

15.0 Suburban Development

15.1 Introduction

Although Cleveland's suburbs began to develop in the nineteenth century, development peaked in the years following World War II. The Cuyahoga County region experienced five periods of suburban development between the mid-nineteenth and late twentieth centuries:

- The urban ring, consisting of development immediately surrounding the city core between 1850 and 1900
- The introduction of electrified streetcars between 1890 and 1930, expanding development to the first suburban rings
- The decentralization of the urban core and the first automobile suburbs, which permitted development to occur even further away from the city between 1920 and 1950
- The ubiquitous development of automobile suburbs and ultimate suburban supremacy during the post-World War II period of 1950–1980
- Construction of additional highways and interstates that allowed for development throughout the county in the 1970s through 1990s; sometimes referred to as exurban development

Each of these phases corresponded with population increases, easing of overcrowding, and changes in employment types (ECH 2017aa).

Summaries of area histories are located in Section 16.

15.2 Early Suburban Development

In the 1850s, Cleveland's urban core met its geographic limits. Overcrowding in this area resulted in a lack of adequate housing, pollution, and crime. Housing on the outskirts of the city was the start of the suburban trend. These first suburbs did not look like suburban areas of the mid-twentieth century with identical

house designs, common setbacks, and new street plans, but rather they reflected a rural town with individual house construction on available single lots (ECH 2017aa).

The construction of the East Cleveland Railway began in 1859 and consisted of a horse drawn streetcar line (ECH 2017aa). Although the railway made the outskirts of the city accessible, only the wealthy could afford the daily transportation fees to travel between residences and the city. The movement of the upper class out of the city and the retention of the lower and working classes within the urban area marked a clear divide between social and economic classes in Cleveland. The expansion and increase of industrial concerns within Cleveland during the late nineteenth century made the city even more densely developed. Industries and supporting businesses attracted more employees, including newly arrived immigrants mostly from southern and eastern Europe, to the area. The employees and their families required places to live and supporting commercial entities nearby since they could not assume travel costs to reside anywhere beyond walking distance. As the city became overcrowded with people, businesses, and industrial pollution, the suburbs were more appealing to affluent residents. Leading industrialists built large estates highlighting their wealth, and other high and mid-level managers, who were able, also fled the inner core of the city to build less opulent but comfortable homes away from the urban chaos. The escape to the country, however, also meant leaving conveniences of the city, such as an established education system, police and fire departments, and established and maintenance of city services like paved streets and sewer systems. Villages that were founded to meet the criteria of modern living during this period included, East Cleveland, Glenville, West Cleveland, Collinwood, Brooklyn, South Brooklyn, and Nottingham. Separate from the city, these

communities developed their own civic organizations (ECH 2017aa).

The invention of the electrified streetcar made living outside of Cleveland more accessible. The electrified streetcar made it possible to develop farther outside of the city. Tracks were laid out on Euclid Avenue, Euclid Heights Boulevard, Detroit Avenue, and Clifton Boulevard. The population increases of suburban East Cleveland and Lakewood on the west side transformed these villages to city status in 1911, followed by Cleveland Heights in 1921 (ECH 2017aa).

Beginning in 1910, the population of streetcar suburbs increased until 1930, as “East Cleveland added 30,488 new residents, Lakewood’s population increased by 55,328, and that of Cleveland Heights by 47,990” (ECH 2017aa). Already established as villages, Bedford and Berea, along with new Euclid, Garfield Heights, Maple Heights, Parma, Rocky River, and Shaker Heights grew into cities by 1931. Along with these new cities, 52 new villages were also founded (ECH 2017aa).

Suburban residents enjoyed the separation from urban life and were opposed to merging with Cleveland’s government. In 1910 and 1916 East Cleveland fought annexation because they did not want perceived urban problems such as, bar rooms, crime, and immigrants moving into their community. Similarly, in 1910 and 1922, Lakewood, a dry community, was also against a merge with the city. It was a common fear among suburban residents that immigrants would alter the communities that they built. As a result, some suburban villages created residency restrictions (ECH 2017aa).

