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5. Classification
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Private: 

Public – Local 

Public – State 

Public – Federal 

Category of Property
(Check only one box.)

Building(s) 

District 

Site 

Structure 

Object
Winton Terrace Historic District       Hamilton, OH
Name of Property                     County and State

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register 0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

DOMESTIC/multiple dwelling
COMMERCE/TRADE/office building

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

DOMESTIC/multiple dwelling
COMMERCE/TRADE/office building

Sections 1-6 page 3
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)
LATE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURY REVIVALS/Colonial Revival

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: BRICK, CONCRETE, ASPHALT

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

Winton Terrace is a district comprised of 93 contributing resources, including 92 two-story multi-family residential buildings and one administration building. The district was constructed by the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority in partnership with the Public Works Administration (PWA) between 1940 and 1941. The district is located in the Winton Hills neighborhood of Cincinnati, north of downtown. The 92 two-story multi-family residential buildings house a total of 750 residential units. There are four different types of residential buildings: Building Type A (22 total), Building Type B (15 total), Building Type C (26 total), and Building Type D (29 total). All buildings, including both the residential buildings and the administration building, are constructed of the same material, red brick, and are similar in style, Colonial Revival, with the main difference between the buildings being their length and the number of apartment units housed within. The district’s physical character can best be described as fitting the Garden Apartment typology with an emphasis on greenery and open space.

The district’s site is suburban in character with all buildings set along either one of three primary streets (Winneste Avenue, Este Avenue, and Kings Run Drive), or two secondary cross streets (Craft Street and Topridge Place). The remainder of the site is comprised of lawns with small trees and plantings and concrete walkways between the residential buildings. Winneste Avenue runs north-south through, bisecting the district at center. Craft Avenue, which culminates in cul-
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de-sacs on both ends, runs perpendicular to Winneste Avenue, bisecting Winneste near the south end of the district. Topridge Place is located near the north end of the district, branching east off of Winneste Avenue. Topridge Place also features a cul-de-sac at its eastern end. Additional buildings front Kings Run Road and Este Avenue, which set the south, east, and west boundaries of the district. The district has continually operated as affordable housing for the residents of Cincinnati since construction in 1941 and retains a high degree of integrity to convey its historic significance.

Narrative Description

Setting: Winton Terrace is located within the Winton Hills neighborhood of Cincinnati, roughly nine miles north of downtown Cincinnati. More specifically, Winton Terrace is located at the southernmost point of the neighborhood. The Winton Hills neighborhood is comprised of residential developments, commercial buildings, and an industrial facility, which is located immediately to the east of Winton Terrace on the eastern side of Este Avenue. Roughly 70 percent of the neighborhood is comprised of lawned and forested areas, thus providing a clear suburban feel.

Site: Winton Terrace is a roughly forty-four-acre district, which consists of 93 similarly designed two-story buildings supported by common neighborhood features such as roads, surface parking lots, a playground, greenspace, and plantings. The buildings are arranged so that most front either Winneste Avenue, Craft Avenue, Topridge Place, Este Avenue, or Kings Run Drive. Those that do not front any of the streets are set perpendicular to the buildings that front those respective streets to provide privacy. (See Photographs 1-9)

Buildings: There are four different types of residential buildings within the district: Building Type A, Building Type B, Building Type C, and Building Type D. Each Building type is rectilinear in shape and constructed of red brick in the Colonial Revival style. The distinguishing factor from type to type is the size of the building’s footprint, which accounts for the number of units within, and roof shape. Type A has the smallest footprint, followed by Type B, then Type C, and Type D, the largest of the district.

Throughout the district, all elevations feature a similar design, finished with matching red brick and gabled roofs, characteristic of the Colonial Revival period. The buildings generally feature two entrance types that both date to the original construction. Along primary elevations, cast stone pedimented entrance surrounds serve as the only ornamentation on the otherwise simple façades. The larger buildings feature rusticated brick quoins at the corners. The Administration Building differs in that it does not feature cast stone pedimented entrance surrounds at any of its entrances. Additional entrance doors are located at secondary side and rear elevations. Regardless of location, doors are consistent throughout the site and consist of single-leaf painted metal doors that date to the late-20th century. Entrances typically contain exterior screens. Some building entrances have concrete ramps with painted metal railings for ADA compliance. Due to the unlevel terrain of the district, some buildings have daylight basements with painted concrete foundations. Similar to doors, windows throughout the district are generally consistent and are
6/6 double-hung vinyl windows with exterior half screens that date to the late-20th century. Some buildings contain chimneys along their side elevations, though this is not consistent between the building types.

Building Type A (20 Total) – Building Type A contains four one-bedroom units and two two-bedroom units. This building type is rectangular-shaped, extending nine-bays in length. Each unit has a front and rear single-leaf entrance with exterior screen. Windows are 6/6 vinyl windows that were installed in the late-20th century. Building Type A has a gabled roof, clad in asphalt shingles with metal louvered dormers located on either side. Eight Type A buildings feature brick chimney stacks along the side elevations; two Type A buildings have the chimney on the left side of the building when facing the primary elevation, while six have a chimney on the right. Type A buildings include Buildings #101, 104, 107, 108, 114, 116, 120, 122, 131, 150, 155, 159, 167, 171, 172, 174, 175, 177, 179, and 191. (Photos 10-13)

Building Type B (14 Total) – Building Type B contains four one-bedroom units and four two-bedroom units. This building type is rectangular-shaped, extending fourteen-bays in length. Each unit has a front and rear single-leaf entrance with exterior screen. Windows are 6/6 vinyl windows that were installed in the late-20th century. There are three variations of Building Type B, each identified by its roof and a segment of the primary elevation that features a front-gable. Five of the 15 Type B buildings feature an uninterrupted gable roof with a brick chimney stack on one of its two side elevations. Four of the 15 buildings feature a combination gabled and hipped roof, with the left side of the primary elevation containing a front facing gabled section with the side elevation’s roof being hipped. The final six Type B buildings display the mirrored image of the combination hip and gable roofs, though the gabled end contains a brick chimney stack. All roofs are clad in asphalt shingles and contain metal louvered dormers on either side. Type B buildings include Buildings #102, 103, 121, 124, 125, 143, 144, 149, 158, 170, 173, 178, 185, and 188. (Photos 14-17)

