (4234, 4328, 4242, 4246, 4250, 4254, and 4256-58). These bungalows were all constructed by builder Ketterer Holzschub in 1927 and have some architectural interest for their details from the period revival styles. Rather than stressing Arts and Crafts details, these bungalows reflect the popular revival styles seen in many other homes in Shorewood. This grouping represents the abundance of this type of bungalow in Shorewood and although none are individually potentially eligible for the National Register or are located in a proposed historic district, they add to the overall architectural context of the built environment in Shorewood.

Modern Styles

After 1940, there were few buildable lots available for new construction in Shorewood, so modern styles of architecture are rare in the community. Some Ranch style homes were built in Shorewood during the 1950s and 1960s, and if they had distinctive characteristics or were part of a proposed historic district, they were included in the survey. None were deemed significant

enough to be potentially individually eligible for the National Register. Some distinctive contemporary houses were included in the survey that were built during the later twentieth century. Discussions in the building permit files indicate that they were controversial, as some residents did not feel they were appropriate for a community with such a well-defined historic appearance as Shorewood. They were added to the reconnaissance survey if it was felt they had distinctive features that may be significant in the future.

There have been some apartment buildings and commercial buildings constructed during the last 50 years that were not included in the survey, as they do not have unusual or distinctive characteristics and will need to have more time pass in order to evaluate their architectural interest. One school building, the Shorewood Intermediate School, built in 1970 is not yet 50 years old, but its distinctive appearance made it appropriate to be identified as a contributing resource in the Shorewood High School Complex. The following is a brief discussion of some of the "modern" styles found in Shorewood.

A house that has a distinctive modern style known as the Art Moderne is the Julius Horwath house, built in 1945. This two-story house has a streamlined effect common to the style. The house has a fine stone veneer and stucco exterior with window bands and other openings decorated with distinctive streamlined awnings. One of the corners is rounded, another hallmark of the Art Moderne style. This very unusual and interesting house is one-of-a-kind in Shorewood and is potentially individually eligible for the National Register for its modern style.

There are no Ranch style houses that are potentially individually eligible for the National Register, but several houses from the 1950s and one house from the 1960s are of interest in the proposed North and South Lakeshore Historic Districts. A very long, contemporary, version of the Ranch style is in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District. Built in 1955, this house at 4101 N. Lake Dr. has a fine stone veneer and wood exterior with window walls and a raised garage ell that make it distinctive for this style. A more typical large Ranch house is at 4090 N. Lake Dr. It was built in 1964 and while the 1955 house contributes to the architectural significance of the district, the house from 1964 does not.

Several houses built in the proposed North Lakeshore Historic District contribute to that area's architectural significance as good examples of the Ranch style. One of the best is located at 2415 E. Kensington Blvd, built in 1954. It features a long, low plan with an impressive stone veneer chimney flanked by window walls. Other less distinctive examples are located at 2301 Kensington Blvd (1959), 2535 E. Lake Bluff Blvd. (1953), 2521 Lake Bluff Blvd. (1953), and 4401 N. Lake Drive (1953).

There is a group of small Ranch and Cape Cod homes that sit along N. Harcourt Pl. in the proposed South Lakeshore Historic District. They were all built in 1951 and 1952 by Harold Pentler, but they are all of different designs. They are typical of the small ranch style homes and Cape Cod style homes built during the post-World War II era and are not distinctive. Therefore, they are of interest as a group of Ranch and Cape Cod houses all built in one area by a single builder, but they do not contribute to the architectural significance of the district.

Apartment Buildings

As Shorewood rapidly expanded during the 1920s, there was a demand for housing that went beyond single family units. Affluent and middle-class people were interested in Shorewood, but either could not afford or did not desire a single-family home. For these people, developers built apartment buildings that were stylish and could be termed "luxury" or "garden" apartments. Most of them were built in the popular period revival styles, blending in well with the similarly styled houses nearby. Most were also located on or near main thoroughfares, such as East Capitol Drive and North Oakland Avenue, making them convenient for shopping or commuting.

During the 1930s, some concerns were raised about the proliferation of more apartment buildings in Shorewood, especially in an area newly opened up for development. This area was along North Wilson Drive where railroad tracks and right-of-way had been purchased and cleared by the village for development. The Great Depression of the 1930s and World War II during the early 1940s put a stop to the rapid development that had occurred in the 1920s and most of this land was eventually platted into middle-class subdivisions and filled with single family houses.

But, after World War II, the demand for housing for veterans and their families became acute and the area closest to North Wilson Drive was eventually developed into apartment housing. F. J. Schroedel, a builder, began to develop a group of small apartment buildings in this area 1943 and completed them in 1946. An even larger and more impressive development, Estabrook Homes, was specifically developed for veterans and their families by Schroedel between 1947 and 1949. Finally, the Ardmore Terrace Corporation filled in the remaining land near Wilson Drive with apartment buildings in 1949 and 1950.

Most of the pre-World War II apartment buildings are potentially eligible for or have been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places either individually or as part of two proposed historic districts. The historic districts are along North Oakland Avenue north of East Capitol Drive and south of East Capitol Drive. Other apartment buildings are eligible as part of building groups.

Many of the individual apartment buildings in Shorewood were identified and determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in 2008 as part of the Architectural and Historical Survey project done to comply with federal law regarding the reconstruction of East Capitol Drive and its effect on adjacent properties. The following individual or paired apartment buildings were identified in this project.

The most distinctive apartment building in Shorewood is the Milwaukee County Landmark, the Annason, at 2121 E. Capitol Drive. It is an outstanding Art Deco style building designed by architect Julius Leiser and built in 1930. It was initially determined eligible for the National Register in 1997. The best example of a period revival style apartment building is Shorewood Manor, located at 4001 N. Prospect Ave. It was constructed in 1924 and designed by Martin Tullgren and Sons. At the time, Martin Tullgren was deceased and the design was done by his sons, Minard and Herbert. Shorewood Manor is a fine example of the Tudor Revival style with details expertly executed in terra cotta. In this design, the Tullgrens took Tudor Revival details and used them in a modern and somewhat streamlined form, which gives the very large building

a light and vertical effect instead of a heavy, overwhelming historic feel. Shorewood Manor was determined eligible for the National Register in 2008.

The Morrison Apartments, located at 2127 E. Capitol Dr. is a four story apartment building with large storefront. The building has a rectangular plan and is constructed of brown multi-hued brick on the north and east public elevations, and tan brick on the other, non-public elevations. The details of the building are from the Mediterranean Revival style and primarily executed in terra cotta. The Morrison Apartment building was constructed in 1925 for Armin Miller, who named it after his father, Morris and was designed by the architectural firm of Martin Tullgren and Sons. In this apartment/commercial building, the Tullgren's use a modernized version of the Mediterranean Revival style. The details are simple and somewhat streamlined, giving the building a design that was popular, yet progressive. This building has a high level of integrity with its architectural details intact and in good condition. This building was determined eligible in 2008 as part of the East Capitol Drive reconstruction project.

Many of the apartment buildings in Shorewood were built in groups of two or four. Two sets of two apartment buildings were built at the west end of East Capitol Drive. The two apartment buildings at 4000 and 4008 N. Morris Blvd. were built in 1928-29 and advertised as the "Capitol Court Apartments. They were built by F. H. Oppitz in the Mediterranean Revival style. They were determined eligible in 2008 as part of the East Capitol Drive reconstruction project. Nearby is another set of two apartment buildings located at 1420 and 1428 E. Capitol Drive. They were built in 1929 for the original owner, Allen Buildings. They both have fine and intact details that reflect the Tudor Revival style and were determined eligible in 2008 as well.

Other apartment buildings in Shorewood are potentially individually eligible for the National Register because they are fine and well-preserved examples of period revival architectural styles and because they represent a type of construction, the urban apartment building of the 1920s. Included in this group is the Mediterranean Revival style Cassanova Apartment Building at 3950 N. Farwell Ave., built in 1928 for M. J. Hayes. It features a decorative "hip" roof of green tile, tall pilasters, round-arched openings, and an entry pavilion with red tile roof.

The large apartment building at 1806-08 E. Wood Place is also influenced by the Mediterranean Revival style, but in a much more formal manner. It has a red tile roof coping and round-arched windows on the first story. Two shallow entry pavilions illustrate a Mediterranean influence. This building was constructed by local builders George Zagel and Brothers and is a fine example of a luxury urban apartment from 1927.

Another interpretation of the Mediterranean Revival style is the apartment building at 4221 N. Oakland Ave., built for Roy Gotfredson in 1927. The bulk of the building is not highly decorated but Mediterranean Revival style characteristics are shown at the cornice level and decorating the entrance. Two other Mediterranean Revival apartment buildings that sit next to each other at 1801 and 1807 E. Jarvis St. were built in 1925 and 1926 for the Goodsitt Brazy Company by George Zagel and Brothers. They are not identical, but have similar red brick walls, tile roof decoration, stone veneer accents and curved gables. The building at 1801 E. Jarvis has outstanding very tall and narrow twisted pilasters accenting corner towers.

The Tudor Revival style was very popular for apartment buildings in Shorewood and there are two individual examples that are potentially eligible for the National Register. They are located at 1807-09 E. Olive St. and 1809 E. Marion St. The apartment building on Olive St. has a formal appearance with distinctive rough-finished limestone frontispieces surrounding the main entrances that feature battlements and buttresses. The Marion St. building has projecting three-story gables with ornamental half-timbering with smooth limestone decoration around the main entrance that also suggest battlements and buttresses, but in a less rustic manner than the decoration of the Olive Street example. Both are fine examples of Tudor Revival style apartment buildings constructed in 1927 and 1928.

Since so many historic apartment buildings were constructed along North Oakland Avenue and were located in close geographical proximity to each other, they could be placed in two proposed historic districts, one north of East Capitol Drive and one south of East Capitol Drive. Both districts include apartment buildings in the Tudor and Mediterranean Revival architectural styles. The district south of Capitol Drive also has a few commercial buildings within its boundaries.

The apartment buildings in the proposed Oakland North Historic District are divided between the Tudor and Mediterranean Revival styles and were all built between 1927 and 1931. They are all three stories in height and have similar size and scale. In the Tudor Revival category, there are two sets of two buildings that are identical, or in one case, mirror images. One set is a more formal variation of the style with a heavy frontispiece decoration (4460 and 4468 N. Oakland Ave.). The mirror image set of buildings features a lighter decoration of ornamental stucco and half-timbering (4422 and 4428 N. Oakland Ave.). The other example (4442 N. Oakland Ave.) is heavily decorated with smooth stone, including a first story covering of stone veneer on the main elevation and stone tabbed window surrounds on the upper floors. The last example of the style (4480 N. Oakland Ave.) also features a first story covered with smooth stone veneer, but with a less decorated upper level and more pronounced Tudor details, such as battlements at the roofline and pilasters that resemble buttresses flanking the main entrance

The Mediterranean Revival apartment buildings in this proposed historic district reflect three variations of the style. One example (4455 N. Oakland Ave.) has a more formal appearance with a very classical frontispiece and classical motifs decorating windows. It also has the distinctive red tile roof decoration or coping common to the style. The second example (4459 N. Oakland Ave.) features grouped windows in large round arches and reveals, classical balustrades, and twisted rope pilasters often found on this style. The third example (4474 N. Oakland Ave.) is distinctive primarily for its group of arcaded round-arched windows on the first story of the main elevation and an elaborate panel on the third floor of the main elevation that has classical details. There is also tile roof coping common to the style.

The proposed Oakland South Historic District is larger and also features some commercial buildings. The buildings were almost all constructed between 1926 and 1928 and are all almost the same size and scale. They range from two to three stories in height and feature details primarily from the Mediterranean Revival style, but there are also examples from the Tudor Revival style.

Two sets of apartment buildings are distinctive because they are almost identical and grouped together. They include the nearly identical apartment buildings at 1714, 1717, and 1723 E. Beverly Rd., a group of Mediterranean Revival style buildings with red tile decoration, curved gables, and stone veneer trim. A second set of nearly identical Mediterranean Revival apartment buildings are located at 1716, 1717, 1720 and 1721 E. Newton Ave. Two of the buildings are more distinctive with additional classical balustrade decoration at the roofline and tile work in third story window reveals. They all feature smooth stone decoration, including twisted rope pilasters.