15.3 Suburban Development & Segregation

The post-World War II era in Cuyahoga County experienced a major rise in the suburban population, and massive growth in developments. As veterans returned home from the war, the suburbs were an ideal place to

settle and raise a family. The National Housing Act of 1934 (NHA) made mortgages more affordable in an attempt to improve the nationwide housing crisis. The Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, better known as the G.I. Bill was essential to suburban growth. Returning veterans had access to this G.I. Bill, which gave government-guaranteed mortgages at low interest rates. It also offered loans to start businesses, provided a year of unemployment pay and gave education benefits to returning veterans. The educational support, unemployment benefits, and loan guarantees presented veterans with security. Providing education allowed veterans to establish a career, which was beneficial to the economy. Between 1945 and 1956, 2.2 million veterans attended college and 3.5 million attended a trade school. Although an expensive program, it proved successful. The economy prospered, and the program generated ten times the cost of the G.I. Bill in tax revenue. The investment made by the government to support the G.I. Bill avoided a potential economic recession as a result of a large population of unemployed veterans returning home. The government recognized the poor treatment servicemen endured following World War I and its negative effect on the economy. During World War II, Industry in the United States shifted to a manufacturing focus on military defense along with allowing women to enter the workplace. These legislation measures gave veterans an opportunity for a transition after serving their country. Developers recognized the housing shortage and utilized the veterans housing benefits, allowing further suburbanization to take hold.

In addition, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) was born out of the NHA and helped returning veterans after the war. The FHA offered programs to build a family home, “[t]heir home loan guarantees supported construction of single-family homes in new suburban areas and adopted guidelines from real estate and banking industries that required racial segregation (enforced through developer-instituted restricted covenants)” (ECH

2017aa). The FHA supported the mass-production of houses and worked with developers to create the suburban landscape. The FHA would not offer mortgages to African Americans, therefore, forcing them to remain in urban areas where the housing stock was older, denser, and overall less desirable. Working with developers, the FHA ensured that the properties could not be sold, or resold, to African American families. Bank loans were only administered to developers upon agreement of enforcing segregation. Covenants were created to restrict racial integration in the suburbs. Common clauses in real estate transactions stated that the property could not be transferred to an African American person, or any other minority. Although many of the covenants targeted African Americans, Jewish and immigrant populations in general were also thought of as undesirable neighbors. Some covenants in Shaker Heights and Forest Hill required owners to obtain consent from the development company and surrounding neighbors before completing the sale of their property (Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity 2015:6). Although covenants were attractive to some buyers, they enhanced racial segregation of residential areas, schools, and general surroundings.



Figure 15-1. 1969 overview of development in Shaker Heights (Cleveland Press Collection, Michael Schwartz Library, Cleveland State University).

In 1948 the case of *Shelley v. Kraemer* went to trial. The Kraemers were a white family in Missouri who were displeased when the

Shelleys, an African American family, moved into their neighborhood. The neighborhood had covenants against desegregation, but when the Kraemers brought the Shelleys to court it decided that, “[s]tate courts could not constitutionally prevent the sale of real property to blacks even if that property is covered by a racially restrictive covenant. Standing alone, racially restrictive covenants violate no rights. However, their enforcement by state court injunctions constitute state action in violation of the 14th Amendment” (Oyez 2017a).

The Fair Housing Act of 1968 outlawed racial discrimination for renting and owning property. In the early years of Shaker Heights, “developers strictly controlled access to community property and, through explicit deed restrictions even prohibited new immigrants and African Americans” (ECH 2017aa). These actions were taken under the belief that property values would decline if African Americans moved into a neighborhood.

Zoning laws were essential in the creation of suburban developments. The 1926 case of *Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Company*, determined that zoning was an appropriate exercise of power (ECH 2017ae). Ambler Realty Company sued the Village of Euclid when the village passed a zoning ordinance that divided the land into several different districts. This action meant that the 68 acres of land owned by the company was within different districts, limiting the types of buildings that the company could construct on its site (Oyez 2017b). The court’s decision to uphold the zoning law maintained the residential suburb. A few decades years later, zoning ordinances were found in almost every municipality in Cuyahoga County (EHC 2017af).

Zoning laws, however controversial, ensured the character of a community. As more areas of Cuyahoga County developed during the mid-twentieth century, zoning laws kept industries often located within the city limits at bay. “As zoning matured from a novelty to an accepted institution, and as the pace of suburban

development accelerated after World War II, critics began to raise questions about the possible use of zoning to classify and segregate the general population according to income, race, or station in life” (EHC 2017af). Most suburbs did not allow apartment buildings or any multi-family units. Some believed that the high costs of large-lot zoning contributed to segregation in neighborhoods as, “the 825,000 acres of land in Cuyahoga County zoned for single-family use in 1971, 67 percent was zoned for ½-acre sites or more” (EHC 2017af). These sizable parcels meant only middle or upper-income earners were able to purchase property in these areas, leaving fewer options for low-wage earners beyond the city limits.