Building Type C (27 Total) – Building Type C contains four one-bedroom units, two two-bedroom units, and two three-bedroom units. This building type is rectangular-shaped, extending sixteen-bays in length. Each unit has a front and rear single-leaf entrance with exterior screen. Windows are modern 6/6 vinyl windows that were installed in the late-20th century. Similar to Building Type B, there are three variations of Building Type C. 15 of the 26 Type C buildings contain a similar combination hipped and gabled roof shown on the Type B buildings; 10 have the hipped roof on its left side when facing the primary elevation, while five have the hipped roof on the right side, some buildings contain brick chimneys on the gabled end. The remaining 11 Type C buildings contain the front facing hipped-on-gable approach on both sides of the building. Of those 11 buildings, five contain a brick chimney stack on the left side when facing the primary elevation. All roofs are clad in asphalt shingles and contain metal louvered dormers on either side. Type C buildings include Buildings #110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 133, 134, 135, 138, 141, 146, 147, 148, 151, 156, 157, 160, 161, 162, 163, 182, 184, 186, 187, 189, 190, and 192. (Photos 18-21)
Building Type D (31 Total) – Building Type D contains four one-bedroom units and six two-bedroom units. This building type is rectangular-shaped, extending sixteen-bays in length. Each unit has a front and rear single-leaf entrance with exterior screen. Windows are modern 6/6 vinyl windows that were installed in the late-20th century. Building Type D is largely consistent throughout the district, with the buildings featuring a hipped roof. At center of the primary elevation, two front facing gabled sections, separated from the flanking sections by brick quoins, serve as additional distinguishable features. Six of the 29 Type D buildings contain brick chimney stacks on the left side when facing the primary elevation. All roofs are clad in asphalt shingles and contain metal louvered dormers on either side. Type D buildings include Buildings #105, 106, 109, 117, 118, 119, 123, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 136, 137, 139, 140, 142, 145, 152, 153, 154, 164, 165, 166, 168, 169, 176, 180, 181, and 183. (Photos 22-25)

Administration Building - The Administration Building is similar in material and configuration to the residential buildings. The two-story building is constructed of red brick with single-leaf doors, and replacement 6/6 vinyl windows with exterior half screens. Windows at the first floor have modern metal security screen for protection. The windows at the second floor contain simple modern cloth awnings. All windows and doors at the Administration Building are modern replacements that date to the late-20th century period.

The Administration Building features many of the same design details as the residential buildings, including brick quoins and brick chimney stack. At the roof level, however, the Administration Building contains a hipped-on-gable roof that highlights the second floor level of the building. At the rear of the building is a slightly pitched two-story portion that extends the building east. This section of the building features the chimney, as well as a skylight. Additional ornamentation at the Administration Building is found in the circular louvers at the gabled portions of the north and south elevation and the circular stone discs at the northern and southern most portions of the primary, west elevation. (Photo 26)

Interior: Each building contains multiple entrances that lead to either unit entries or the kitchen at rear. Most units are two-stories with a living room and kitchen at the first floor, and one-or two-bedrooms and a bathroom at the second floor. Some units scattered throughout the site are one-story lofts. Finishes within all units have been updated over the years as is typical of rental housing and primarily include vinyl tile floors and painted gypsum board walls and ceilings. Stairs are wood with simple wood railings and vinyl treads. Some units contain original wood flooring at the second floor level. Bathrooms have modern ceramic tile floors. Kitchen appliances and bathroom fixtures are modern. (Type A Interior, see Photos 27-28; Type B Interior, see Photos 29-31; Type C Interior, see Photos 32-35; Type C Interior, see Photos 36-40)

Basements within the residential buildings are utilitarian in character with exposed concrete floors, walls, and ceilings. Basements are only accessed from the interior at the rear of the residential buildings through a floor gate.

Administration Building - The interior of the Administration Building is typical of multi-family housing districts. The first floor houses an office, a laundromat, and a community center for the
residents. The second floor features additional community space but was inaccessible due to COVID-19 visitation restrictions. The management office is located centrally at the first floor, accessible via the double-leaf doors. The office includes a reception area with individual offices located at the rear. The community space is located at the south end of the building and is generally open in floor plan. The rear of the building contains the laundromat. Finishes within the Administration Building are modern dating to a late-20th century renovation. Floors are vinyl tile, walls are painted gypsum board or painted CMU, and ceilings are painted gypsum board. Due to the original use of the building as public housing administration, the current finishes are consistent with those originally installed in the building. (See Photos 40-43)

**Physical Integrity:** The buildings that make up Winton Terrace were designed to be uniform and simple in character and were intended to provide low-income residents a place to live with a neighborhood-like feel. Early public housing developments constructed during the 1930s were specifically designed under the European influence of the Garden-Style apartments, with low-rise buildings set with lawn space and similar living conditions from building to building. Winton Terrace retains sufficient physical integrity to convey its historic values. The district maintains all seven aspects of integrity. Winton Terrace is in its original location, and thus retains integrity of location. The district is located just north of downtown Cincinnati within a suburban neighborhood. Winton Terrace retains its association as affordable housing as it has continuously functioned this way since its completed construction in 1941. To the casual observer, Winton Terrace looks the same as it did when it was constructed as public housing, and thus retains integrity of association and feeling. The setting of the district remains consistent with the period of significance as the district maintains its suburban setting. The design of the buildings remains consistent with the district’s original design, with Colonial Revival-style residential and administration buildings. The buildings are constructed of red brick with cast stone ornamentation at building entrances. Unit floor plans are generally the same as when constructed with typical layouts consisting of living rooms, kitchens, bedrooms, and bathrooms. Additionally, the design and layout of the district remains intact as it was originally planned to be with landscape features such as green spaces and playgrounds.

Minimal exterior alterations at the residential buildings have occurred since completion in 1941. A renovation was undertaken in the late-20th century to upgrade windows and doors at the exterior and update finishes within the units. This renovation retained much of the original layout and appearance of the units. Windows have been replaced with 6/6 vinyl windows that match the multi-light design of the original window configuration. At the Administration Building, the original storefront system at the façade of the building was replaced with the existing door and window configuration. Door replacement has also occurred at other entrances at the building. Despite these changes, the Administration Building retains its brick and stone ornamentation, as well as its visual association as an office/community building.