A set of matching apartment buildings sit along North Oakland Avenue (3576 and 3582). They, too, have distinctive tile roof decoration, curved gables, and colored tile work in the gable peaks. Tile work in a large central gable is a distinctive detail of the apartment building at 3552 N. Oakland Ave. that also has wrought iron balconies and a wide classical entrance with pilasters. More decorative is the building at 3560 N. Oakland Ave., with a large amount of tile decoration at the roof line, distinctive twisted rope pilasters, and a formal entrance with square columns.

Similar to the apartments on E. Beverly Rd. is the building at 3825 N. Oakland Ave. with its light tan brick main elevation wall, curved gables, and tile decoration set in between the raised gables. The entry decoration is unusual with a stone arch opening flanked by two much narrower arched openings and topped with a tile roof and wrought iron decoration. Much more simple is the apartment at 3540 N. Oakland with little decoration other than the tile roof coping, two long fluted pilasters, and a simple classical frontispiece. More elaborate is the apartment at 3532 N. Oakland Ave. It features a multi-hued red tile roof decoration, parapet curved gables and upper story window banks decorated with large pointed arches and stucco reveals. Pointed arch windows also decorate the area over the main entrance, which has a Tudor Revival style stone surround. In fact, with the pointed arches of this building, it is a marriage of the Mediterranean and Tudor Revival styles.

There are several other apartment buildings with less distinctive style characteristics, but they are also contributing in these proposed districts because they add to the district's overall architectural significance. Three commercial buildings are located in the district and all contribute to its architectural significance, as well, as good examples of the Mediterranean Revival style. From the large Goodsitt & Brazy commercial and apartment building at 3801-3817 N. Oakland Ave. to the diminutive storefront at 3723 N. Oakland, also built for Goodsitt & Brazy, these buildings blend in well with the apartment houses of the district, creating a distinctive residential-commercial area along Oakland Avenue south of Capitol Drive.

Three other distinctive apartment house complexes were identified in the survey. They include the group of stone veneer apartment houses built by F. J. Schroedel along and near N. Wilson Dr. between 1943 and 1947. They have an interesting use of rustic stone veneer that suggest a recycled or locally-quarried material not necessary for World War II use and have a vaguely Colonial Revival architectural style. However, they are not potentially individually eligible for the National Register, nor as a group are they eligible as a proposed historic district.

The Ardmore Terrace Apartment Buildings on N. Wilson Dr. and N. Ardmore Avenue were built as post-World War II construction to meet the housing demand of that era. They were completed

by the Ardmore Terrace Corporation in 1949-1950 and are large red brick apartment buildings with Colonial Revival style elements. Two of the buildings along N. Wilson Dr. included retail spaces. They have some architectural interest as a complex built to meet post-World War II housing demands, but are not potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, nor as a group are they eligible as a proposed historic district.

One complex that is potentially eligible for the National Register is combined in the proposed Estabrook Homes Historic District. This district, made up of 13 Colonial Revival style apartment buildings, sits along North Wilson Drive at the northwest corner of Shorewood. There are also addresses along E. Glendale Ave., E. Kensington Blvd. and N. Woodruff Ave. The homes were built by the Schroedel Construction Company specifically to meet the demand for post World War II housing for veterans' families and were completed between 1947 and 1949.

The buildings were meant to house 200 veterans' families in what were called "garden" type apartment homes. Each building is large, with a main block and two large ells. The two story red brick buildings were designed to house about 15 apartments with around six apartments in each section of the large buildings. The complex included wide lawns spaces, still extant, underground parking, and about 2,000 square feet of living space for each family. The apartments were built with two bedrooms, a full bath, a large dining and living area, and a kitchen with the most modern of appliances, including dishwashers, garbage disposals, a gas stove, and refrigerator. The apartments included automatic washers and dryers and eight closets provided plenty of storage for the young families moving into this complex.⁹

This complex is architecturally significant not so much for its Colonial Revival style, which blends in well with the architecture of the community, but for its type of construction, a large-scale complex built to house World War II veterans' families. These types of complexes were built to ease the housing crunch of the late 1940s and to provide "starter" homes for veterans' families. This particular complex, the Estabrook Homes, is a fine and intact example of this type of housing and these buildings, grouped together in a potentially eligible historic district, are important historic resources in Shorewood.

COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

Some fine examples of commercial buildings from the 1920s era are located in Shorewood and several have been identified as potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or have been determined eligible as part of the East Capitol Drive reconstruction highway project process.

The most notable commercial building in Shorewood is the outstanding Art Deco Amory Courts Building. It was given this name because it was on the site of the old National Guard Horse Cavalry Armory. It was built in 1930-31 and was a late commission for the firm of Martin Tullgren and Sons, still operating with son Herbert Tullgren after the deaths of both his father Martin and brother Minard in 1922 and 1928, respectively.

⁹ "Schroedel Construction Company Starts Excavating for Estabrook Homes," *Shorewood Herald*, July 3, 1947, 1.

The building is large with storefronts on the first story and apartment on the upper floors. It is primarily constructed of tan bricks, but its corner storefront entry pavilion and two side entry pavilions are decorated with fine Art Deco details. These details include stylized sunrises, black glazed terra cotta tiles, stylized swags, medallions with a bird motif, a horizontal stylized low-relief sunburst, low-relief figural decoration, and an unusual motif above the storefront meant to be used for a bank, a coin motif of a Lincoln Head Penny and the reverse of the Buffalo Nickel, a Native American Chief. Like most Art Deco buildings, the details of the windows and wall surfaces give the building an vertical appearance, a hallmark of the style. This outstanding commercial building was determined eligible in 2008.

Another building determined eligible in 2008 is the Rogoroski Block at 1431-33 E. Capitol Drive. The Rogoroski Block is a three-story commercial building with two storefronts on the East Capitol Drive or north elevation and apartments on the upper stories. The main apartment entrance is along North Morris Boulevard. The building is constructed of multi-color tan bricks and has details that suggest the Mediterranean Revival style. The building has a flat roof with decorative hip-roof parapets clad with asphalt shingles that suggest red tile roofs. The second story of the north elevation has window openings with flat brick arches and there are decorative brick reveals over the third story windows above the east storefront. Decoration on this part of the building includes a cast stone shield and stone corner quoins. The storefronts are original and clad with smooth limestone that is decorated with a cornice of brackets and plaques. The show windows of each storefront are part of a pre-fabricated copper storefront. The building is a good example of a commercial building combined with an apartment building.

Another good example of a combination of commercial building with apartment building is the contributing building in the proposed Oakland South Historic District discussed in the apartment building section above. This building (3801-3817 N. Oakland Ave.) contributes to that district but would also be potentially individually eligible for the National Register for this type of commercial building construction.

There are several other buildings on North Oakland Avenue that are potentially individually eligible for the National Register. One is the unusual one-story Mediterranean Revival, multi-storefront building at 4401-4411 N. Oakland Ave. It was designed by noted architect Herbert Tullgren of the Martin Tullgren and Sons firm and built by noted local builder George Zagel & Brothers in 1924. The building has the ornamental clay tile roof and other decoration common to the style, but its architectural significance lies in its arcaded arched storefronts that have a high level of integrity. There are no apartments above and no wasted space in this fine example of a one-story period revival commercial building.

The commercial building at 4425-4429 N. Oakland Ave. was built in 1922 and is a rather plain tan brick building with a finely-crafted Art Deco style tile storefront. The black, white, and red color scheme of this storefront makes it stand out as does the design with its emphasis on both horizontal and vertical elements. The vertical lines at the center suggest highly stylized columns or pilasters, while the horizontal lines with the medallions is a stylized take on a classical motif, which is one of the common details of Art Deco decoration. Because of its outstanding and unusual storefront, this building is potentially individually eligible for the National Register.

One of the most interesting of the commercial buildings along North Oakland Avenue in Shorewood is the F. C. Fass & Son Funeral Home, a lavish Mediterranean Revival style building that suggests a large home. Built in 1931 and designed by the architectural firm of Dick and Bauer, the Fass Funeral Home is a fine example of a relatively new type of commercial building, the funeral home. Prior to the early twentieth century, most funerals were held at home and/or churches. Undertakers were often connected to the furniture business, as cabinet makers were the first coffin makers and undertaking was, at first, a sideline to a furniture or other business. As times and tastes changed, undertakers began to create "parlors" in their businesses to hold funerals for families that did not have their own family parlor or who no longer wished to have this activity in their homes. The idea of having a "home" funeral in a parlor, though, was still the kind of atmosphere that was desired and undertakers took that idea and turned it into a commercial business in either converted houses or in new construction. The Fass Funeral home is architecturally significant not just because it is a fine and highly decorated example of the Mediterranean Revival style, but for its type of construction, a funeral home from the pre World War II era.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Post Office

The historic public buildings associated with Shorewood are related to the federal and local governments. The federal government is represented most closely with the Post Office. In 1937, Shorewood's new post office was built. The post office, at 1620 E. Capitol Dr. is a building that is a modern take on the Classical Revival style of so many post offices built in the twentieth century. Its stripped-down appearance with stylized fluted pilasters reflects the Art Deco style. The post office was evaluated for the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Wisconsin Post Office thematic group and was determined to be not eligible. It does, though, add some architectural interest in Shorewood.

Village Hall and Fire & Police Station

The Shorewood Village Hall was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1984 for its association with its use as a village hall. The building began as a school but was converted to the village hall in 1916. It has the basic exterior form of the old school still extant, but its current appearance dates largely from a 1936 remodeling done with WPA funding.

Next door is the Shorewood Fire and Police station originally constructed in 1928 with an addition and renovations made in 1936 done with WPA funding. The fire and police station has a combination of an original Craftsman style main block with an addition that suggests the period revival styles seen in Shorewood. It features multi-hued brick walls with darker brick accents at the corners and around openings, a building motif that appears on other publicly-constructed buildings in Shorewood. The main fire department bays on the front elevation have projecting gables with large brackets in the Craftsman style. The addition to the station has a Tudor Revival-influenced tower and ell. The building was designed by Henry Hengels, Shorewood's village engineer who later had a notable career as State of Wisconsin architect.

While the building does not have architectural significance, it is potentially eligible for the National Register for its historical association with the development of Shorewood's local government services.

Public Works Building Complex

Also designed by Henry Hengels and built in 1928 is the Public Works Administration Building (3801 N. Morris Blvd.). Additional buildings were added to this complex between 1928 and 1934 and feature similar building characteristics. But it is the main administration building, along with an incinerator that was executed in the neo-Gothic Revival style that stands out. This building, like the Police and Fire Station, has a multi-hued brick exterior with light tan walls accented by deep red bricks in the wall surfaces, at the corners, and around doors and windows. This interesting brickwork pattern gives the building a very decorative polychromatic appearance reminiscent of the High Victorian Gothic style. The building is accented with a tower that is castle-like with battlements and there are battlements on the parapet of the office wing of the building. Trim around doors and windows suggests tabbed surrounds. Just like the architects of the large homes in Shorewood mixed revival styles and motifs to create unusual buildings, Henry Hengels did the same in this public works building.

The later-added storage and garage buildings of this complex contribute to the architectural significance of the main building and the entire complex is potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. It has also been designated a Milwaukee County Landmark.

Hubbard Park Buildings

Similar multi-hued bricks were used in the construction of one of the important public buildings in Shorewood, the Scout Craft Cabin in Hubbard Park, now known as the Hubbard Park Lodge. Shorewood made good use of WPA money in the 1930s and went on somewhat of a building "blitz" in 1936 and 1937, when the Village Hall and Police and Fire Station buildings were renovated and added to and when three important buildings were constructed in Hubbard Park. The buildings in Hubbard Park are all significant and eligible for the National Register for architecture. The Shorewood Community Lodge was completed first in early 1937, while the Scout Craft Cabin and Ice Skating Pavilion were completed later in 1937.

The largest building is the old Scout Craft Cabin and from a newspaper article from 1937, it is learned that the bricks that make up the side walls of the building were taken from an old Armory building in downtown Shorewood. Other materials used in the building are stone veneer and log siding. These materials lend themselves well to the "rustic" style used in the building, a style popular for park buildings that were funded by the WPA in the 1930s. But, according to the newspaper article, the building's extended log ell on the front elevation was meant to resemble an "Indian block house" and was made for scouts to use for transmitting signals. The building's interior continues the rustic appearance of the exterior and overall, it is a fine park building with a high quality of building materials and methods (especially in the use of recycled materials) and is an architectural landmark in the community.