Despite restrictions within several suburban communities, the suburbs started to diversify during the mid-century. As with urban life, ethnic communities consolidated within the suburbs. A large Jewish population moved to the Woodland, Glenville, and Kinsman communities, and transitioned to Cleveland Heights in the 1950s (ECH 2017aa). In the 1930s, Glenville was predominately Jewish, but by the 1960s, the demographic changed to mostly African American families. The transition between demographics was not turbulent in Glenville because “Unlike non-Jewish neighborhoods, Jewish families often were more willing to sell their houses to African American families” (M. Miller 2017). The Jewish Community Federation organized the Glenville Tutoring Project, which was available to all Glenville residents, regardless of ethnicity.

African American families congregated in the Glenville, Kinsman, and Hough neighborhoods following the Jewish populations. Like most suburban neighborhoods, the Hough neighborhood began as a primarily white community. However, as the neighborhood transitioned, noticeable shifts in conditions occurred including unemployment, crime, and a lower tax base. The 1966 Hough Riots, followed by the 1968 Glenville Shootout, were

caused by the rising racial turmoil and segregation prevalent in the area.

Although African Americans were moving to the suburbs, they remained a minority. By 1970, only East Cleveland was a majority African American neighborhood in Cuyahoga County, totaling 59 percent. African Americans also represented 15 percent of the population within Shaker Heights. The black population in Cleveland Heights, Euclid, and Maple Heights was then less than 3 percent, and minuscule in western suburbs (ECH 2017aa).

The Heights Community Congress was established in 1972 to help African American families integrate into the suburbs. The fair housing organization was beneficial to the termination of racial discrimination in suburbia. Often, lending agencies would not fund home improvements in neighborhoods with black families, believing that the property values within that neighborhood would decrease. The Heights Community Congress offered workshops to educate African Americans on how to obtain loans and funding to buy a home. The organization highlighted successful integrated neighborhoods as an example to the public that property values do not decrease (Culp 2017).

Bratenahl was an early suburb developed in 1904 when residents from Glenville were denied annexation from Cleveland. East of Cleveland, Glenville was established by affluent industrialists seeking escape from urban life as discussed earlier. In the early twentieth century, its population was primarily Jewish. During the 1960s, the area had a large African American population (EHC 2017ag).

Prior to rapid expansion when returning veterans made their homes in the suburbs, only the wealthy could afford living in the outskirts of the city. The rise in suburban development following World War II impacted the restrictions on buying or renting properties. Restrictions created by the NHA and FHA intentionally segregated neighborhoods, in turn causing

racial tension. As minority populations settled in suburban communities, organizations were established to promote equality.

15.4 Suburban Development 1940-1976

As automobile ownership increased, the demographics of the suburbs broadened. No longer was suburban life only attainable by the wealthy, now becoming a common place of residence for middle-class families. In Cuyahoga County 64 percent of families owned a personal automobile in 1940. Bay Village, Lyndhurst, and Fairview Park were developed as automobile suburbs. Additionally, already established villages expanded with the accessibility of personal automobiles. A good example of this expansion was Parma, which in 1931 had a population of approximately 14,000, but almost doubled in population by 1950, and then during the 1950s, added another 54,000 residents. Parma’s rapid expansion made it Cuyahoga County’s second largest city (ECH 2017aa).

Accessibility to roads and public transportation were necessary to a community on the outskirts of Cleveland. During the 1930s, the freeway-beltway system and the Lakefront Freeway began construction. In 1940, work on the Lakefront Freeway, Rocky River Bridge and the Willow Freeway were underway (EHC 2017ah). The Lakefront Freeway connected Gordon Park from the bridge extending westward along Bulkley Boulevard. The Rocky River Bridge connected Rocky River to Lakewood. Willow Freeway extended from Cleveland Memorial Shoreway, through South Broadway into the suburbs of Newburgh Heights and Cuyahoga Heights, to the east-west freeway. The construction of the interstate highway system throughout the region added to suburban growth. In the 1960s, main roads were extended to better serve communities beyond Cleveland city limits. In the mid-1960s, interstate routes were located through the eastern suburbs (EHC 2017ai). The interstates permitted these “second ring” of suburban