Overall, the Winton Terrace Historic District maintains a high degree of integrity and conveys its historic appearance and use as a public housing development.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

- A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes
- C. A birthplace or grave
- D. A cemetery
- E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure
- F. A commemorative property
- G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

POLITICS/GOVERNMENT
ARCHITECTURE

Period of Significance
1940-41

Significant Dates
1940-41

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

Cultural Affiliation

Architect/Builder
Allied Architects for Cincinnati Housing – Garber, Frederick W., Chief Architect
McHugh, James, Builder
Kenney, Henry Fletcher, Landscape Architect
The Winton Terrace Historic District is locally significant under Criterion A in the category of Politics/Government for its role in the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority’s development of public housing and under Criterion C in the category of Architecture as an excellent example of the Colonial Revival style applied to a public housing development. The Winton Terrace Historic District was constructed between 1940 and 1941 as the second housing development completed by the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority (CMHA). Winton Terrace, a district of 93 uniform buildings, was designed to house families and was funded through the Public Works Administration (PWA). The development was CMHA’s first foray into designing housing complexes rather than isolated high-rises and drastically lowered the cost of construction, allowing for more affordable rental rates. Additionally, the development was CMHA’s first to be on undeveloped property that did not result in displacement through demolition. The district’s 93 buildings display matching materials and features, including red brick exteriors, brick quoins, varying gabled and hipped roofs, and cast stone entrance ornamentation. Winton Terrace was designed by Frederick W. Garber, then Chief Architect of the Allied Architects for Cincinnati Housing, a group of architects, engineers, and landscape architects who advised the CMHA in the design and development of housing. The Winton Terrace Historic District also meets the registration requirements established in the Multiple Property Documentation Form, Draft Public Housing in the United States, 1933-1949, prepared by the National Park Service. The period of significance extends from 1940 to 1941, inclusive of the period of construction and reflects the role that the 1933 legislation, including Ohio’s Metropolitan Housing Authority Law and the U.S. Congress’s National Industrial Recover Act of 1933, played in the development of public housing in Cincinnati.
The Public Works Administration’s Role in the Development of Public Housing

The PWA was created by the federal government through the passing of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, which was part of Roosevelt’s New Deal policies during the Great Depression. The PWA funded the construction of large-scale public structures such as dams, hospitals, bridges, and housing throughout the country. Prior to its being shut down in 1944, the agency was responsible for over seven billion dollars in investment.

The Great Depression refocused the nation’s attention on the inequalities of the housing market and on the rampant slums forming throughout the United States. As poverty increased, the already deteriorating housing stock available to the poor worsened. With little disposable income available, property owners deferred maintenance and construction on new housing ceased. All of these factors tied together to exacerbate the issues with housing in cities across the country, Cincinnati among them.

Despite well documented issues with housing conditions, permanent government-built housing did not come into existence until the New Deal under President Franklin Roosevelt, through Title II, Section 202 legislation of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. The act allotted $3.3 billion for PWA projects, among them included the “construction, reconstruction, alteration, or repair under public regulation or control of low-cost housing and slum clearance projects.” This landmark legislation opened the avenue for local governments to apply for funds to construct housing units for low-income or displaced residents. The act was followed in 1935 with guidelines on constructing proper housing. The PWA-issued publication Unit Plans: Typical Room Arrangements, Site Plans and Details for Low-Rent Housing guided planning and construction of low-rent housing, providing design guidelines that focused on elements such as ample green space within the site, ventilation, and natural lighting for residents. The finalized design of Winton Terrace adhered to these simple guidelines, providing a more suburban neighborhood atmosphere than typically found for low-income residents.

While the PWA aided in combatting the national housing shortage, housing scholars, including Catherine Bauer, Edith Elmer Wood, Helen Alfred, and Mary Simlovitch, advocated for a stronger federal housing policy that would provide safe, sanitary, and well-designed modern housing for all. Fundamental ideas about what housing should provide were explored. Of particular importance was preserving the family unit, as Dr. Wood said, “the most important function of any community is to build, maintain, and protect its homes and the families within them. Industry, business, and government are means toward this end.” Modern life required new
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2 Lusignan, 9.
3 Ibid, 9.
housing that accounted for urban settlement patterns, automobile and mass transportation, working outside of the home, the domestic needs of housewives and children, recreational facilities, and avoiding congestion. In the minds of reformers, all of these aspects of modern life demanded more than what the tenement or Victorian Era house could reasonably provide, hence a new approach to housing the nation was required. The philosophy behind this idea was that good citizens cannot contribute to society if they are relegated to the slums and outdated housing. These reformers posited that good housing creates productive citizens who contribute to the overall health of society.

Bauer and other reformers lobbied for a new federal policy in the 1930s to expand upon the work begun by the PWA. With the passing of the Wagner-Steagall Act in 1937, federal enabling legislation made it possible for the formation of localized housing authorities across the country. Even after the passing of the Wagner-Steagall Act, however, housing projects, such as Winton Terrace, continued to be constructed and funded by the PWA until the agency was shut down in 1944. Despite being short-lived, the PWA was instrumental in developing federally funded public housing in the earliest period of the program. Furthermore, the passing of the National Industrial Recovery Act in 1933 illustrates the federal government’s first foray into the construction of housing for citizens and serves as a landmark piece of legislation whose impact is accurately depicted in the completed Winton Terrace Historic District.

The Role of Government in the Development of Public Housing in Cincinnati, Ohio

The Better Housing League of Cincinnati and the Need for Public Housing in Cincinnati

In 1913, Cincinnati held a national conference on housing to discuss a movement towards better housing across the country. Due to the conference being held in Cincinnati, the city was used as a model for evaluating housing conditions in large cities. Conclusions made after the evaluation stated that Cincinnati “had the worst housing of any city in the country.” Women such as Setty S. Kuhn, Louise Pollak, and Margaret McGuffey, who were members of the Cincinnati Women’s City Club, sought to promote and enlist other people, both men and women, to fight the poor housing conditions of Cincinnati. In 1916, the Better Housing League was created.

Led by women, the Better Housing League established itself as a leader in housing reform in Cincinnati. The league concentrated their efforts on the elimination of the city’s poor tenement housing, where roughly one-third of Cincinnati’s working-class population resided. The reason for so many living in these conditions was largely due to the natural landscape of Cincinnati. Cincinnati’s proximity to the Ohio River and the nearby hilltops to the north created a basin effect on which the city had to design around. This caused very dense housing and commercial

6 Ibid, 5-9.
7 Ibid, 2-4.
10 Ibid.
construction due to limited available land and because transportation to the hilltops was difficult. The residences were usually three or four stories high, built close together with small open spaces around them.11

By the early 20th century, the wealthy families that originally lived downtown started to move to the suburbs. Since the working-class families did not have the money to move and construct new residences, they were forced to stay in the cramped downtown. The cramped development of the tenement housing not only created a lack of livable space, but it also brought along disease. A study of Cincinnati’s housing conditions by the United States Public Health Service in 1916 stated:

These tenement houses are of a particularly undesirable character, being for the most part old dwelling houses which have been converted into tenements without any of the sanitary or hygienic arrangements which necessarily go with a modern dwelling…There are bathrooms. There is a bad arrangement of toilets, which are almost universally situated in the narrow yard, and one is shared by several families.12

The Better Housing League’s mission was to publicize the terrible living conditions in tenements. They believed that without public support for their cleanup, the remediation of the tenement houses would never come to fruition. This was evidenced prior to the formation of the Better Housing League with the city run Tenement House Bureau. Attempts were made by the Tenement House Bureau, but it was namely in vain due to their sporadic and ill-managed attempts at clean up in select areas. By depicting the grim reality of living within tenements daily, the Better Housing League started to gain recognition.13

This recognition prompted city officials to grant $4,000 in 1917 and they continued to fund the league for the following decade. This allowed the league to conduct yearly surveys of the tenement conditions. In 1918, roughly ninety percent of the tenement houses in the city were located in the basin district, the area between the Ohio River and the northern hilltops, totaling nearly 30,000 residents.14 To offer a comparison of these tenement statistics, the league also conducted a survey of the suburbs of Winton Place, Elmwood, and Carthage, all located north of downtown Cincinnati (See Figure 26 map of North Cincinnati suburbs). Conclusions of the study showed that the overall living conditions of these suburban neighborhoods was good due to the open land they provided.15

The Better Housing League’s success in documenting the existing living conditions for tenement residents influenced the Housing Bureau of Cincinnati and its then building commissioner, Charles Sagmeister, to commence a citywide cleanup. From 1917 to 1926, 635 buildings were condemned, 772 buildings were torn down, 8,237 toilets, 7,190 sinks, and 1,108 second means of
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egress were installed, and 4,747 structural repairs were completed, along with other minor improvements. Continued funding for such improvements and the construction of new residential buildings would come six years later in 1933 with enactment of state housing legislation in Ohio, as well as with the formation of the Public Works Administration and associated federal funding.

Actions of advocacy groups like Cincinnati’s Better Housing League played an integral role in Ohio’s development of state-based housing legislation. Through their push to raise awareness about the deteriorated housing conditions throughout Cincinnati and their demands for action from the local government, the State of Ohio pushed forward landmark housing legislation that set a precedent for states across the country. Without the actions of the Better Housing League, public housing developments, like Winton Terrace, would not have been constructed.

**Formation of Public Housing in Ohio**

In 1933, Ohio became the first state in the country to pass enabling legislation for the creation of local housing authorities. The legislation allowed housing authorities to accept federal aid and to take over some existing housing operations from the federal government. Cities and towns throughout Ohio experienced similar deterioration and an inadequate amount of affordable quality housing as much of the nation. This often resulted in large slums and dilapidated housing units.

The State of Ohio had one of the highest national population growth rates during the 1920s and 1930s, at 20.8% and 15.4% respectively. Coupled with the onset of the Great Depression, the need for affordable housing throughout Ohio spurred the state public housing legislation, which was enacted in 1933. Shortly after, local housing authorities started to form throughout the state in both large cities and rural towns that sought to remedy the suffering housing stock.

The City of Cleveland was the first in Ohio to enact a public housing agency in 1933, which was co-founded by Ernest Bohn, the first president of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. He was also a one-term member of the Ohio General Assembly and later chaired the Committee on Housing of the Cleveland City Council. Bohn took advantage of early programs that were precursors to the United States Housing Act of 1937, also known as the Wagner-Steagall Act, to develop some of the nation’s first public housing. By the late-1960s, 67 percent of all new housing construction in Cleveland was for affordable housing. By the 1990s, the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority had become the most prolific and influential
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housing authority in the state, with 38 developments containing 11,500 units which housed roughly 18,000 residents.\textsuperscript{20}

In addition to Cleveland, the cities of Akron, Cincinnati, and Columbus were also at the forefront of affordable housing in Ohio. In 1937, Akron received state authorization to create the Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority, which was formally established in 1938. Public housing continued as a force for good and gained a positive reception in the community of Akron.\textsuperscript{21} In the capital city, the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority followed the state’s other major cities and constructed their first complex, Poindexter Village, in 1940. Poindexter Village consisted of 35 buildings.\textsuperscript{22} All but two building units of the Poindexter Village complex were demolished in 2016-2017.

Similar to Akron and Columbus, Cincinnati’s first public housing developments were not constructed until the late-1930s and early-1940s. Additionally, the development of the CMHA followed similar trends and was the result of housing reformers, such as the Better Housing League, who sought to improve the city through slum and tenement clearance. The work of the Better Housing League was realized with the opening of Laurel Homes (NR #87000690 – Delisted), the CMHA’s first public housing complex, in 1938.\textsuperscript{23}

\textit{Early History of the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority}

In 1932, housing reformers from Ohio’s two largest cities, Cincinnati and Cleveland, lobbied for a bill to be passed that would provide the cities with funds necessary to construct large scale quality housing. On January 3, 1933, House Bill No. 8 passed the Third Special Session of the 89th Ohio General Assembly and permitted the acceptance of federal loans. This bill served as the backbone for funding proposed housing projects. The new housing law was modeled after New York’s state housing law of 1926, establishing a seven-member State Board of Housing to recommend and approve which housing authorities could construct new projects under the newly formed Cincinnati Housing Corporation, the precursor to the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority. The board also conducted studies throughout the state to see which areas needed low-income housing the most.\textsuperscript{24}

Shortly after the passing of House Bill No. 8, the federal government created the PWA. Through the creation of the new federal agency in 1933, the federal government offered billions of dollars for the development of various buildings and structures throughout the state; included among these developments was specific language that stipulated the funds could be used for the construction of low-cost housing. As it related to Cincinnati specifically, the founding of the PWA provided the Cincinnati Housing Corporation with funds for slum clearance and

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} “CMHA Response to Expert Group Report, July 19, 2013,” Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority.
\textsuperscript{23} “Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority,” Guide to African American Resources: Cincinnati History and Library Archives.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
construction. Immediately, local housing construction companies submitted plans to the
Cincinnati Housing Corporation for slum clearance and reconstruction of new housing sites. However, getting the necessary funds proved harder than expected.