The Shorewood Community Lodge was built as an all-purpose recreational building for the community, but for many years, until recently, it was most notable as the home of the Shorewood Women's Club. This building was constructed entirely with stone veneer and log siding. The stone veneer is used on the raised foundation of the building that sits on a slope in the park. This material is also used for stone piers to decorate the main entrance wall. Log siding completes the wall surfaces and the building is decorated with brackets and numerous large openings. This building also represents a variation of the Rustic style and its log exterior blends in well with the nearby Scout Craft Cabin.

This third building in this potentially eligible group of buildings is the Ice Skating Pavilion, also used as a scout youth center. This building is less "rustic" in appearance and constructed completely of red brick. But it features a porch that has a rustic motif. It is a fine example of a small park building with most of its original historic details intact.

Two other resources in Hubbard Park have architectural interest. One is the stone arch tunnel constructed in 1884 under the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad tracks. The tunnel has two arched openings, both with large round limestone arches. Cut limestone blocks make up the rest of the tunnel and its abutments. While not individually potentially eligible for the National Register, this tunnel would be eligible in a nomination of all of Hubbard Park's historic resources.

Another tunnel that would contribute to a National Register nomination of Hubbard Park's historic resources is a pedestrian tunnel that also was built under the railroad tracks for access from a parking lot to the Hubbard Park buildings. This tunnel was another WPA project from 1940 and is built with Art Deco details, including stylized fluted columns and horizontal bands that decorate the tunnel structure. The curve of the tunnel, itself, also expresses a modern styling, as do the flared abutments.

CHURCHES

There are five churches in Shorewood that are of architectural interest and four are potentially individually eligible for the National Register. The second earliest (the first being the church-school building of St. Robert Catholic Church, discussed later) of the church buildings in the community that is still extant is the old Shorewood Presbyterian Church, completed in 1924 at 4060 N. Oakland Ave. This building was constructed in the Craftsman style with a simple rectangular plan, clapboard walls and gable peaks with vertical half timbering and large arched window. The church was used until 1951, when the congregation moved to a large Colonial Revival style church complex to the south.

The old Shorewood Presbyterian Church has a very unusual style for a church building, but the application of vinyl siding and other alterations to the building have lowered its integrity. Even though it was not overly decorated originally, the original wood clapboards were an important part of the building's Craftsman style. Therefore, the building is not eligible for the National Register.

The next significant church building constructed in Shorewood was the Luther Memorial Chapel, built in 1925 and designed by the noted architectural firm of Brust and Philipp. An old wood-frame church building had been on this site, but was replaced by the 1925 structure, a fine example of the Neo-Gothic Revival style as interpreted in churches. The Gothic Revival style was popular for churches from the mid-nineteenth century on and most communities in Wisconsin have large examples of this popular style. After 1900, gothic churches began to be scaled back and details, while still gothic, were becoming more restrained. Some churches began to take on more of an appearance of the Tudor Revival style as seen in houses, so the term Neo-Gothic Revival is often used for churches built after 1900.

The Luther Memorial Chapel is a fine example of this Neo-Gothic style. It features brick construction that is accented with stucco material in the main gable peaks. This effect is seen on some of the Tudor Revival houses also built in Shorewood. The arches are more Tudor influenced than old gothic style, and the tower is unusual in its overall shape. It is a fine and unusual example of a Neo-Gothic Revival church building that fits in well with the overall architectural character of the village.

In 1949-50 an addition was made to the church that mimics the style characteristics of the original building. In 1966-67, an addition was made to this structure. The original church and its 1949-50 addition are architecturally significant and potentially individually eligible for the National Register, while the 1966-67 addition is non-contributing to the building.

In 1914, the first St. Robert School was constructed as both a school and a church auditorium. The auditorium was used for church services until 1938, when the grand Romanesque Revival St. Robert Church (2214 E. Capitol Dr.) was completed in 1938. Designed in 1936 by architects Maginnis & Walsh with L. A. Brielmaier & Sons assisting, the church design was reportedly inspired by a 12th Century Romanesque church from the Lombardy region of Italy, with a spire-topped bell tower, or campanile, typical of towers of this design in Italy. The impressive design of the church includes a tall, rectangular plan and walls of red brick accented with limestone. The roofs of the entire building are covered with multi-hued red tile and the tall conical spire on the tower has a colored and glazed tile surface.

There are elaborate stone details throughout, the most dramatic being on the main or south elevation where two wide flat limestone panels run from ground to roof, perhaps suggesting buttresses or pilasters. Stone also accents all the windows of the building. Some of the stone surrounds are simple, while others feature columns and oculus windows. A large rose window sits in the main elevation, as well.

The main entrance is covered with a gable-roofed portico that is supported by two columns of polished Dakota granite decorated with limestone Corinthian capitals and stone pilasters. The entry, itself, has a large double wood door topped with a compound arch and tympanum. Flanking side entrances are topped with tympanums filled with figural carved stone. Near the tower is another entrance into the church. It is topped with an elaborately-carved figural tympanum over an incised religious quotation. The portico in front of this entrance is complete constructed of limestone and is elaborately carved.

This church is one of the most architecturally significant in the area and was determined eligible as part of the St. Robert Church complex in 2008 as part of the East Capitol Drive reconstruction project.

The Colonial Revival style was not often used for churches, but it was used with great effect by architect Francis Rose in his design for the North Shore Presbyterian Church at 4048 N. Bartlett Ave. The large church took two years to complete, 1951 and 1952 and an educational wing was added to the complex in 1959 with matching architectural details.

The church complex is constructed entirely of red brick and features details typical of the Colonial Revival style including return eaves, gable-roofed dormers, round-arched openings, and a Palladian style window. The windows of the church, itself, are highly decorative with 15-over-15 light sashes topped with transoms with diamond and curved mullions. The windows sit on paneled bases and are decorated with round brick arches. A large Palladian window sits in a wall end in a similar way that a Rose window would grace a Romanesque Revival church. There is also a large stone reveal flanked by windows in another gable end and a stone plaque with broken scroll pediment on an end wall of the education wing.

A large square tower accents the building and it has a colonial style belfry with round-arched louvered openings and domed roof. Entrances are found in the tower and are decorated with sidelights and transoms as well as round-arches and reveals. The education wing has similar, but less decorative details with an ell that features gable roofed dormers.

This church is architecturally significant and potentially individually eligible for the National Register as a fine example of an unusual church design done in the Colonial Revival style. The Colonial Revival style remained very popular in the 1950s for institutional buildings and this style fits in very well with the residential architecture of Shorewood.

Built only seven years later, the Kingo Lutheran Church is a modern design far different from the historic design of the North Shore Presbyterian Church or the historic designs of the Luther Memorial Chapel and St. Robert Church. The architect Harry Ollrogge designed this church as a replacement for a small frame building on the same site (1225 E. Olive St.). But instead of using an historic style for this church (the Neo-Gothic Revival was still popular, as well), the architect designed this modern building.

The building has a largely rectangular plan with a very steeply-pitched gable roof with wide flared eaves that extend to cover projecting tan brick walls. A steeply-pitched gable roofed ell projects from the southeast corner of the building, as well. The side walls feature projecting plain brick piers that suggest a modern variation of buttresses and openings in the walls consist of narrow windows along the piers and a very narrow window band running under the roof eaves. The main entrances along the west and southeast elevations are set in the steep gables that are largely window walls. A large modern cross sits in the west elevation gable. At the northeast corner there is an open rectangular bell tower made up of a large brick pier and metal beams in the shape of crosses.

Because of its fine modern design, this church building is architecturally significant and potentially individually eligible for the National Register.

SCHOOLS

The most significant educational complex in Shorewood is the Shorewood High School, a potentially individually eligible complex. It is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places both for its architectural significance and for its important association with advancements in education. The idea of using separate buildings for high school subjects, similar to a college campus, was one of the progressive ideas of the Shorewood school system in the 1920s. That the community completed this educational concept is significant and the Classical Revival buildings reflect the importance of this historic resource. There are three historic elementary schools in Shorewood as well, the Atwater School, the Lake Bluff School, and St. Robert School.

The Shorewood High School complex is a set of buildings, with the exception of a modern middle school building, are all designed in the Classical Revival architectural style. Instead of building one large high school, it was determined in the mid-1920s that Shorewood's high school would consist of a set of buildings. The first was designed as a single high school building, but was set to become an administration building with the construction of the additional buildings of the campus. The architectural firm of Herbst and Kuenzli designed the Classical Revival buildings of the campus between 1925 and 1935 and gave them all similar details and building materials so that they would have a cohesive appearance together. Altogether there were five buildings erected in the complex. The Shorewood Intermediate School was built within the complex in 1970.

The first building constructed is known as the Administration Building, completed in 1925. The three story tan brick building is accented with limestone. The first story brick walls are scored to suggest a raised stone foundation and the center of the building is slightly recessed from the end walls, which are decorated with pilasters and raised limestone parapets. A wide stone frieze runs under the building's projecting cornice. At the center of the main elevation is a shallow projecting central pavilion that features a parapet, entablature and colossal Ionic columns. A dome rises from the center of the building and is topped with a copper roof that has developed a green patina. The dome is decorated with classical motifs. The original multiple-light over single light sashes have been replaced, but most of the rest of the building's historic details remain intact.

The Manual Arts Building, know the Community Fitness Center, was also completed in 1925. It has a one-story plan and is also constructed of tan bricks. It is much more simply decorated, but does feature a central entry pavilion with parapet, entablature, and pilasters. Some of the building's original windows have been filled in, but the building contributes to the architectural significance of the high school complex.

In 1927, plans were made for a gymnasium building on the high school campus and the building was completed in 1928. Like the manual arts building, this building is one story in height and

constructed of tan bricks. It has similar Classical Revival details to the administration building, including pilasters, and entry pavilions with parapets and stone veneer accents.

In 1928, after the construction of the gymnasium, a bond issue was approved for the construction of a science building and heating plant. The new Science Building was completed in 1929 and has a form and massing and Classical Revival features that are very similar to the ones seen on the Administration Building although slightly less decorative. The building has a plain parapet, projecting stone cornice and entrance with an entablature supported by round columns. Like the Administration Building, this building has a central pavilion decorated with colossal columns. An addition projects from this building, but it has features that blend in well with the historic appearance of the original building. A community pool addition, added in 1976, though, is non-contributing, although it is a fine modern glass and metal structure designed by architects Kahler, Slater & Fitzhugh Scott.

The heating plant also features Classical Revival style details such as a parapet, cornice and a two-story elevation with colossal columns and wide pilasters. This two-story elevation is attached to a retaining wall built of tan brick that is scored to mimic stone. The openings of the wall are round-arched and there are decorative oval reveals in the upper level of this wall structure.

While these four buildings are impressive, probably the gem of the complex is the Auditorium, built with the assistance of WPA funding in 1935. Again, an impressive Classical Revival building with parapet roof, cornice, colossal columns and other classical motifs was designed by Herbst and Kuenzli. But, more important, perhaps, was the auditorium, itself. Seating over 1,000 people, it was said to have interior design based on the RKO Theater in New York City and had state-of-the-art equipment.

Added to the high school complex in 1970 was the Shorewood Intermediate School designed by Plunkett, Keymar, Reginato & Associates. At this time, most school designs were long, low, largely one-story buildings. But this design adds to the architectural significance of the complex because of its unusual design. The building reflects the other architecture of the complex by its size, three stories, and its use of pillars around the entire structure that mimic classical columns. An addition has been made to the building that detracts somewhat from its historic integrity, but the original main block of this school building, although not quite 50 years old, still contributes to the architectural significance of the complex.

The two elementary schools in Shorewood are also of architectural interest as good examples of school construction of their eras. Atwater School, at 2100 E. Capitol Dr. was designed by Robert Messmer & Brothers in the Classical Revival Style. Featuring a red brick main block, the building was given an abundance of classical details, including a parapet roof, prominent cornice, and projecting ends and a central entry pavilion decorated with colossal Ionic columns. The school has a wonderful entrance in between the colossal columns with a three-story arch filled with openings. Sitting back from the street with an impressive landscaped front lawn, the Atwater School is an architectural gem.

The school has been added to, but in a mostly sympathetic manner and the original block of the school can be clearly seen. It is this original block that is potentially individually eligible for the National Register.

Noted architects Eschweiler & Eschweiler designed the original section of the Lake Bluff School (1600 E. Lake Bluff Blvd.) which was completed in 1924. They used a style not unlike the Tudor Revival style in houses that is often called Collegiate Gothic. This style is based on the architecture of English universities. The style was loosely applied to these institutional buildings and would include details like battlements, finials, and towers.