developments to further grow during the 1950s through 1970s. Many of these areas earned city status due to the rise in population, including Parma Heights in 1959; Brook Park, North Olmsted, and Warrensville Heights in 1960; and Bedford Heights and Seven Hills in 1961. During the mid-century period, the city of Cleveland lost 127,457 residents; however, residents in the county suburbs grew by 631,042. Overall, between 1940 and 1970, suburban population went from 28 percent of the population of the Greater Cleveland area to 62 percent in 1970, not only marking a doubling of the population in these areas, but also signifying the movement of the majority of residents from the city to the suburbs (ECH 2017aa).

Table 5. City of Cleveland Population vs. Population of Cuyahoga County Suburbs 1940-1970

Year	City of Cleveland Population	Population of Cuyahoga County suburbs
1940	878,336	338,914
1950	914,808	474,724
1960	876,050	771,845
1970	750,903	970,397

Source: Population of Counties by Decennial Census:1900 to 1990, Richard L. Forstall; 1995.

15.5 Local Developers

Some developers in Cuyahoga County created residential communities that focused on education and community related activities. Green space was important to city planning and commerce was limited to the outskirts of town so not to interfere with family life. Zoning and land use regulations were crucial to maintaining suburban culture. Sir Ebenezer Howard’s ‘Garden City’ was popular among developers (Howard 1898). This concept consisted of radial streets surrounded by landscaped parks with the goal to create a self-sufficient utopian

community separate from urban areas. In 1892, Sir Ebenezer Howard wrote *To-morrow: a Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, followed by the 1902 *Garden Cities of To-morrow*. Howard's theory was that the ideal community would combine the best elements of the city and the country.

The Van Sweringen brothers were inspired by Howard and used the Garden City as a guideline for Shaker Heights. Located east of Cleveland, Shaker Heights was an established village in 1911 and became a city in 1931 (ECH 2017aj). In 1905, brothers Oris P. and Mantis J. Van Sweringen bought land for development in an area that was formerly occupied by the United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearing, also known as the Shakers. Their vision for an exclusive community was ensured by, "[s]trict zoning and building and deed restrictions, and architectural design guidelines managed and enforced by the Van Sweringen Co. [that] resulted in a model residential suburb in the 1920s and 1930s" (ECH 2017aj). Newspaper advertisements for the Van Sweringen Company even flaunted, "Most communities just happen; the best are planned" (Marshall 2006:8). The picturesque city was aesthetically attractive and offered community organizations, such as church groups, country clubs and athletic groups. The Shaker Heights school system was named one of the best in the nation in 1960.

Architecturally, the buildings in Shaker Heights were either English, French, or Colonial designs, which were common during this period of the early twentieth century. The Van Sweringen brothers worked with architects to develop and build their ideal suburban neighborhood. Creating four groups of Demonstration Homes designed by different architects allowed potential residents a sneak peek into the Shaker Heights community. Philip Small and Charles Rowley were hired to design one section of Demonstration Homes, as well as Bloodgood Tuttle who worked with the brothers to design nine high-quality Van Sweringen Demonstration Homes in 1924 (Rotman

2017b). Tuttle continued to design residential homes in Shaker Heights, all of which were English Tudor, French, or Dutch Colonial. Other architects invested in Shaker Heights were Howell and Thomas, Walker and Weeks, Charles, Schneider and Abram Garfield.

In 1920, the Shaker Rapid Transit line connected Shaker Heights to downtown Cleveland, and the increased accessibility attracted more residents to the suburb. The community grew from 1,700 in 1920 to 17,783 in 1931, and to 23,393 in 1949 (ECH 2017aj). The early land-use covenants that enforced segregation in Shaker Heights were discontinued in the 1950s, permitting a larger demographic to locate to the area. The development reached its peak between 1953 and 1956.

William B. Risman, a real estate developer during the 1950's, built about 5,000 single family homes in the Cleveland, Akron, and Pittsburgh areas. His brother, Robert, joined the business in 1958 and they began building and managing apartment buildings in Cleveland and Detroit. They developed the large Bedford Ridge Subdivision in Bedford Heights in 1959 (CUY 1110924 – 1111224). Together the brothers also created two businesses; Consolidated Management, an apartment owner and management company, and a real estate firm Realktek Industries (Coyne, et al. 2016:70).