The first construction company that sought to utilize the federal funds was the Ferro Construction Company. Their application for federal loans via the Cincinnati Housing Corporation was first submitted in August 1933 and then submitted a second time in October 1933. According to the proposals, the Cincinnati Housing Corporation would acquire the land and construct and maintain the housing project under the supervision of the Ohio State Board of Housing. City Manager C.A. Dykstra lobbied with the PWA for the project, citing that it was in response to the studies conducted by the BHL, the City Planning Commission, and the Cincinnati Building Department. Unfortunately, the Ferro Construction Company could not raise the necessary equity to obtain a federal loan and the project failed despite being backed by city officials. Continued failed attempts at securing the necessary funds for large scale redevelopment continued through the following months via numerous applications, forcing city officials to rethink how to structure their approach. This was because the state was overly reluctant to fund the private construction companies with the remaining equity to secure the federal funds.

The vehicle which permitted Cincinnati housing reformers to create a housing agency was established when the Ohio State Legislature passed the nation’s first housing authority law on September 5, 1933: the Metropolitan Housing Authority Law. The bill permitted local housing authorities to borrow money from the federal government to clear slums and to build and operate low-cost housing. A petition from local housing officials to create a housing authority in Cincinnati was delivered to the State Housing Board and on November 22, 1933, the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority was created. It was the second housing authority established in the United States, behind only Cleveland. Beyond the city limits, the CMHA had jurisdiction over the townships of Sycamore, Springfield, and Columbia.

The first official meeting of the CMHA was held on December 9, 1933, where Stanley M. Rowe, then president of Shepard Elevator Company, was selected as chairman. Other board members included Myron Downs, a planning engineer; Bleeker Marquette, BHL’s executive secretary; C.A. Dykstra, Cincinnati’s city manager; and Alfred Bettman, head of the City Planning Commission. Their first order of business was to continue the fight for the slum clearance and redevelopment of the West End. An application for the project was submitted to the PWA on April 3, 1934.

In August 1938, Laurel Homes, the CMHA’s first housing development, opened with 1,039 units. The development, which was considered to be the second largest PWA public housing project in the nation, consisted of 25 residential buildings that replaced “a densely populated slum.”

Two major points of contention revolved around the development itself, which necessitated demolition of existing structures, and the cost of the development. In order to construct Laurel Homes, slum clearance took place. The final construction, however, significantly diminished the number of housing units in the neighborhood. Chair of the CMHA, Stanley Rowe, explained the loss in units, stating “The old Laurel Homes site had 1,600 dwelling units and when completed with the five buildings soon to be erected, Laurel Homes will have only 1,300 dwellings.” As a result of Laurel Homes, therefore, approximately 300 persons were displaced. In addition to concerns with displacement as a result of slum clearance, construction on previously developed land drove up the cost of rent within the buildings. Prior to construction of Laurel Homes, the land on which it was constructed was 65 percent occupied with buildings. When the project was completed only 20 percent of the land was occupied by buildings. Although this was purposefully done to provide adequate space for residents, the location of the property and cost of demolition and new construction resulted in monthly rental costs of exactly one dollar more than monthly rent at Winton Terrace when it opened three years later, $4.50 per month as opposed to $3.50. Laurel Homes was largely demolished between 2000 and 2002.

Prior to the Winton Terrace Historic District’s construction, the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority (CMHA) had already constructed one public housing development for the city of Cincinnati, Laurel Homes – located downtown. This development, however, was deemed unsuccessful for multiple reasons – resulting in a shift in planning for the development of Winton Terrace. This was in part due to the population displacement that slum clearance had on the city of Cincinnati, as well as the higher rent values placed on the downtown location of Laurel Homes.

One new strategy planned by CMHA was based on a scattered sites development constructed by the Fort Wayne Housing Authority in Fort Wayne, Indiana. In March 1939, then president of CMHA Stanley Rowe, opposed the scattered sites type of public housing due to his inclination that “spotting better homes among old buildings in substandard neighborhoods doesn’t improve the neighborhood and is an inefficient way of raising the general standard of housing conditions.” Furthermore, he argued that scattered sites did not “make for well-rounded neighborhood development and the participation of tenants in forms of community activity which will tend to build character and lessen delinquency.” Ultimately, other officials in CMHA agreed with Rowe’s argument and the opposition against scattered site public housing stood.

The issue of high rent was caused by underfunding from the Public Works Administration (PWA) for CMHA’s first public housing development, Laurel Homes. Laurel Homes was
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27 Gibbs, “Laurel Homes Historic District, Hamilton County, OH.”
28 “Ground Is Broken By Mayor For Housing Project Of Winton Terrace,” *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, June 7, 1940.
initially proposed in 1933 as three separate public housing developments with two housing white residents and one housing black residents. However, due to numerous American cities needing funding from the PWA at that time, enough funds were not available for the large project, thus resulting in the slum clearance and construction of only one site, Laurel Homes.

Aimed at constructing a public housing development without similar financial obstacles to those that hindered the construction of their first planned development, CMHA decided to forgo the funding needed for slum clearance and purchased vacant land, believing that they could save money while developing a distinct neighborhood. However, CMHA faced opposition for the construction of a second public housing development after the setbacks caused by Laurel Homes. Walter K. Sibbald, a Cincinnati-based lawyer, contended that the public housing developments did not function as low-rent housing, most likely due to the high rent costs caused by Laurel Homes. In February 1940, CMHA defended their right to construct public housing with federal funding in a favorable 4-3 vote by board members and thus commenced work on Winton Terrace. They argued that the vacant land projects would be community developments that not only contained new residential construction, but also provide open spaces and recreational grounds for their tenants.31 Cost efficiency was further evidenced through the fact that the land for Winton Terrace cost only two cents per square foot while Laurel Homes cost $2.20 per square foot.32

Following the CMHA vote, construction on Winton Terrace commenced. For the design of the district, Frederick W. Garber, serving as Chief Architect of the Allied Architects for Cincinnati Housing, was assigned the project to be funded by the PWA. Garber was assisted by the firms of Kruckemeyer & Strong, Fechheimer & Horst, and Harry Hake and Harry Hake Jr. William E. Bodenstein served as mechanical engineer, Henry Fletcher Kenney was retained as landscape architect, and James McHugh served as contractor. The vacant land for Winton Terrace was chosen due its proximity to the Mill Creek Valley industrial plants, which employed roughly 60,000 persons of lower-income status.33 The first task was to make a clearing for the approximately forty-four-acre district. This involved the removal of trees and other wooded bio growth. Once cleared, construction of the roads and buildings commenced.

Upon completion, Nathan Straus, then head of the United States Housing Authority, called Winton Terrace “one of the finest in this country.”34 Each unit had a separate entrance, providing a sense of individuality among its residents. The site was also the first by CMHA to have a separate community building that housed offices, maintenance shops, recreational, and social space - with ample room for outdoor recreational space (See Figures 27-29).