The Lake Bluff School's original main block featured most of its gothic details in the entry pavilions with curved gables, applied stone trim and Tudor-arched entrances. Window bands were decorated with tabbed surrounds and stonework decorated the building corners. A large addition in 1928 covered the original entrances with ells and the gothic decoration was limited largely to tabbed surrounds and a large tower-like ell. Finally, in 1930, another major addition was made to the school, giving it much of its current main elevation's appearance. The Collegiate Gothic style was still used, but was restricted mainly to the decoration of a large entry pavilion still extant today. This entry pavilion has a curved gable parapet and a large stone frontispiece that decorates a window band above the entrance that has arched openings supported by small columns. Other additions have been made to the building, one executed between 1948 and 1950 and another completed in 1992.

The Lake Bluff School has some architectural interest for its Collegiate Gothic elements that are extant from the 1930 addition, but this addition covered over all of the 1924 and 1928 details of the school so the original plan is no longer extant. The school does not have enough distinctive details from any one of these periods to make it potentially eligible for the National Register for architecture.

The only other historic school in Shorewood is the St. Robert School (2200 E. Capitol Dr.). The original St. Robert School was constructed in 1914 as both a school and a church auditorium. The original building sits along East Capitol Drive and was added to in both 1927 and 1958. There have been some alterations to the original building, but its overall form and massing and its Classical Revival influenced design are intact. However, the building does not have enough distinctive characteristics to be potentially individually eligible for the National Register, but the school is a contributing part of the St. Robert Church complex that was determined eligible in 2008 as part of the Capitol Drive reconstruction project.

ARCHITECTS AND BUILDERS

Several of the Milwaukee area's most important architects and many local builders were responsible for the design of houses or other buildings in Shorewood. In the Results Chapter of this report, all of the names of architects and builders that were uncovered in the survey are listed along with building addresses in the lists of buildings identified in the survey. A discussion of the important architects and builders, along with their buildings has been given in the style

sections of this chapter. This section will, then, only list some of the most prolific and and/or important architects and builders identified in the survey.

Architects

Brust and Philipp
Eschweiler & Eschweiler*
Ernest Flagg
Herbst & Kuenzli*
Henry Hengels (Shorewood village engineer, later State of Wisconsin architect)
Lindl & Schutte
Richard Philipp
Martin Tullgren and Sons (Herbert & Minard Tullgren)*
Charles Valentine*
Thomas Van Alyea*
Russell Barr Williamson*

*Milwaukee area architects

Builders

Daum & Zinger Construction Co.*
R. W. Dwyer
George Faber
August Gauger
A. W. Hauser
Hercules Construction Company*
Ketterer Holzschub*
A. Lienemann
Mehrik Bros.
Harry Mews*
A. B. O'Conner, Inc.
Herbert Newman
Harold Pentler
George Schley & Sons
Val Schramka*
Francis J. Schroedel (Schroedel Construction Company)*
William Thalman*
Walter Truettner
George Zagel & Bro.
John Zoebel

*These builders were listed in either the 1926, 1930 and/or 1935 City of Milwaukee Directories. Harry Mews and William Thalman were listed in the 1930 directory as having Shorewood office addresses.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter contains lists of properties already listed in the National Register of Historic Places, properties already determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (East Capitol Drive Section 106 Highway Project survey), Milwaukee County Landmarks, properties identified in the survey as potentially individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and properties identified in the survey within boundaries of potentially eligible National Register of Historic Places districts.

PROPERTIES LISTED IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>
Estabrook Park 3930 N. Murray Ave.	Kilbourntown House (aka Benjamin Church House) Shorewood Village Hall
<i>Ernest Flagg Stone Masonry Houses of Milwaukee County:</i>	
4448 N. Maryland Ave.	George E. Morgan House
2614 E. Menlo Blvd.	Thomas Bossert House
1913 E. Olive St.	Erwin Cords House
3821 N. Prospect Ave.	Seneca W. and Bertha Hatch House
3559 N. Summit Ave.	Henry A. Meyer House

PROPERTIES DETERMINED ELIGIBLE FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>
1420-1428 E. Capitol Dr.	Allen Apartment Buildings (2)
1431-1433 E. Capitol Dr.	Rogoroski Block
1572 E. Capitol Dr.	American Bowling Congress Building
2121 E. Capitol Dr.	Annason Apartment Building
2200-2214 E. Capitol Dr.	St. Robert Church Complex
2727 E. Capitol Dr.	Morrison Apartment Building
4000-4008 N. Morris Blvd.	Brazy Apartment Buildings (2)
4001-4015 N. Oakland Ave.	Armory Courts Building
4001 N. Prospect Ave.	Shorewood Manor Apartment Building



MILWAUKEE COUNTY LANDMARKS

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>
Estabrook Park	Kilbourntown House (aka Benjamin Church House)
1701 E. Capitol Dr.	Shorewood High School Complex
2121 E. Capitol Dr.	Annason Apartments
2214 E. Capitol Dr.	St. Robert Church
3510 N. Lake Dr.	Vogel/Passmore House
3937 N. Lake Dr.	Lindemann/Sijan House
3565 N. Morris Blvd.	Hubbard Park
3801 N. Morris Blvd.	Shorewood Department of Public Works Administration Building

PROPERTIES POTENTIALLY INDIVIDUALLY ELIGIBLE FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

Houses:

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Architect/Builder*</i>
2706 E. Beverly Rd.	Arthur C. Best	1928	
3921-23 N. Downer Ave.		1922	Russell Barr Williamson, architect
2700 E. Edgewood Ave.	Samuel Austin	1925	George Schley & Sons
4137 N. Farwell Ave.	Agnes Keeley	1922	Russell Barr Williamson, Architect
3631 N. Hackett Ave.	Charles Davidson	1922	
3905 N. Harcourt Pl.	Nathan Stein	1922	Russell Barr Williamson, architect
3934 N. Harcourt Pl.	Bernard Nietschmann	1923	Russell Barr Williamson, architect
3510 N. Lake Dr.	Frederick Vogel	1922-23	Walter Judell&Harry Bogner, architects
3515 N. Lake Dr.	Harry S. Johnston	1927	Richard Philipp, architect
3525 N. Lake Dr.		1927	LaCroix & Memmler, architects
3534 N. Lake Dr.	Dr. Charles Albright	1927	Eschweiler & Eschweiler, architects
3541 N. Lake Dr.	Leo Goldman House	1926	Thomas Van Alyea, architect
3562 N. Lake Dr.	George Uihlein	1931	
3565 N. Lake Dr.		1927-28	George Schley & Sons
3575 N. Lake Dr.		1929	
3590 N. Lake Dr.		1922-23	Eschweiler & Eschweiler, architects
3600 N. Lake Dr.		1914	Eschweiler & Eschweiler, architects
3601 N. Lake Dr.		1927	Thomas Van Alyea, architect

*Architects will be designated with the term "architect(s)." All other names are builders.

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
3615 N. Lake Dr.		1928-29	possibly Eschweiler & Eschweiler, architects
3701 N. Lake Dr.		1923	Thomas Van Alyea, architect
3709 N. Lake Dr.		1930	
3823 N. Lake Dr.		1929-30	George Schley & Sons
3916 N. Lake Dr.		1916	
3937 N. Lake Dr.		1916	Elmer Grey, architect
4217 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4226 N. Lake Dr.		1914	
4136 N. Lake Dr.		1926	Thomas Van Alyea, architect
4162 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4200 N. Lake Dr.	Fred Munkwitz	1918	Eschweiler & Eschweiler, architect
4217 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4226 N. Lake Dr.		1914	
4232 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4320 N. Lake Dr.	Franklin L. Weyenberg	1915-56	Charles Valentine, architect
4400 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4408 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4411 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4424 N. Lake Dr.		1917	Herman Buemming, architect
4425 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4430 N. Lake Dr.	Walter Harnischfeger	1926	Eschweiler & Eschweiler, architects
4442 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4447 N. Lake Dr.		pre-1922	
4470 N. Lake Dr.	Dr. Claude Beebe	1928	
4496 N. Lake Dr.		1929	
4500 N. Lake Dr.	E. W. Hoffman	1929	
2216 E. Lake Bluff Blvd.		1928	George Schley & Sons
2621 E. Menlo Blvd.		1929	
2805 E. Menlo Blvd.		1925	
4200 N. Morris Blvd.	Julius Horwath	1945	
2101 E. Newton Ave.	Eggers House	1921	Russell Barr Williamson, architect
2500 E. Newton Ave.	John & Evelyn Walbridge	1910	
2733 E. Newton Ave.		1927	George Schley & Sons
4155-57 E. Newton Ave.		1924	Russell Barr Williamson, architect
2609 E. Olive St.		pre-1922	
3508 N. Prospect Ave.		1924	
2700 E. Shorewood Blvd.	August Gebhardt	1916	Clare Hosmer, architect
4323 N. Stowell Ave.	Emil Munkwitz	1921	Russell Barr Williamson, architect
4163 N. Stowell Ave.		1916	

Apartment Buildings

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Owner/Architect/Builder</i>
3950 N. Farwell Ave.	Cassanova Apartments	1928	M. J. Hayes, owner Roy O. Papenthien, architect
1801 E. Jarvis St.		1925	Goodsitt Brazy Co., owner George Zagel & Bro., builder
1807 E. Jarvis St.		1926	Goodsitt Brazy Co., owner George Zagel & Bro, builder
1809 E. Marion St.		1928	Roy Gotfredson, owner
4320-4334 N. Oakland Ave.		1927	Roy Gotfredson, owner
1807-09 E. Olive St.		1927	
3554 N. Prospect Ave.		1925	H. L. Taneger, owner
4272 N. Wilson Dr.		1931	Fred Semrow, owner
1806-08 E. Wood Pl.		1927	George Zagel & Bro., builder

Commercial Buildings

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Owner/Architect/Builder</i>
3601 N. Oakland Ave.	Fred C. Fass & Son Co.	1931	Dick & Bauer, architect
	Funeral Home	1955	Geor. F. Spinti III, architect
3801-17 N. Oakland Ave.		1927	Goodsitt & Brazy, owner
4401-11 N. Oakland Ave.		1924	Herbert Tullgren (Martin Tullgren & Sons), architect George Zagel & Bro., builder
4425-29 N. Oakland Ave.		1922	G. E. Roeka, owner

Public Buildings

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Architect</i>
3565 N. Morris Blvd.	Hubbard Park Tunnel	1940-41	
3565A N. Morris Blvd.	Railroad Bridge	1883	
3565C N. Morris Blvd.	Ice Skating Pavilion	1937	
3565E N. Morris Blvd.	Shorewood Community Lodge	1936-37	
3565F N. Morris Blvd.	Scout Craft Cabin	1936-37	
3801 N. Morris Blvd.	Shorewood Public Works Buildings	1928- 1934	Henry Hengels, architect
3936 N. Murray Ave.	Shorewood Fire & Police Station	1928	Henry Hengels, architect
	Alterations	1936 1964-65	

Churches

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Architect</i>
4048 N. Bartlett Ave.	North Shore Presbyterian Church	1951-52	Francis Rose
3833 N. Maryland Ave.	Luther Memorial Chapel	1924	Brust & Philipp
		1949-50	
		1966	Harry Ollrogge & Associates,
1225 E. Olive St.	Kingo Lutheran Church	1957	Edgar A. Stubenrauch Associates

Schools

<i>Address</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
Shorewood High School Complex:			
1701A E. Capitol Drive	Shorewood High School Administration Building	1925	Herbst & Kuenzli, architect
1701B E. Capitol Drive	Manual Arts Building	1925	Herbst & Kuenzli
1701C E. Capitol Drive	Gymnasium	1928	Herbst & Kuenzli
1701D E. Capitol Dr.	Heating Plant	1928	Herbst & Kuenzli
1701E E. Capitol Dr.	Science Building	1929	Herbst & Kuenzli
	Pool Addition (NC)	1976	Kahler, Slater & Fitzhugh Scott, architect
1701F E. Capitol Dr.	Auditorium	1936	Herbst & Kuenzli
3830 N. Morris Blvd.	Intermediate School	1970	Plunkett, Keymar, Reginato & Associates, architect
2100 E. Capitol Dr.	Atwater School	1915	Robert A. Messmer & Brothers