Around the same time, developer Saul Biskind was developing in the Cleveland area. Biskind was a unique developer who saw the appeal in having different architectural styles within his developments. In North Olmsted, Biskind created the Bretton Ridge subdivision in the mid-1960s. Bretton Ridge offered fourteen different styles of modern homes by five different builders. Unlike most suburban developments, the homes in Bretton Ridge were quite large, averaging at 2,100 square feet with "three of four bedrooms, one or two full bathrooms, one half-bath, and a two-car attached garage" (Coyne, et al. 2016:143). The development

also included amenities such as, “a seven-acre private recreation area, with a large swimming pool, putting green, tennis courts, baseball diamond, basketball court, shuffleboard area, horseshoe pits, ice skating rink, and picnic area” (Coyne, et al. 2016:143). This large-scale development followed another suburban development in North Olmsted. The Park Ridge subdivision located adjacent to Bretton Ridge, was constructed between 1962 and 1968 and also offered large, 2,000 square foot homes (Coyne, et al. 2016:153).

Carl Milstein was another prominent developer in the Cleveland area. Milstein began his career with his friend Alvin Siegal running a home building business called Alvin Homes, eventually becoming the third-largest homebuilder in the United States. In 1955, Milstein and his partners, Alex Fodor and Sam H. Miller, purchased 1,250 acres of land in Brook Park for development. For every 200 homes built, an acre of land was dedicated to recreational purposes. The community was completed in 1959, consisting of Ranch and Cape Cod style homes. The typical home included a basement, three bedrooms, a full-bath and detached garage and was approximately 1,000 square feet. In the 1960s Milstein started developing high-rise apartment buildings in northeast Ohio with his company Associated Management Corporation, most of which were subsidized by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (Coyne, et al. 2016: 85).

Further information about other local developers associated with surveyed resources is found in Appendix B of this report.

15.6 Prefabricated Homes

The post-World War II suburban boom was made possible by advances in modern construction technology, partially as a result from technological strides made in manufacturing during the war effort. Mass produced houses using prefabrication technology changed the landscape of these

areas, many of which were open or agricultural lands prior to the construction of residential subdivision housing. This resulted in miles of identical housing in planned neighborhoods made affordable to the average American family. The cheap, easy to assemble ‘kit’ homes, such as the Lustron Homes, Sears Catalog Homes, and Forest City Enterprises, Inc., grew in popularity during this period, even though kit houses were available since the early twentieth century.

15.6.1 Lustron Homes

Lustron Homes, based in Columbus, Ohio, utilized the enameled-steel surplus from World War II to help solve the housing shortage. A warplane manufacturing plant was used for production and was over 1 million square feet in size. The answer to the severe housing shortage could not be executed with traditional building methods because of the speed of construction. Instead, quickly constructed prefabricated houses were used. Lustron Homes were among several types of quick, mass produced housing styles. Constructed out of easily maintained enameled-steel, Lustron Homes were briefly available from 1948 through 1950. Engineer and inventor, Carl Strandlund saw an opportunity for the government’s steel supply in the form of service stations and food stands (Fetters 2002:3). Since service stations and food stands were not essential at that time, Strandlund had to consider what the American people needed most. Wilson Wyatt, of the Veterans Emergency Housing Program and Expediter of the National Housing Agency proposed that it be used for prefabricated homes (Fetters 2002:4–5). The company created four home models, ranging from 713 to 1,209 square feet (Waite 2017). The homes were attractive because of their minimal maintenance and quick assembly. Today, many existing Lustron Homes have been altered, and some are difficult to identify in their current conditions due to the application of vinyl siding over the exterior steel, such as the surviving Lustron Home on 1517 Crestwood Road in Mayfield Heights. This building was not

surveyed but is recommended for future survey as it is the only known remaining example of Lustron Homes in the county.