Winton Terrace officially opened on June 9, 1941, to praise among the city’s residents. Housing officials toured the site and concluded that CMHA created a community setting: “Winton
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31 Fairbanks, 121.
32 Ibid, 121.
34 Ibid, 121.
Terrace is very much like a small independent village, as it has an administration building where community meetings are held and the people choose their own council.\(^{35}\) This was not true for all public housing complexes. For example, a community building was planned at Laurel Homes, but it was never built due to funding cuts.\(^{36}\) Therefore most communal activities took place in the basement recreational rooms, and there was no centralized public space for tenants to meet and discuss common issues. Though common in public housing design across the country, the incorporation of a defined community building at Winton Terrace is illustrative of community planning initiatives of the time that were heavily influenced by the growth of urban planning and planners like Clarence Stein and Henry Wright.

Upon completion, the site was racially segregated to house only white families. Winton Terrace remained segregated until the 1950s, when the CMHA shifted policy to integrate its housing developments. Winton Terrace’s integration corresponded with the completion of the neighboring public housing site, Findlater Gardens, in 1958.\(^{37}\)

Throughout the following decades, Winton Terrace has retained its function as public housing under the direction of the CMHA. As is typical for public housing sites throughout the United States, Winton Terrace has undergone renovations in the latter part of the 20\(^{th}\) century to maintain its appearance and functionality.

Winton Terrace’s planning and construction marked a significant shift in the development of public housing in Cincinnati. Referred to as a “vacant land project” by *The Cincinnati Enquirer* during its developmental stages, Winton Terrace sought to aid in the plan to provide affordable housing and clear slums and tenements throughout the city. As seen with Laurel Homes, new public housing complexes utilized less land for buildings than existing structures. With the development of Winton Terrace, displacement was no longer an issue. In fact, Stanley Rowe explained at a convention on the National Association of Housing Officials that “without some vacant land housing, shortage of accommodations would stop slum clearance.”\(^{38}\)

Although slum clearance projects in the city proper continued to take place after Winton Terrace, including at Lincoln Court to the south of Laurel Homes in the west end, Winton Terrace marked the CMHA’s first foray in developing Garden Style apartment houses on vacant land. Winton Terrace, therefore, successfully diminished rents, eliminated issues with displacement, and succeeded in providing adequate, affordable housing to Cincinnati’s residents. Winton Terrace was shortly followed by English Woods, which was referred to as a “twin of Winton Terrace” by *The Cincinnati Enquirer*.\(^{39}\) Like Winton Terrace, English Woods was constructed on vacant
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\(^{35}\) Ibid, 122.


\(^{38}\) “Convention Delegates To Inspect Housing Sites In City; Drawing Presents Conception Of Winton Terrace Project,” *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, Dec. 3, 1939.

\(^{39}\) “First 100 Families Already Are Established in Attractive English Woods; Government’s $3,800,000 Housing Project Eventually To Shelter 650 More,” *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, April 20, 1942.
land, though in the Mill Creek valley of the city, in 1942. English Woods was demolished c. 2006.

Through landmark legislation passed in 1933 at both the federal and state level, the construction of public housing by government entities was enabled. That same year, the CMHA opened as Ohio’s fourth housing authority and quickly proceeded to plan for housing developments that would offset the city’s housing issues, including both housing shortages and deteriorated conditions. The construction of Winton Terrace delivers a successful narrative within the history of the CMHA as the first affordable housing complex to be constructed on vacant land in order to avoid displacement of residents through slum clearance and the subsequent overhead costs. Winton Terrace successfully led the way for later CMHA developments of a similar nature, including English Woods and the later Findlater Gardens, which is directly adjacent to the north of the subject district.

**Criterion C: Architecture**

The Winton Terrace Historic District serves as an excellent example of the Colonial Revival style applied to a public housing development. It was designed with a suburban, Garden Apartment aesthetic with architectural embellishment similar to single family houses of the era. Each of the 93 contributing buildings was designed with similar materials and features to create a uniform district that was both economical and appealing to residents. Typical building features throughout the district include red brick exteriors, varying gabled and hipped roofs, and cast stone entrance ornamentation. As such, the Winton Terrace Historic District is locally significant under Criterion C in the category of Architecture.

*Frederick W. Garber and the Allied Architects*

Frederick W. Garber was a Cincinnati-based architect who practiced for 46 years after receiving his education from the Cincinnati Technical School and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, graduating from the latter in 1903. He began his architectural career with fellow architect Clifford B. Woodward under the firm Woodward & Garber. Upon Woodward’s retirement, Garber remained in the field as a solo architect until his retirement. Garber was instrumental in designing the first four affordable housing sites for the CMHA: Laurel Homes, Winton Terrace, English Woods, and Lincoln Court. All were low-rise housing, but Laurel Homes and Lincoln Court were more austere in design with minimal ornamentation, while Winton Terrace and English Woods featured facades with covered entrances and side gabled and hipped roofs. Lincoln Court and English Woods are no longer extant.

In addition to his work with the CMHA, Garber played an integral role in the formation of Cincinnati’s skyline and the design of numerous well-known municipal and educational buildings. In addition to the four affordable housing sites, Garber designed the Union Central
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Building and Annex/Central Trust Bank Building (NR #07000028, West Fourth Street H.D. B.I.), the Dixie Terminal Building, the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Building (NR #76001443, West Fourth Street H.D.), the Cincinnati Club (NR #85000068), and the Christ Church Chapel. Cincinnati-based schools that are accredited to Garber include the Withrow High School (NR #83001987), Western Hills High School, Walnut Hills High School, and Hartwell High School.42

Garber served as Chief Architect for the Allied Architects for Cincinnati Housing in the early 1940s. The Allied Architects was a consortium of the city’s notable architects that reviewed bids sent to the CHMA and advised the authority on proposed housing developments. Other firms within the Allied Architects associated with the development of Winton Terrace included Kruckmeyer & Strong, Fechheimer & Ihorst, and Harry Hake & Harry Hake, Jr., as well as William E. Bodenstein, mechanical engineer, and Henry Fletcher Kenney, landscape architect. Garber was the most well-known modernist of the architects, though Fechheimer & Ihorst were known for designing the Wilson Memorial Building on the University of Cincinnati campus and Harry Hake & Harry Hake, Jr. later designed the Federal Reserve Bank building in downtown Cincinnati. Harry Hake, Sr. designed a series of Cincinnati Fire Department Stations and the Art Deco style Cincinnati and Suburban Telephone Company Building (NR #90001908) and the Art Deco/Streamlined Classical Ohio State Office Building (NR #95000495) in Columbus, Ohio. Kenney, like his peers in the Allied Architects, was a well-respected landscape architect in the city who designed the gardens at the Taft Museum and the former Coney Island Park, now Kings Island.