PROPOSED HISTORIC DISTRICTS**Proposed Ardmore Avenue Historic District**

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
N. Alpine Ave.			
4339	1937	Colonial Revival	
4343	1939	Tudor Revival	
4349	1940	Colonial Revival	
4353	1958	Colonial Revival	
4357	1938	Colonial Revival	Harry Mews
4363	1936	Colonial Revival	George Faber
4367	1936	Colonial Revival	
4371	1937	Colonial Revival	Harry Mews
4375	1936	Tudor Revival	
4381	1937	Georgian Revival	Harry Mews
4385	1935	Mediterranean Rev.	Harry Mews
4391	1937	Colonial Revival	Harry Mews NC*

*NC: a non-contributing building in the district

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>	
4395	1935	Tudor Revival	Harry Mews	
4399	1948	Tudor Revival		
N. Ardmore Ave. 4124-4126	1931	Tudor Revival		
4128	1929	Bungalow/Tudor		
4131	1937	Tudor Revival		
4132	1935	Tudor Revival		
4136	1937	Tudor Revival		
4137	1932	Colonial Revival		
4141	1936	Colonial Revival		
4200	1925	American Foursquare		
4203	1931	Bungalow		
4204	1937	Tudor Revival	Daum & Zingen	
4205	1927	Bungalow/Tudor	John Zoebel	
4208	1947	Colonial Revival		
4209	1927	Tudor Revival	John Zoebel	
4212	1926	Colonial Revival		
4213	1928	Bungalow	John Zoebel	
4217	1928	Bungalow	John Zoebel	
4220	1948	Gabled Ell/Ranch		NC
4224	1927	Bungalow	A. W. Hauser	
4225	1930	Tudor Revival		
4228	1927	Dutch Colonial	A. W. Hauser	
4229	1928	Colonial Revival		
4232	1927	Bungalow	A. W. Hauser	
4233	1929	Bungalow		
4236	1927	Dutch Colonial	Emil Heilman	
4237	1935	Colonial Revival		
4240	1927	Colonial Revival	Emil Heilman	
4241	1950	Colonial Revival		
4244	1927	Dutch Colonial	Julius Stock/H. Olsen	
4245		Cape Cod		
4248	1927	Colonial Revival	Stock/Olsen	
4251	1949	Ranch		
4254	1935	Dutch Colonial		
4258	1953	Side Gable		NC
4262	1936	Colonial Revival	William F. Thalman	
4304	1942	Colonial Revival		
4310	1938	Georgian Revival		
4314	1935	Tudor Revival		
4318	1939	French Revival		
4320	1936	Two Story Cube		NC
4326	1932	Tudor Revival		
4334	1936	Colonial Revival		
4340	1938	Colonial Revival		NC

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4346	1930	Norman Revival	
4401	1949	Colonial Revival	Harry Mews
4405	1951	Colonial Revival	
4411	1951	Colonial Revival	NC
4412	1938	Tudor Revival	
4415	1953	Cape Cod	
4416	1940	Colonial Revival	Schroeder Bros. Inc.
4419	1952	Cape Cod	
4420	1931	Tudor Revival	August Gauger
4425	1949	Colonial Revival	
4426	1930	Tudor Revival	Kenmitz & Hess Home Show House
4430	1941	Tudor Revival	Harry Mews
4434	1931	Colonial Revival	George Faber
4438	1934	Colonial Revival	
4444	1936	Colonial Revival	
4445	1934	Tudor Revival	
4448	1931	Colonial Revival	
4451	1931	Tudor Revival	
4452	1930	Colonial Revival	
4455	1940	French Revival	Mehrik Bros.
4456	1930	Tudor Revival	
4459	1939	Colonial Revival	
4460	1936	Colonial Revival	
4463	1936	Colonial Revival	
4464	1937	French Revival	
4467	1936	Colonial Revival	
4468	1940	Colonial Revival	
4470	1937	Colonial Revival	
4471	1936	Colonial Revival	
4475	1936	Tudor Revival	
4476	1931	Colonial Revival	
4480	1939	Colonial Revival	
4481	1939	French Revival	Mehrik Bros.
4483	1941	French Revival	
4484	1940	Colonial Revival	August Gauger
4490-92	1947	Side Gable	
4495	1947	Two Story Cube	
4500-02	1946	Side Gable	NC
4501-03	1939	Colonial Revival	
4516	1941	Colonial Revival	
4517	1937	Colonial Revival	
4520	1942	French Revival	
4521	1936	Tudor Revival	A. B. O'Connor Inc.
4524	1936	Colonial Revival	Mehrik Bros.

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4525	1932	Tudor Revival	
4528	1941	French Revival	
4531	1936	Tudor Revival	A. B. O'Connor Inc.
4534	1941	Colonial Revival	A. H. Ganger
4535	1932	Colonial Revival	
4539	1936	Colonial Revival	A. B. O'Connor, Inc.
4540	1941	Colonial Revival	August Gauger
4542	1950	Colonial Revival	
4543	1941	Colonial Revival	
4609	1940	French Revival	
E. Congress St. 1219-1221	1951	Duplex	
E. Glendale Ave. 1116-18	1931	Colonial Revival	
1201-1203	1941	Dutch Colonial	
1204	1939	Mediterranean Rev.	
1218-20	1951	Colonial Revival	Gilbert & Arthur Mueller
1304-1306	1948	Colonial Revival	Vandaboom and Zinn
E. Kensington Blvd. 1119-21	1936	Tudor Revival	
1123	1936	Tudor Revival	
1204-06	1941	Colonial Revival	
1207-09	1936	Tudor Revival	Harry Mews
1212	1939	Colonial Revival	
1213-15	1936	Dutch Colonial	
1218-20	1940	Tudor Revival	
1219-21	1936	French Revival	
1305-1307	1946	Colonial Revival	Walter Schroeder
E. Lake Bluff Blvd. 1301	1938	Colonial Revival	
E. Wildwood Ave. 4312	1940	Colonial Revival	
4316	1941	Colonial Revival	
4326	1936	Colonial Revival	
4330	1936	Colonial Revival	
4331	1935-36	Colonial Revival	
4335	1936	Colonial Revival	
4336	1935	Colonial Revival	William Thalman
4339	1934	Colonial Revival	William Thalman
4340	1935	Colonial Revival	William Thalman
4344		Tudor Revival	
4345	1935	Colonial Revival	
4346	1937	Colonial Revival	
4349	1935	Tudor Revival	
4350	1951	Ranch	

NC

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4353	1935	French Revival	
4356	1931	Tudor Revival	A. B. O'Connor
4357	1934	Colonial Revival	William Thalman
4360	1934	Tudor Revival	
4363	1933	Mediterranean Rev.	George Schley & Sons
4367	1935	Mediterranean Rev.	
4368	1988	Contemporary	NC
4370	1931	Colonial Revival	Fred Semrow
4371	1933	Tudor Revival	Grootemaat Sons, Inc.
4372	1930	Tudor Revival	George Faber
4374-76	1984	Tudor Revival	NC
4375	1930	Tudor Revival	William Thalman
4379	1930	Mediterranean Rev.	William Thalman
4380	1930	Tudor Revival	George Faber
4384	1931	Mediterranean Rev.	
4385	1938	Colonial Revival	Mehrik Bros.
4388	1938	Colonial Revival	
4389	1938	Mediterranean Rev.	Daum & Zinger Const. Co.
4392	1931	Tudor Revival	
4395	1936	Tudor Revival	William Thalman
4396	1936	Tudor Revival	
4400	1937	Colonial Revival	Faber Knuth Co.
4401	1930	Tudor Revival	Edw. M. Giese Co.
4407	1938	Colonial Revival	
4409		Colonial Revival	
4411	1937	Colonial Revival	
4412	1936	Colonial Revival	
4415	1950	Contemporary	Kurtz & Trumpf
4419	1936	Colonial Revival	Guarantee Builders
4420	1937	Mediterranean Rev.	
4424	1931	Tudor Revival	Val Schramka
4425		French Revival	
4428	1931	Mediterranean Rev.	Val Schramka
4431	1936	French Revival	
4432	1931	Colonial Revival	Val Schramka
4435	1938	Colonial Revival	
4436	1936	Colonial Revival	
4440	1955	Colonial Revival	
4441-43	1956	Raised Ranch	
4450-52	1937	Colonial Revival	
4451-53	1938	Dutch Colonial	
4500-02	1953	Colonial Revival	
4501-4503	1941	Colonial Revival	
4515	1950	Colonial Revival	
4516	1940	Colonial Revival	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4520		Colonial Revival	A. B. O'Connor
4521	1947	Colonial Revival	Mehrik
4524	1937	Tudor Revival	
4525	1951	Colonial Revival	Whyhnhoff & Brunner Inc.
4526	1937	Colonial Revival	J. E. Jacobson
4529	1941	Colonial Revival	A. H. Gauger
4532	1937	Colonial Revival	
4535	1940	Colonial Revival	
4536	1938	Colonial Revival	
4539	1948	French Revival	Mehrik
4543-45	1942	Two Story Cube	NC
4609	1940	Colonial Revival	
N. Woodburn St.			
4101-03	1931-32	Tudor Revival	Daum & Zingen
4104-06	1929	Colonial Revival	Daum & Zingen
4105-07	1931	Colonial Revival	
4108-10	1929	Tudor Revival	Daum & Zingen
4111-13	1930	Tudor Revival	Daum & Zingen
4112-14	1929	Mediterranean Rev.	Daum & Zingen
4115-17	1930	Mediterranean Rev.	Daum & Zingen
4116-18	1929	Colonial Revival	Daum & Zingen
4120	1929	Dutch Colonial	Miswald WildeCo.
4119-21	1930	Georgian Revival	Daum & Zingen
4123-25	1929	Tudor Revival	Wilson Mayer Inv. Co.
4129	1927	Tudor Revival	
4133	1927	Dutch Colonial	William Thalman
4137	1927	Colonial Revival	
4141	1926	Bungalow	

Proposed Downer West Historic District

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Builder</i>
E. Beverly Rd.			
2408	1922	Tudor Revival	
2411	1922	Dutch Colonial	
2412		Colonial Revival	
2416		Craftsman	
2417	1928	Craftsman	
2423	1924	Craftsman	
2424	1933	Georgian Revival	
2428	1923	Tudor Revival	
2429	1924	Craftsman	
2500	1924	Craftsman	
2501	1924	Craftsman	
2507	1939	Craftsman	
2508	1928	Craftsman	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
2514	1925	Craftsman	
2517		Craftsman	
2520	1923	Craftsman	
2523	1922	Craftsman	
N. Downer Ave.			
3701		American Foursquare	
3711		Craftsman	
E. Menlo Blvd.			
2200		Colonial Revival	
2201	1927	Tudor Revival	
2204		Craftsman	
2205		Colonial Revival	
2208		Craftsman	NC
2209		Front Gable	NC
2212		Craftsman	
2215		Dutch Colonial	
2218		Craftsman	
2219		Craftsman	
2224		American Foursquare	
2225		Craftsman	
2300	1922	Craftsman	
2301		Craftsman	
2304		Craftsman	
2305		Craftsman	
2308	1921	Bungalow	
2309		Mediterranean Rev.	
2312		Craftsman	
2313		Craftsman	
2316		Side Gable	NC
2317		Bungalow	
2320	1921	Two Story Cube	Coxton Method Buildings
2321		Craftsman	
2326	1922	Craftsman	
2325		Craftsman	
2400	1926	Tudor Revival	
2406		Two Story Cube	
2407		Craftsman	
2410		Craftsman	
2411	1922	Tudor Revival	
2414		Bungalow	
2417	1923	Tudor Revival	
2418		Craftsman	
2423	1918	Craftsman	
2424		Prairie	
2500		Craftsman	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
2501		Craftsman	
2506		Craftsman	
2510		Mediterranean Rev.	
2511		Craftsman	
2515		Craftsman	
2516		Craftsman	
2523	1910	Front Gable	
2524		Craftsman	
2527		Craftsman	
E. Newton Ave.			
2200	1923	Tudor Revival	
2206	1921	Craftsman	
2209	1921	Craftsman	
2210		Queen Anne	
2215		Craftsman	
2216		Craftsman	
2221		Craftsman	
2222		Bungalow	
2225		Craftsman	
2226		Craftsman	
2301		Craftsman	
2304	1923	Craftsman	
2305		Craftsman	
2308		Craftsman	
2311		Craftsman	
2314		Craftsman	
2319		Craftsman	
2320		Craftsman	
2325		Craftsman	
2401	1913	Dutch Colonial	E. F. Seztke, builder
2407		Craftsman	
2408		Craftsman	
2411		Craftsman	
2412	1922	Craftsman	
2416		Craftsman	
2417		Craftsman	
2421		Craftsman	
2422		Craftsman	
2425		Craftsman	
2500		Prairie	
2501		Georgian Revival	
2504		Craftsman	
2510		Craftsman	NC
2511	1922	Colonial Revival	
2515		Craftsman	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
2516		Craftsman	
2521		Craftsman	
2525		Craftsman	
N. Prospect Ave.			
3701		Craftsman	
3710		Two Story Cube	
3900	1926	Spanish Colonial	
E. Shorewood Blvd.			
2401	1922-23	Two Story Cube	
2406		Colonial Revival	
2407		Tudor Revival	
2410		Colonial Revival	
2413		Tudor Revival	
2419		Tudor Revival	
2423	1924	Bungalow	
2429		Georgian Revival	
2500		Bungalow	
2501		Two Story Cube	
2507		Craftsman	
2508	1922	Tudor Revival	
2513	1923	Tudor Revival	
2514	1924	Prairie	
2519	1921	Mediterranean Rev.	
2520		Tudor Revival	
2523	1923	American Foursquare	Walter Truettner
2524	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	Walter Truettner
N. Stowell Ave.			
3901	1925	Colonial Revival	