15.6.2 Forest City Materials, Co.

Forest City Materials Co., was a Cleveland-based prefabricated home business. Founded by Jewish Polish immigrant Charles Ratner in 1922, the business began as a lumber and building materials retailer. Observing the demand for quickly constructed homes during the mid-century, Charles' brothers, who later assumed ownership of the business, expanded the company. In 1941, brothers Leonard and Max Ratner created "one of the nation's first firms to manufacture prefabricated homes" (ECH 2017ak). They saw the change in customers' self-efficiency levels. Instead of relying on hiring tradesmen, homeowners began to take on the do-it-yourself maintenance. In 1955, the company opened a retail shop to support homeowner's projects. The company consolidated from a lumber and building materials company into a commercial property management and changed its name from Forest City Materials Co. to Forest City Enterprises, Inc. in 1960 (ECH 2017ak).

Forest City Enterprises, Inc. specialized in low-income housing and merged with Thomas J. Dillon Construction Co. in 1968 to create "Operation Breakthrough." Operation Breakthrough was simply, "to solve the nation's housing shortage by producing manufactured homes on an assembly-line basis, using modern, technologically-advanced building techniques" (*Akron Beacon Journal* 1969:2). The federal government worked with the companies to make it a success providing funds to the, "multimillion-dollar experiment to relieve the housing shortage" (*Akron Beacon Journal* 1970:1). Together, the companies built single family homes, townhouses, and high-rise apartments in the region. All units were preconstructed and would arrive with plumbing and heating capabilities.

Although kit houses were popular due to their quick and efficient production, other companies erected homes from ready-made plans. Some subdivisions required the property owners to seek out their own builders rather than develop the same building. Each community created their own character depending on the variety or uniformity of the homes. Additional research into this company may yield future survey opportunities. Resources surveyed during this project did not discover any prefabricated building constructed by Forest City Materials, Co.

15.7 Suburban Conflicts

Families relocated to the suburbs in the early twentieth century to escape industrialism and overcrowding in urban areas. As a result, conflicts arose between the tensions of conserving residential neighborhoods while expanding industry within city limits (Saplak 2017). East Woodland, an urban renewal project from 1960, was in poor condition. It was rezoned for industrial usage in 1965, but reverted back to residential by 1968 after receiving resistance from residents not willing to relocate. During the 1970s, industrial areas grew beyond Cleveland city limits. The Woodland East Community Organization (WECO) was founded in 1971 in response to the expansion of urban industry. WECO members were "dedicated not just to reviving the neighborhood economically, but to keeping the area safe for residents and businesses" (Saplak 2017). The goal was to revitalize the community using funds from the local industries.

During the 1960s, the older suburbs that bordered Cleveland's limits were declining. Several factors contributed to the phenomenon. The residents who lived in these suburbs had a significantly lower income level after many of the jobs created by the industrial booms of the World War II and Korean War began to disappear. Other socioeconomic factors that contributed to its decline included a lack of community investment, loss of jobs, and

pressure for the development in the outer metropolitan fringe (Vicino 2008:63).

15.8 Continued Evolution of Suburban Areas

As the suburban areas surrounding Cleveland developed throughout Cuyahoga County the region continuously changed. Suburban houses within subdivision developments offered families options outside of cramped, urban living conditions. While the opportunity to reside in single-family detached homes appealed to numerous individuals and families, municipal organizations required new and expanding infrastructure, including improved roads and sewer systems, larger police and fire department to accommodate the growth. Commercial entities, places of worship, and schools also appeared in new suburban areas to meet the

residential needs. Families without access to an automobile who earned lower wages often had stay in the city later until smaller, more affordable subdivisions were created or when home prices fell as others moved from the area.

Survey of several planned subdivisions throughout Cuyahoga County showed varying states of condition. Some, like those in Bedford, Garfield Heights, and Berea, showed their ages as homes and associated infrastructure showed some signs of neglect. These areas, however, also retain historic integrity as they had fewer physical alterations, including additions or applications of replacement building materials. Other subdivisions like those in Moreland Hills, Shaker Heights, and Rocky River, remain occupied by upper and middle-class families, but exhibit the physical changes mentioned above, comprising their historic integrity.



Figure 15-2. 1959 construction of a residential development in Bedford (Cleveland Press Collection, Michael Schwartz Library, Cleveland State University).

15.9 Survey Results

The overlying theme of the report and the main impact to the landscape of Cuyahoga County in the mid-twentieth century is suburban development. As other themes and resource types have been previously investigated, this topic will focus on residential development in the suburban areas of the county.