Many major cities in Ohio had groups of Allied Architects throughout the 1940s, which were also common throughout the country. Some were involved with public housing like the Allied Architects for Cincinnati Housing, but all designed various public buildings. In Dayton, the Allied Architects oversaw bids for the Dayton Metropolitan Housing Authority. The Allied Architects in Columbus designed civic structures, like city hall and the central police station. The Cleveland airport was designed by the Allied Architects of Cleveland, and the Allied Akron Architects were involved with buildings at the University of Akron.

**Garden Apartment Typology**

All residential buildings within the Winton Terrace Historic District convey garden apartment typology. Garden apartments are generally low-rise, two- or three-story walkup buildings consisting of individual apartments grouped around stairways.43 Due to the building typology, including their size and materiality, as well as their affinity to lawn and garden spaces, garden apartment complexes grew to become a favored form of public housing design. In Cincinnati, few examples of garden apartments were identified during surveys for the “Apartment Buildings in Ohio Urban Centers, 1870-1970” Multiple Property Documentation Form.44
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As an example of a garden apartment complex, Winton Terrace features many of the character-defining features of the type. All buildings within the district are two-stories in height with access to both first and second floor levels in the majority of units. In addition to their size, Winton’s buildings display many other character-defining features associated with garden apartments. These include curvilinear streets and cul-de-sacs, which were thought to calm traffic and provide a safer home for children, and shared outdoor recreational spaces, including both active and passive recreation.\(^{45}\) As an example of garden apartments, Winton Terrace is also illustrative of PWA design guidelines set forth in 1935.

In their guidelines, *Unit Plans: Typical Room Arrangements, Site Plans and Details for Low-rent Housing*, the PWA specified that “without adequate open areas, the modern housing development would be a failure,” because these open areas “provide the answer to three important problems – a) circulation and access, b) passive recreation, and c) active recreation.”\(^{46}\) Thus, at Winton Terrace, the CMHA was intent on providing not just residences but also outdoor recreational spaces for tenants. Playground spaces, an example of active recreation, were planned as public outdoor spaces for children and families and remain at the complex today. As garden apartments, the design of Winton Terrace also put an emphasis on landscaping, or passive recreation. Unlike in high-rise public housing complexes, tenants in the two-story property could all look out their windows into a garden, easily accessible from their apartment units. Further, because these outdoor spaces were shared, they promoted community engagement.

While the garden apartment type emphasized access to nature, it also conformed to another tenet of modern public housing: low construction costs. The low-rise development could be constructed quicker and at a lower cost than the proposals for isolated high-rises that CMHA had been reviewing before Winton Terrace. This is particularly true for urban high-rises that necessitated slum clearance, such as Laurel Homes. The lower costs upfront allowed for more affordable rental rates when tenants moved in, providing more options for low-income families.

Despite efforts to keep construction costs low and development timelines short, the PWA promoted thoughtful design: “The architecture of low-rent housing projects should express simplicity, fitness, harmony, and honesty. In addition, there must be a logical and agreeable blending between the arrangement and the design of buildings in relation to that of open areas.”\(^{47}\) Winton Terrace expresses just that. The entire site was easily and safely accessible on the curvilinear roads and through shared green space, more typical of a suburban neighborhood that was not common for low-income families since public housing at the time was more often confined to high-rises in crowded urban areas with less outdoor spaces. With the garden apartment type, Garber and the Allied Architects were able to provide additional ornamentation, utilizing character-defining features of the Colonial Revival Style, which distinguished the complex from other forms of public housing in Cincinnati at that time.

\(^{45}\) Ibid.

\(^{46}\) *Unit Plans: Typical Room Arrangements, Site Plans and Details for Low-rent Housing*, United States Public Works Administration, (1935), 1-2.

\(^{47}\) *Unit Plans: Typical Room Arrangements, Site Plans and Details for Low-rent Housing*, United States Public Works Administration, (1935), 1.
Colonial Revival Style

One of the most popular and commonly applied architectural styles throughout the country, the Colonial Revival Style was generally used on building types between 1880 and 1960. The style traces its roots to the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia, which increased interest in the architecture of the country prior to its founding.\(^48\) Despite this, the style became even more prominent following the sesquicentennial celebration in 1926.

During the sesquicentennial celebration in 1926, one of the major milestones in the Colonial Revival style took place. Through the efforts of Reverend W.A.R. Goodwin and John D. Rockefeller Jr., hundreds of buildings in the former colonial town of Williamsburg, Virginia were restored and reconstructed. The idea was to provide the American people with a place where they could enjoy and experience colonial life.\(^49\) Many of the buildings were designed in the Georgian Revival Style.\(^50\)

By the 1930s, the Colonial Revival style, which rarely featured true copies of the Federal or Georgian styles, had taken hold as one of the most popular styles for residential buildings, banks, churches, schools, government offices, and commercial buildings.\(^51\) The style conveyed tradition, viewed through the lens of a familiar architectural form. The style most commonly featured: two-story heights in residential buildings; symmetrical façades; double-hung, multi-paned windows; columned porches; pedimented doors; side gabled or hipped roofs; pilasters; and decorative pendants.\(^52\)

The style remained prominent through the 1940s and 1950s, with simplified residential versions most commonly designed. The Colonial Revival style continues to inspire residential architecture to the present day.\(^53\)

Winton Terrace as an Example of the Colonial Revival Style

Like many American cities, Cincinnati features a great deal of Colonial Revival architecture. The style was first seen in the Queen City about 1895 in neighborhoods such as Clifton, Hyde Park,
and East Walnut Hills, typically applied to single-family houses. Although Winton Terrace does not feature the high-style design that many of the earlier versions in those neighborhoods do, the district consists of 93 buildings that all feature similar designs and character-defining features that are considered tenants of the style. Further, the simplified version of the style afforded CMHA the opportunity to construct economical, yet welcoming buildings that evoked a sense of pride and tradition within residents. As a common residential application, the overall setting of the district further provided the appearance of traditional residential homes. Unlike the common modern connotation with “public housing,” historic images picture the development as high quality and well-designed with a pleasant aesthetic typically afforded to single-family housing developments.