Proposed Estabrook Homes Historic District

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Builder/Owner</i>
E. Glendale Ave.			
700-714	1947-49	Colonial Revival	Schroedel Construction Co.
701-715	1947-49	Colonial Revival	
802-816	1947-49	Colonial Revival	
803-817	1947-49	Colonial Revival	
E. Kensington Blvd.			
810-824	1947-49	Colonial Revival	
811-825	1947-49	Colonial Revival	
N. Wilson Dr.			
4400-4410	1947-49	Colonial Revival	
4414-4430	1947-49	Colonial Revival	
4434-4444	1947-49	Colonial Revival	
4500-4510	1947-49	Colonial Revival	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Builder/Owner</i>
4514-4530	1947-49	Colonial Revival	Schroedel Construction Co.
4534-4544	1947-49	Colonial Revival	
N. Woodruff Ave. 4511-4535	1947-49	Colonial Revival	

Proposed North Lakeshore Historic District

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
E. Capitol Drive 2618-20	1925	Tudor Revival	
2624	1933	Colonial Revival	William F. Thalman
2630	1924	Georgian Revival	
2710	1922	Bungalow	
2718	1924	Bungalow	NC
2729	1924	Tudor Revival	
N. Downer Ave. 4100	1924	Tudor Revival	
4101-03	1936	Tudor Revival	
4107-09	1925	Prairie	
4112	1926	Tudor Revival	
4113		Georgian Revival	
4119		Georgian Revival	
4138	1921	Georgian Revival	
4143-45	1923	Tudor Revival	Thomas Van Alyea
4151-53	1923	Tudor Revival	
4167	1925	Tudor Revival	Thomas Van Alyea (home)
4201	1923	Prairie	
4205-07	1924	Craftsman	
4209		Colonial Revival	
4213		Duplex	NC
4221	1931	Dutch Colonial	
4225	1922	Dutch Colonial	
N. Farwell Ave. 4409	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	
4410	1926	Tudor Revival	
4414	1927	Tudor Revival	
4415	1927	Tudor Revival	
4420	1927	Georgian Revival	
4421	1927	Dutch Colonial	
4426	1927	Georgian Revival	
4427	1929	Tudor Revival	
4432	1927	Tudor Revival	
4433	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	George Schley & Sons
4439	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	
4440	1927	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4444	1931	Tudor Revival	
4445	1927	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons
4451	1927	Tudor Revival	
4452	1930	Tudor Revival	
4457	1925	Colonial Revival	
4460	1928	Colonial Revival	
4461	1925	Tudor Revival	
4465	1924	Bungalow	
4466	1925	Cape Cod	NC
4470	1926	Tudor Revival	
4471	1926	Tudor Revival	
4476	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	
4477	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	
4482	1951	Colonial Revival	NC
4483	1929	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons
4491		Colonial Revival	NC
E. Jarvis St.			
2606	1930	Gabled Ell	
2610	1924	Colonial Revival	
2616	1924	Gabled Ell	NC
2700-02	1952	International	
E. Kensington Blvd.			
2100	1925	Mediterranean Rev.	
2101	1925	Mediterranean Rev.	
2107	1925	Craftsman	
2108	1923	Georgian Revival	
2114	1926	Colonial Revival	
2120	1929	Tudor Revival	
2200	1920	Tudor Revival	
2206	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	
2209	1926	Tudor Revival	
2212	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
2213	1926	Tudor Revival	
2218	1923	Tudor Revival	
2224		Georgian Revival	
2300	1921	Georgian Revival	
2301	1959	Ranch	
2306	1923	Tudor Revival	
2309	1925	Tudor Revival	
2312	1929	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons
2313	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	
2415	1954	Ranch	
N. Lake Dr.			
4001	1921	Tudor Revival	
4015		Bungalow	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4025	1923	Georgian Revival	
4031		Colonial Revival	
4037	1923-24	Mediterranean Rev.	
4043	1923-24	Mediterranean Rev.	
4049		Georgian Revival	
4055		Mediterranean Rev.	
4060	1957	Ranch	
4061		Mediterranean Rev.	
4067	1925	Tudor Revival	
4068	1940	Mediterranean Rev.	
4073	1927	Tudor Revival	A. Lienemann
4074	1934	Mediterranean Rev.	
4079		Mediterranean Rev.	
4082	1926	Tudor Revival	
4085	1926	Mediterranean Rev.	
4090	1964	Ranch	Charles H. Harper & Associates Inc.
4091	1926	Dutch Colonial	A. Lienemann
4098	1925-26	Tudor Revival	
4100	1934	Colonial Revival	
4101	1955	Contemporary Ranch	
4107	1955	Two Story Cube	NC
4108	1934	Tudor Revival	
4113	1963	Colonial Revival	NC
4114	1951	Colonial Revival	
4120	1945-46	Gabled Ell	
4121	1930	Colonial Revival	
4130	1954	Ranch	
4136	1926-27	Spanish Colonial	Thomas Van Alyea
4137	1950	Ranch	Falkner Moody Company
4145	1954	Two Story Cube	
4150		Colonial Revival	
4151	1953	Colonial Revival	Carl Zimmerman NC
4154	1925	Mediterranean Rev.	
4155	1953	Raised Ranch	Carl Zimmerman NC
4162		Mediterranean Rev.	
4200	1918	Tudor Revival	Eschweiler&Eschweiler
4201	1954	Ranch	
4210	1981	Contemporary	Joseph Valerio NC
4216		Tudor Revival	
4217		Mediterranean Rev.	
4226	1914	Italian Renaissance Rev.	
4227	1953	Ranch	
4232		Tudor Revival	
4240		Tudor Revival	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4300	1938-39	Tudor Revival	
4303	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
4308	1925-26	Mediterranean Rev.	George Schley & Sons
4315	1954	Ranch	
4320	1915-16	Mediterranean Rev.	Charles Valentine
4400		Tudor Revival	
4401	1953	Ranch	
4408		Italian Renaissance Rev.	
4411		Mediterranean Rev.	
4415	1963	Colonial Revival	NC
4424	1917	Georgian Revival	Herman Buemming
4425		Georgian Revival	
4430	1926	Tudor Revival	Eschweiler&Eschweiler
4431		Tudor Revival	
4439	2005-06	Mediterranean Revival	NC
4442	1916	Mediterranean Rev.	
4447		Tudor Revival	
4450	1972	Contemporary	Edmond Mazur
4455	1950	Colonial Revival	NC
4460	1940	Two Story Cube	NC
4461	1956	Colonial Revival	
4467	1924	Mediterranean Rev.	
4470	1928	Georgian Revival	
4473	1924	Mediterranean Rev.	George Schley & Sons
4479	1983	Neo-Colonial	Schneider Builders NC
4480	1948-49	Colonial Revival	
4485	1953	Raised Ranch	Carl Zimmerman NC
4496	1929	Tudor Revival	
4500	1929	Mediterranean Rev.	
E. Lake Bluff Blvd.			
2216	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	George Schley & Sons
2304	1951	Colonial Revival	
2312	1929	Tudor Revival	
2318	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	
2406	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
2500	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
2501	1927	Tudor Revival	
2510	1925	Tudor Revival	
2515	1950	Colonial Revival	
2518	1922	Georgian Revival	
2521	1953	Ranch	
2535	1953	Contemporary	
E. Marion St.			
2419	1921	Colonial Revival	
2505	1954	Ranch	NC

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
2514	1926	Tudor Revival	
2520-2520A	1924	Tudor Revival	
2528		Two Story Cube	
2601	1920	French Revival	
N. Maryland Ave.			
4400	1963	Colonial Revival	NC
4401	1928	Georgian Revival	
4407	1923	Two Story Cube	NC
4408	1926-27	Tudor Revival	
4411	1929	Norman Revival	
4414	1926	Tudor Revival	
4417	1927	Tudor Revival	
4418	1925	Tudor Revival	
4421	1929	Tudor Revival	
4424	1925	Georgian Revival	
4425	1928	French Revival	Hercules Const. Co.
4428	1926	Dutch Colonial	NC
4429	1928	Tudor Revival	
4434	1926-27	Georgian Revival	Herbert Newman
4435	1926	Georgian Revival	Herbert Newman
4440	1927	Tudor Revival	Heideman-Aaerst-Weiss Inc.
4441	1926	Tudor Revival	
4444		Tudor Revival	
4445	1924	Tudor Revival	
4448	1926	French Revival	Ernest Flagg
4449	1925	Tudor Revival	
4454	1925	Georgian Revival	
4455	1923	Georgian Revival	
4458	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	
4459	1925	Mediterranean Rev.	
4464	1925	Georgian Revival	
4465	1923-24	Colonial Revival	
4469	1930	Tudor Revival	
4470	1926-27	Tudor Revival	
4475	1925	Spanish Colonial	NC
4476	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	
4480	1930	Mediterranean Rev.	
4481	1927	Tudor Revival	
4491	1926	Georgian Revival	
4492	1929	Tudor Revival	
E. Olive St.			
2500	1921	Georgian Revival	
2501-03	1924-25	Tudor Revival	
2517-2519	1923	French Revival	Thomas Van Alyea
2518		American Foursquare	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
2600		Tudor Revival	
2601		Georgian Revival	
2606	1922	Georgian Revival	
2609		Georgian Revival	
2625	1951	Colonial Revival	
N. Prospect Ave.			
4410	1927	Colonial Revival	
4413		Dutch Colonial	
4418		Tudor Revival	
4419		Tudor Revival	
4423	1924	Georgian Revival	
4426		Tudor Revival	
4429		Tudor Revival	
4430		Mediterranean Rev.	
4436	1926	Tudor Revival	
4437	1939	Colonial Revival	
4440	1954	Colonial Revival	
4443		Bungalow	
4444		Tudor Revival	
4449	1921	Georgian Revival	
4450	1925	Craftsman	
4456	1926	Tudor Revival	
4457	1924	Dutch Colonial	
4461		Georgian Revival	
4464	1937	Georgian Revival	
4468	1925	Mediterranean Rev.	
4471	1925	Tudor Revival	
4476	1931	Georgian Revival	William Thalman
4477	1927	Colonial Revival	
4481	1948	Colonial Revival	
4482	1929	Tudor Revival	
4490	1963	Ranch	NC
4493	1929	Mediterranean Rev.	
N. Richland Ct.			
4000	1952	Cape Cod	
4014	1983	Contemporary	Kent Keegan NC
4017		Craftsman	
4018	1918	Georgian Revival	Charles Valentine
4027		American Foursquare	
4028	1921	Tudor Revival	Charles Valentine
4033	1917	Tudor Revival	Charles Valentine
4036	1917	Mediterranean Rev.	Charles Valentine
4039		Colonial Revival	
4042		Mediterranean Rev.	
4045		Georgian Revival	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>	
4051	1928	Tudor Revival	Perce Schley	
4052		Mediterranean Rev.		
4058	1920	Eclectic Revival		
4059	1914	Georgian Revival		
4064	1969	Colonial Revival		
4065		Tudor Revival		
4068		Colonial Revival		
4071		Craftsman		
4078	1922	Georgian Revival		
4079	1924	Craftsman		
N. Stowell Ave.				
4106-08	1923	Dutch Colonial	Charles Valentine	
4110-12	1923	Dutch Colonial	Charles Valentine	
4116-18	1923	Two Story Cube		NC
4120-22	1925	Tudor Revival	Shorewater Corp.	
4146-48	1925	Mediterranean Rev.		
4150-52	1922	Two Story Cube		NC
4154-56	1922	Two Story Cube		NC
4160	1925	Two Story Cube		NC
4205-07		Tudor Revival		
4308	1926	Tudor Revival		
4213-15	1927	Tudor Revival		
4214	1907	Craftsman		
4219	1921	Tudor Revival		
4220	1907	Craftsman		
4223	1922	Craftsman		
4300-02	1952	Two Story Cube	Carl Zimmerman	NC
4301	1924	Georgian Revival		
4304	1952	Colonial Revival	Carl Zimmerman	NC
4310	1939	French Revival	William Thalmann	
4313		Craftsman		
4314	1925	Tudor Revival	W. G. Herbst(architect home)	
4317	1931	Georgian Revival	George Schley & Sons	
4323	1921	Prairie	Russell Barr Williamson	
4401		Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons	
4411		Tudor Revival		
4412		Craftsman		
4415	1922	Georgian Revival		
4418	1955	Contemporary		
4422		Georgian Revival		
4423	1927	Tudor Revival		
4427	1923	Tudor Revival		
4428		Tudor Revival		
4433	1928	Georgian Revival		
4436		Craftsman		