15.9.1 Single-Family Houses

Suburban residential development mainly occurred as housing subdivisions of large-scale redevelopment of vacant, underutilized, or lands previously under cultivation. These lands were typically purchased and platted or subdivided into individual housing lots by a single investment, construction, or development company. The lots were then sold to individual buyers or to home-builder companies to

construct homes, sometimes with restrictions on the type and size or who was permitted to occupy. Lots could also be retained by the construction company, who would then build houses before selling them to individual owners. Subdivisions may also include a combination of the above scenarios, which would result in some similar designed houses built by one company with uniquely styled homes on lots purchased by individuals who hired an architect or builder to construct homes to their tastes.

Subdivisions of the modern-era are recognizable on maps and aerials photographs as areas with curving streets, oftentimes with limited entryways from main streets. The FHA through its National Housing Act of 1934, previously set “desirable standards” that subdivisions include a layout that adapted to the natural topographic features, elimination of sharp street corners and dangerous intersection, and other features to make developments attractive and provide privacy to the community (US Department of the Interior [USDOI] 2002:48-49). These standards continued to be applied by later private developers across the country, featuring house lots of comparable sizes and similar setbacks from streets.

For this report, the survey team reviewed the *Mid-twentieth Century Architecture and History*

Survey compiled by the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission that included 32 subdivisions within the county that developed within the mid-twentieth century (Coynes, et al. 2016). The teams excluded subdivisions that already featured houses recorded on OHI forms from survey. Many of the remaining subdivisions were surveyed during fieldwork for this report. Four subdivisions that were not listed in the previous report were surveyed. Representative examples of building types and architectural styles in each area were included in the survey. Not every building was included to avoid repetition of duplicate house plans and because the large number of houses within subdivisions would not have allowed survey of other resource types. The goal was to record some houses in each subdivision to provide future researchers information about the developments. Although between the reports, a few dozen subdivisions have been reviewed, numerous other subdivisions from this period within Cuyahoga County are eligible for survey.

The survey team reviewed subdivisions of various sizes, architectural styles, and economic scales to provide a wide overview of residential development during this period. Survey also included individual houses that were not part of planned neighborhoods. Many of these houses are along primary streets.



Plate 52. House in Forest Hills Subdivision (CUY 1130921), constructed in 1955, 1367 Burlington Rd., Cleveland Heights.



Plate 53. House in Carriage Park Subdivision (CUY 1106827), constructed in 1969, 5990 Hansom Dr., Solon.



Plate 54. House in Co-Moor Colony Subdivision (CUY 1154716), constructed in 1964, 19583 Tanbark Ln., Strongsville.



Plate 55. House in Lee Gardens Subdivision (CUY 1111623), constructed in 1942, 4404 Glenview Rd., Warrensville Heights.



Plate 56. House in Heather Hill Subdivision (CUY 1107624), constructed in 1969, 23870 David Dr., Bedford Heights.



Plate 57. House in Fortune Heights Subdivision (CUY 1153417), constructed in 1942, 4346 S. Parkside Dr., Brooklyn.



Plate 58. House not within a subdivision (CUY 1122423), constructed in 1959, 4041 Eastwood Ln., Warrensville Heights.

15.9.2 Apartment Buildings

Suburban development also included multi-family and multi-story apartment buildings. Many of the large, multi-story apartment buildings surveyed for the report were constructed in the 1960s and 1970s, suggesting this type of housing was built after many of the subdivisions and other single-family homes. The large units tend to be part of complexes that include a few identical buildings, constructed at the same date. The

complexes usually are located along major streets and close to interstate access. The complexes feature amenities like swimming pools, fitness centers, common areas, and ample parking in lots or garages. Medium-sized apartment buildings are two- to three-story buildings with about a dozen units. Other multi-family dwellings include small buildings with only a couple of units. These buildings tend to look like single-family homes with a single entry on the primary façade. They are recognizable as apartments because of multiple mailboxes.



Plate 59. Waverly House Condominiums (CUY 1142712), constructed in 1963, 14567 Madison Ave., Lakewood.



Plate 60. Clague Towers (CUY 1138614), constructed in 1969, 3675 Clague Rd., North Olmsted.



Plate 61. Medium-sized apartment building (CUY 1103822), constructed in 1967, 26251 Brush Ave., Euclid.



Plate 62. Medium-sized apartment building (CUY 1127211), constructed in 1967, 17825 Lakeshore Blvd., Cleveland.



Plate 63. Two-unit apartment building (CUY 1121422), constructed in 1957, 752 E. 222nd St., Euclid.