Each of the 93 buildings within the district display the tenants of the style. All buildings are two stories in height with symmetrical façades and a combination of side gabled or hipped roofs. Although windows throughout the district have been replaced, all buildings feature double-hung multi-pane windows that are generally six-over-six as was the original configuration (a traditional Colonial Revival configuration). At the primary elevation of many of the 92 residential buildings, simple columned entrance porticos are centrally located. Additional entrances feature cast stone pedimented entrance surrounds. In many cases, most prominently seen at the Administration Building, there are instances of decorative stone pendants. Stone lintels and brick quoins also exist at the Administration Building, serving as additional ornamentation on the district’s central building.

As an example of a public housing complex, Winton Terrace was built using efficient means and methods during an era in which public housing design was primarily concerned with low costs and rapid construction costs. Although a prominent architectural style applied to residential buildings, the Colonial Revival style was not often associated with public housing, which commonly lacked ornamentation as a means of saving costs. For example, the design of Laurel Homes, another of Garber’s works, is remarkably simple in comparison. Its buildings are faced with standard brick, featuring flat roofs and a concrete cornice line and windowsills. The ornamentation is minimal, and it has few architecturally distinguishing features. English Woods, as a second example of Garber’s work in Cincinnati, was far more comparable in design and type to Winton Terrace. English Woods was also a garden apartment complex with numerous two story buildings that featured brick exteriors, gabled roofs, and chimneys. Unlike Winton Terrace, however, English Woods did not feature Colonial Revival style elements, such as the door surrounds. Though simpler than many private single-family Colonial Revival residences, the façades of Winton Terrace’s buildings embody the style through the side gabled and hipped roofs, columned entrance porticos, and decorative stone pendants. At Winton Terrace, Garber was able to ensure the buildings were constructed at a low cost while still creating an aesthetically pleasing place for tenants to live, distinguishing the complex as architecturally significant public housing.

Winton Terrace serves as an excellent representation of the Colonial Revival style applied to a public housing development. The Allied Architects for Cincinnati Housing effectively utilized a great deal of the common and character-defining elements of the style in their design. As a result, the 93 contributing resources form one cohesive and architecturally uniform district in Cincinnati.

**Draft Public Housing in the United States, 1933-1949 MPDF**

Winton Terrace meets the following registration requirements established in the Multiple Property Documentation Form, Draft Public Housing in the United States, 1933-1949, prepared by the National Park Service:

- built and operated as public housing between 1933 and 1949
- conceived of as low-income housing
- associated with the development of federal public housing programs in the 1930s and 40s
- associated with the ideas of modern architecture and urban planning
- developed as a district, an interrelated facility with component parts that functioned in concert to fulfill the purposes of the program, in this case buildings and landscape\(^5\)

Winton Terrace is a public housing site that commenced construction in 1940 and was completed in 1941, thus being compliant under the first bullet point. This date range is important to the overall history of public housing as this was the first set of structured guidelines issued by the federal government. All public housing sites constructed during this timeframe with financial aid from the federal government were subject to these guidelines.

Winton Terrace was constructed as low-income housing and thus qualifies under the second bullet point. The housing development was constructed by the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority whose function was to construct low-income housing for the residents of Cincinnati. Winton Terrace was constructed between 1940 and 1941 utilizing federal funds provided by the PWA under the auspices of the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority, a government sanctioned agency. Federal public housing programs were essential to the housing market after the Great Depression because they were tailored to meet the needs of a growing population that had largely been subject to decrepit and poor living conditions.

The design of Winton Terrace utilized modern urban planning techniques that were comprised of ideas set forth by European models of large-scale housing and Garden Style Apartments. The planned layout of the site retains large areas of greenspace and the use of smaller sized townhouse style buildings reflects the European models.

The overall composition of Winton Terrace, from its buildings to its landscaping and spatial awareness, are all key components of a successful public housing complex, and one that typifies the standards set forth by the Multiple Property Documentation Form, Draft Public Housing in the United States, 1933-1949.

Conclusion

The Winton Terrace Historic District is locally significant under Criterion A in the category of Politics/Government as the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority’s second public housing development. Through landmark 1933 state and federal legislation that established the CMHA, the organization developed public housing complexes that sought to enhance and upgrade the quality of low-income housing. Although just CMHA’s second development, Winton Terrace served as an important trend-setter for later developments as CMHA’s first housing complex constructed outside the city’s core and on vacant land that did not require demolition or displacement. In addition to the CMHA’s role in the development of the district, Winton Terrace was constructed by the Public Works Administration and accurately reflects the values set forth by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal program.

The Winton Terrace Historic District is also locally significant under Criterion C in the category of Architecture as an intact and uniform complex of 93 buildings all designed in a similar Colonial Revival style. Designed by the Allied Architects for Cincinnati Housing, all buildings, including the residential buildings and the Administration Building, contain matching features, including double-hung multi-pane windows, cast stone pedimented entrance surrounds, gabled roofs and red brick cladding – all traditional Colonial Revival design elements.

Additionally, Winton Terrace possesses the characteristics of eligible properties identified in the MPDF Draft Public Housing in the United States, 1933-1949. These characteristics include repetitive building forms, as seen in the buildings’ Colonial Revival design; livable human scale and a balance between buildings and open space; and careful site planning in regards to spatial design, circulation patterns, semi-private gardens, and courtyard areas. The buildings were often constructed of brick and took the form of walk-up apartments. Complexes typically had non-residential features such as community centers, management offices, recreation, and community rooms, all of which are found in Winton Terrace’s Administration Building. The MPDF further states that interior features of public housing projects are utilitarian with simple finishes such as plaster walls, and simple kitchens with built-in cabinetry, also present at Winton Terrace.
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The National Register boundary reflects the original and current boundary of the district and includes all contributing resources historically associated with Winton Terrace.
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1 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 001 – Site view, looking north.
2 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 002 – Site view, looking northwest.
3 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 003 – Site view, looking southeast.
4 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 004 – Site view, looking west.
5 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 005 – Site view, looking south.
6 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 006 – Site view, looking northwest.
7 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 007 – Site view, looking northeast.
8 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 008 – Site view, looking northeast.
9 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 009 – Site view, looking north.
10 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 010 – Building Type A, #101, view looking north at South Elevation.
11 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 011 – Building Type A, #101, view, looking northwest at East Elevation.
12 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 012 – Building Type A, #179, view looking southwest at North Elevation.
13 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 013 – Building Type A, #179, view looking north at South Elevation.
14 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 014 – Building Type B, #149, view looking southeast at North and West Elevations.
15 of 43. OH_HamiltonCounty_WintonTerrace 015 – Building Type B, #149, view looking north at South and West Elevations.
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