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4443	1930	Tudor Revival	Val Schramka
4447		Tudor Revival	
4457		Colonial Revival	
4476	1923	Colonial Revival	NC
E. Wood Pl. 2500-02	1926	Tudor Revival	
2501		Tudor Revival	
2519	1922	Tudor Revival	
2520	1923	Tudor Revival	Russell Barr Williamson
2601		Georgian Revival	
2607	1923	Craftsman	
2608	1928	French Revival	
2613	1926	Tudor Revival	
2618		Tudor Revival	
2619	1922-23	Georgian Revival	

Proposed South Lakeshore Historic District

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
E. Beverly Rd. 2600	1926	Tudor Revival	
2601	1926	Bungalow	
2604	1923	Georgian Revival	
2605	1922	Tudor Revival	
2608	1923	Colonial Revival	
2611	1922	Colonial Revival	
2614	1921	Bungalow	
2615	1924	Georgian Revival	
2618	1921	Prairie	Russell Barr Williamson
2621	1921	Mediterranean Rev.	
2624	1922	Colonial Revival	
2627	1923	Georgian Revival	
2631-33	1926	Tudor Revival	
2632	1924	Tudor Revival	
2637	1924	Georgian Revival	
2641	1923	Tudor Revival	
2642	1937	Craftsman	
2647	1925	Colonial Revival	
2651	1946	Colonial Revival	
2700	1929	Craftsman	
2701	1925	Tudor Revival	
2706	1928	Georgian Revival	
2711	1924	Dutch Colonial	
2712	1923	Tudor Revival	
2718		Mediterranean Rev.	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>	
2719	1921	Mediterranean Rev.		
2725	1921	Tudor Revival		
2726	1925	Mediterranean Rev.		
2731	1921	Tudor Revival		
2732	1921	Tudor Revival		
2737	1923	Mediterranean Rev.		
N. Downer Ave. 3820	1924	Mediterranean Rev.		
E. Edgewood Ave. 2616	1923	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons	
2700	1925	Spanish Col. Rev		
2800	1922	Tudor Revival		
N. Hackett Ave. 3509	1925	Mediterranean Rev.		
3510	1927	Tudor Revival		
3514	1923	Georgian Revival		
3515	1923	Georgian Revival		
3520	1925	Tudor Revival		
3521	1922	Georgian Revival		
3528	1923	Georgian Revival		
3529	1922	Georgian Revival		
3534	1925	Colonial Revival		
3535	1922	Craftsman		
3541	1922	Craftsman		
3542	1926	Bungalow		
3548	1923	Mediterranean Rev.		
3549	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	Hercules Construction Co.	
3601	1923	Mediterranean Rev.		
3612	1925	Tudor Revival		
3615	1925	Tudor Revival		
3622	1926	Tudor Revival		
3623	1927	Tudor Revival		
3631	1922	Georgian Revival		
N. Harcourt Pl. 3909	1951	Ranch	Harold Pentler	NC
3910	1951	Ranch	Harold Pentler	NC
3915	1951	Ranch	Harold Pentler	NC
3916	1951	Ranch	Harold Pentler	NC
3919	1951	Ranch	Harold Pentler	NC
3920	1951	Ranch	Harold Pentler	NC
3929	1951	Ranch	Harold Pentler	NC
3930	1952	Cape Cod	Harold Pentler	NC
3934	1923	Prairie	Russell Barr Williamson	
3935		Bungalow		
3938		Craftsman		

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
3939	1922	Craftsman	
3945		Craftsman	
3948	1924	Tudor Revival	
3949		American Foursquare	
3954	1959	French Revival	
3955		Craftsman	
3959		Craftsman	
3965	1922	Prairie	Russell Barr Williamson
N. Lake Dr. 3510	1922-23	Georgian Revival	Walter Judell & Harry Bogner
3515	1927	Tudor Revival	Richard Philipp
3525	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	LaCroix & Memmler
3533	1929	Tudor Revival	George Schley
3534	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Eschweiler & Eschweiler
3541	1926-27	Norman Revival	B: Thomas Van Alyea
3550	1948, 1990	Colonial Revival	R. Dwyer
3562	1931	Mediterranean Rev.	
3565	1927-28	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons
3575	1929	Tudor Revival	
3580	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
3590	1923-24	Tudor Revival	Eschweiler & Eschweiler
3600	1914	Tudor Revival	Eschweiler & Eschweiler
3601	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	
3615	1928-29	French Revival	Eschweiler & Eschweiler
3701	1923	Tudor Revival	Thomas Van Alyea
3709	1930	Norman Revival	
3715	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	
3725	1929	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons
3801	1929	Tudor Revival	Charles W. Valentine
3815	1929	Tudor Revival	R. W. Dwyer
3816	1936	Tudor Revival	
3823	1929-30	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons
3850	1954	Colonial Revival	
3900		Georgian Revival	
3901	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	Lindl & Schutte
3911	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	
3915	1942	French Revival	Daum & Zingen
3916	1916	Tudor Revival	
3921	1954	Ranch	
3926	1931	Georgian Revival	
3932		Tudor Revival	
3937	1916	Tudor Revival	Elmer Grey
3944	1927-28	Mediterranean Rev.	S. M. Siesel

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
3947	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	Scott & Mayer
3957		Georgian Revival	
3960	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	
3965	2004	Mediterranean Rev.	Stecker Const. Co. NC
3966	1927	Tudor Revival	
E. Menlo Blvd.			
2600	1951	Tudor Revival	
2608	1924	Tudor Revival	
2609	1923	Tudor Revival	
2614	1925	French Revival	Ernest Flagg
2615	1926	Mediterranean Rev.	
2621	1924	Tudor Revival	
2700	1925	Mediterranean Rev.	
2709	1926	Tudor Revival	
2714	1927	Colonial Revival	
2724	1925	Mediterranean Rev.	
2730	1926	Tudor Revival	
2800	1925	Georgian Revival	
2805	1925	Mediterranean Rev.	
2810	1922	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons
2811	1926	Tudor Revival	
2818	1925	Georgian Revival	
2821	1929	Tudor Revival	
2826	1925	Tudor Revival	
E. Newton Ave.			
2600	1926	Tudor Revival	
2601	1926	Tudor Revival	
2608	1926	Georgian Revival	
2609	1924	Dutch Colonial	
2614	1922	Colonial Revival	
2615	1923	Two Story Cube	
2620	1923	Tudor Revival	
2621	1923	Mediterranean Revival	
2626	1922	Tudor Revival	
2634	1930	Colonial Revival	George Schley & Sons
2640	1922	Georgian Revival	
2648	1923	Tudor Revival	
2700	1923	Prairie	
2701	1928	Tudor Revival	
2703	1928	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons
2710	1922	Georgian Revival	George Schley & Sons
2711	1923	Norman Revival	
2716	1924	Mediterranean Rev.	
2717	1926	Tudor Revival	
2722	1928	Tudor Revival	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
2723	1923	Georgian Revival	
2728	1922	Tudor Revival	
2733	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	George Schley & Sons
2736	1926	Mediterranean Rev.	George Schley & Sons
N. Shepard Ave.			
3500	1924	Mediterranean Rev.	
3501	1924	Tudor Revival	
3508	1928	Tudor Revival	
3509	1923	Georgian Revival	
3514	1921	Mediterranean Rev.	
3521	1923	Tudor Revival	
3524	1923	Tudor Revival	
3527	1922	Mediterranean Rev.	
3533	1922	Tudor Revival	
3536		Tudor Revival	
3539	1925	Tudor Revival	
3547	1922	Mediterranean Rev.	
3553	1922	French Revival	Charles Valentine
E. Shorewood Blvd.			
2600	1927	Tudor Revival	
2606	1923	Tudor Revival	George Gehrig
2607	1924	Tudor Revival	
2612	1922	Tudor Revival	
2613	1926	Tudor Revival	
2618	1922	Tudor Revival	
2621	1940	French Revival	
2624	1935	Georgian Revival	
2625	1922	Mediterranean Rev.	
2630	1927	Tudor Revival	
2631	1924	Mediterranean Rev.	
2637	1923	Dutch Colonial	
2642	1925	Mediterranean Rev.	
2643	1925	Spanish Colonial	
2648	1921	Bungalow	
2649	1925	Craftsman	
2700	1915	Prairie	attrib: Clare Hosmer
2701	1927	Tudor Revival	
2709	1923	Tudor Revival	
2714	1924	Mediterranean Rev.	
2715	1924	Mediterranean Rev.	
2720	1924	Tudor Revival	
2721	1922	Mediterranean Rev.	H. Schmidt
2726	1927	Tudor Revival	George Schley & Sons
2727	1925	Dutch Colonial	A. Linemann
2733	1924	Georgian Revival	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
N. Summit Ave.			
3501	1924	Mediterranean Rev.	
3508	1925	Tudor Revival	
3509	1921	Georgian Revival	
3514		Georgian Revival	
3515	1922	Georgian Revival	
3520	1929	Tudor Revival	
3521	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
3526	1926	Tudor Revival	
3529	1929	Mediterranean Rev.	
3534		Mediterranean Rev.	
3531	1924	Mediterranean Rev.	
3535	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	
3540	1924	Tudor Revival	
3546	1926	Tudor Revival	
3549	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
3554	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
3559	1925	Tudor Revival	Ernest Flagg
3560	1927-28	Georgian Revival	
3568	1924	Georgian Revival	

Proposed Oakland North Historic District

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Builder/Owner</i>
N. Oakland Ave.			
4422	1929	Tudor Revival	Hubert Buchholz
4428	1928	Tudor Revival	E. A. Hillger
4434		Contemporary	NC
4442		Tudor Revival	
4455	1931	Mediterranean Rev.	Frank DeSal
4459	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Sol Blankstein
4460	1929	Mediterranean Rev.	W. F. Wager
4468	1929	Mediterranean Rev.	W. F. Wager
4474	1929	Mediterranean Rev.	Martin Binn
4480	1931	Tudor Revival	H. N. Reagan

Proposed Oakland South Historic District

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Builder/Owner</i>
E. Beverly Rd.			
1714	1926	Mediterranean Rev.	Goodsitt & Brazy
1717	1926	"	"
1723	1926	"	"
E. Newton Ave.			
1716	1927	Classical Revival	Dell Realty Co.

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Builder/Owner</i>
1717	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Dell Realty Co.
1720	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Dell Realty Co.
1721	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Dell Realty Co.
N. Oakland Ave.			
3524-30	1928	Mediterranean Rev.	Edw. J. Fleck Co.
3532	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Edw. J. Fleck Co.
3540	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Edw. J. Fleck Co.
3546	1927	Tudor Revival	Edw. J. Fleck Co.
3552	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Edw. J. Fleck Co.
3560	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Edw. J. Fleck Co.
3568	1924	Classical Revival	
3576	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	J. G. Jansen
3582	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	J. G. Jansen
3715	1947	Colonial Revival	Carl Weise, R. W. Dwyer
3723	1926	Mediterranean Rev.	Goodsitt & Brazy
3801-3817	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Goodsitt & Brazy
3819	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Goodsitt & Brazy
3825	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Goodsitt & Brazy
3833	1927	Mediterranean Rev.	Goodsitt & Brazy

Proposed Prospect Avenue Historic District

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
N. Farwell Ave.			
4100	1922	Colonial Revival	
4105	1923	Colonial Revival	
4106	1927	Dutch Colonial	
4109		Colonial Revival	
4110	1921	Bungalow	
4114	1923	Colonial Revival	
4117	1929	Two Story Cube	NC
4118	1923	Colonial Revival	
4119		Tudor Revival	
4121		Craftsman	
4124	1928	Dutch Colonial	
4125	1924	Colonial Revival	H. Grotophorst
4128	1924	American Foursquare	
4129	1921	Craftsman	H. Grotophorst
4132	1922	Tudor Revival	Joseph Hickey
4135	1926	Colonial Revival	C. H. Hickey
4136	1921	Dutch Colonial	Joseph Hickey
4137	1923	Prairie	Russell Barr Williamson
4142	1922	Bungalow	
4143		Bungalow	
4146	1928	Bungalow	
4147	1923	Bungalow	E. N. Morgan

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4150	1929	Craftsman	
4151	1923	Dutch Colonial	
4154	1924	Two Story Cube	NC
4155-57	1924	Prairie	Russell Barr Williamson
4158	1924	Dutch Colonial	
4159-61	1923	Two Story Cube	NC
4163-65	1926	Two Story Cube	
4200	1921	Side Gable	Arthur Wenz
4204	1921	Tudor Revival	Arthur Wenz
4210	1923	Dutch Colonial	
4212-14	1926	Two Story Cube	
4216-18		Tudor Revival	
4220-22	1923	Tudor Revival	J. M. Tice
4224	1929	Tudor Revival	
E. Jarvis St.			
2220	1923	Colonial Revival	
2414	1922	Craftsman	
E. Lake Bluff Blvd.			
2401		Colonial Revival	
E. Olive St.			
2303		Colonial Revival	
2315	1921	Front Gable	American House Co.
2317	1921	Two Story Cube	American House Co.
2401	1925	Colonial Revival	
2420	1921	Dutch Colonial	T. S. Van Alyea
N. Prospect Ave.			
4101	1922	Colonial Revival	
4106	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
4107		Bungalow	NC
4111	1921	Bungalow	Herbert Newman
4112		Bungalow	
4115	1922	Bungalow	
4118	1926	Colonial Revival	
4119	1915	Craftsman	
4124	1921	Bungalow	
4125		Bungalow	
4128	1922	Colonial Revival	
4129	1924	Tudor Revival	
4132		Tudor Revival	
4133	1926	Bungalow	
4136	1927	Tudor Revival	
4137	1925	Tudor Revival	
4142	1923	Craftsman	
4143	1918	American Foursquare	
4146	1923	Dutch Colonial	

<i>Address</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Style</i>	<i>Architect/Builder</i>
4147		Craftsman	
4150		Bungalow	
4151	1922	Craftsman	
4154		Craftsman	
4155		Bungalow	
4158	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	
4163	1921	Colonial Revival	Milwaukee Contracting Co.
4201	1923	Mediterranean Rev.	W. G. Truettner
4205-07	1924	Med. Duplex	
4206		Bungalow	
4209-11	1925	Craftsman	
4210-12	1924	Med. Duplex	
4215	1923	Two Story Cube	NC
4216	1921	Colonial Revival	
4221		Craftsman	
4222	1921	Bungalow	
4224	1922	Mediterranean Rev.	
4225-27	1926	Colonial Revival	Gehring Laak Co.
4300		Craftsman	
4301		Mediterranean Rev.	
4308		Craftsman	
4309		Craftsman	
4312	1923	Colonial Revival	
4313	1926	Bungalow	
4317		Bungalow	
4318		Craftsman	
4321	1925	Tudor Revival	
4325		Bungalow	
N. Stowell Ave.			
4101		Dutch Colonial	
4109	1922	Tudor Revival	
4115		Tudor Revival	
4121		Bungalow	
4127		Dutch Colonial	
4129-31	1929	Tudor Revival	
4135	1924	Two Story Cube	NC
4139	1924	Colonial Revival	NC
4143		Bungalow	
4149	1922	Bungalow	
4153		Craftsman	
4159		Bungalow	

CHAPTER FIVE

RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The following paragraph, taken from a brochure published by the Division of Historic Preservation, Wisconsin Historical Society, entitled, "Wisconsin Historic Preservation Program," sums up the importance of historic preservation in Wisconsin.

"In Wisconsin, the presence of prehistoric and historic properties offers state residents and visitors a special sense of place and a feeling of continuity and association with the past. Such a contribution is invaluable at a time when shopping malls, superhighways, suburban tract housing, and other influences are leading to the increasing homogenization and standardization of American life. Wisconsin's cultural resources provide a wide and welcome variety of esthetic, education, and economic benefits that improve the quality of life in the state."

During the survey of the historic resources of Shorewood, one thing became clear; the village has a many intact historic neighborhoods that meet the eligibility requirements of the National Register of Historic Places as historic districts. In fact, most of the historic properties of the community are in these historic districts; there are only a few located outside of them. What to do with these results is suggested after a few words about the benefits of historic preservation.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Social Benefits

The preservation of the historic resources in Shorewood is important for a number of tangible and intangible, yet significant, reasons. Historic resources provide a community with a sense of its history, an awareness of its origins, and a distinct image of itself. They provide an important mental and physical continuity, familiarity, and orientation in a rapidly changing world. Older buildings and sites contribute to a visual diversity, a human scale, a richness of craftsmanship, and pleasant associations that can enrich our daily lives.

The preservation of local historic resources can strengthen community pride. Every community has something that makes it historically unique. Protecting the physical evidence of a community's historic character increases citizens' pride in and identification with their area.



Economic Benefits of Historic Preservation in Wisconsin

During the past several decades, the historic preservation movement has been active in Wisconsin, and several observations about the economic benefits of historic preservation have become apparent. Historic preservation has been successful in stimulating private and public investment throughout the state. On a local level, preservation enhances a community's image that helps stabilize property values and attracts new business investment. More directly, historic preservation is an important element in Wisconsin's tourism industry. Many polls show that people do not travel just for recreation, but to see and appreciate the unique history of areas where they do not live.

Historic preservation has a positive economic impact on an area. The rehabilitation and restoration of historic buildings improves the economic base by adaptively reusing vacant buildings, stimulating property investment, attracting new businesses, adding jobs, and increasing the local tax base. Of particular interest to Shorewood, historic preservation can also help stabilize older neighborhoods via economic incentives for rehabilitation, neighborhood pride, and increased property values. Also, local rehabilitation of historic buildings generally utilize local labor and construction companies, helping create jobs and provide income for the local economy.

One of the most common misconceptions about historic preservation is that it is more expensive than new construction. Statistics show that this is not always the case. Rehabilitation of old buildings often is a cost-effective investment, less risky than new construction, and less affected by changing economic cycles. Rehabilitation projects usually cost about one-half to one-third less than similar new construction. For example, there is less expense for foundation and structural work, less expense for interior details that are reused rather than newly constructed, less expense for high-quality construction and design, and potential financial incentives for the rehabilitation of older buildings. Reuse of historic materials is also much "greener" than purchasing newly-made building materials.

The impact of historic preservation on tourism is one of the largest economic incentives for maintaining and restoring historic buildings. Tourism is important not only in Wisconsin, but throughout the nation. Historic properties, historic districts, and communities that have historic downtowns are popular tourist attractions. Studies have shown that there has been a growth in tourism nationally that is based on people traveling to architecturally, historically, and/or culturally important sites. Historic resources enhance the state's appeal to visitors, and many local communities are making concerted attempts to attract tourists by developing local historic resources. Although Shorewood is not a tourist destination, these same factors can make the case for improving Shorewood as a desirable residential community.

INCENTIVES FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

There are a number of direct and indirect economic incentives for historic preservation of resources in Wisconsin. These incentives are primarily in the form of direct tax credits, as explained below.

Rehabilitation Income Tax Credits

State and federal income tax credits are available to owners of historic properties for the rehabilitation of both residential and income-producing buildings. A 20 percent federal and five percent state tax credit exists for the costs incurred in rehabilitating income-producing buildings. A 25 percent state income tax credit is available for the costs incurred in rehabilitating historic owner-occupied residential buildings. The buildings must be eligible for or listed in the National and State Registers of Historic Places.

With the number of apartment buildings in Shorewood that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, this income tax credit might be very useful in helping maintain historic income-producing buildings in the village.

Rehabilitation Tax Credits for Homeowners

State tax credits are available to owners of historic properties that are their principle residences. A 25 percent state tax credit exists for the costs incurred in rehabilitating owner-occupied residential buildings. The buildings must be eligible for or listed in the National and State Registers of Historic Places.

This tax credit could be very useful for home owners in Shorewood who have older, larger homes that might need rehabilitation and who are interested in maintaining their historic character.

Charitable Tax Deductions for Easement Donations

Owners of historic properties that donate preservation easements to qualified organizations may be eligible for federal and state income tax deductions or deductions on estate and gift taxes. Eligible properties are those listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

High Resale Value

An incentive for some owners is the fact that many historic properties gain added value from this designation and add to the resale value of a property. In particular, these values can be raised when a property is part of a historic district.

Protection of Property Investment

Most people want to protect their property investment and their quality of life by ensuring that their neighborhood or surrounding area is protected from inappropriate or negative changes. Historic designation, particularly on the local level can add protection from inappropriate new construction, inappropriate uses, or roadway changes. Properties listed in the National or State Registers of Historic Places have some limited protection from the negative effects of federal or state funded projects, particularly in the area of road construction. Historic designation may also have an effect on the way people perceive an area, and this perception may limit the inappropriate development of that area.

Eligibility for Technical Assistance

Owners of officially designated historic properties are generally eligible for special technical advice and assistance from the Division of Historic Preservation, Wisconsin Historical Society. Many pamphlets are available on technical topics regarding the maintenance and rehabilitation of historic buildings, and trained preservation architects are on staff in the Division of Historic Preservation to handle specific issues regarding historic restoration.

Recognition and Prestige

For many people, the best incentive is the prestige that having a historic property conveys. This recognition and prestige can translate into profits for businesses that are located in historic buildings and/or historic districts. In particular, many bed and breakfast operations rely on the historic quality of their buildings to attract clients, and businesses in historic buildings or historic districts often use this designation to promote their businesses.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTIONS

Establish a Historic Preservation Commission

The village of Shorewood should establish a Historic Preservation Commission to act upon the recommendations and results of this survey. Now that the survey is completed, a local Historic Preservation Commission could apply for the Historic Preservation Division's Certified Local Government status so that the village has access to grants to follow through on the following recommendations.

Nominations to the National and State Registers of Historic Places

It is recommended that Shorewood, preferably through a Historic Preservation Commission or through the Shorewood Historical Society move forward with a program to place the proposed historic districts and individual sites into the National and State Registers of

Historic Places. In particular, listing these districts would provide owners of both commercial and residential properties with access to historic tax credits. This may help private homeowners in rehabilitating an older building. It would also be of assistance for apartment house owners, who could use the tax credits to rehabilitate buildings at a high level.

Educational Materials

The village of Shorewood and/or the Shorewood Historical Society can further promote historic preservation in the city by the production of educational materials. Some fine materials have already been produced in Shorewood, but materials especially created for the school system would be particularly useful. Producing more educational materials raises the community's consciousness about historic preservation and helps preserve important historic resources if they are threatened.

Use and Review the Report

It is important that this report be used and reviewed and updated periodically as historic resources change (it is hoped for the better) in the village. The village of Shorewood and/or the Shorewood Historical Society should review the lists in the Results chapter and make revisions when appropriate. Changes to buildings and new information may change properties' positions on the lists and in order to serve local officials' historic preservation needs in their planning activities, it is important that they are aware of current evaluations of the properties included in this report. Like any planning report, it is hoped that this document can provide a guide and catalyst for discussion of historic preservation activities in Shorewood in the future.

Note: Information in this chapter is taken from "Economic Benefits of Historic Preservation in Wisconsin" and "Incentives for Historic Preservation." Both pamphlets are on file in the Division of Historic Preservation, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin.



