NPS Form 10-900
(3-82)

OMB No. 1024-0018
Exp. 10-31-84

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only
received MAR 27 1985
date entered JUL 29 1985

See instructions in *How to Complete National Register Forms*
Type all entries—complete applicable sections

1. Name

historic Early Twentieth Century Raleigh Neighborhoods TR

and/or common

2. Location

street & number See individual district continuation sheets ___ not for publication

city, town Raleigh ___ vicinity of Congressional District Fourth

state North Carolina code 037 county Wake code 183

3. Classification

Category	Ownership	Status	Present Use	
X district	___ public	X occupied	___ agriculture	___ museum
___ building(s)	___ private	X unoccupied	___ commercial	X park
___ structure	X both	X work in progress	X educational	X private residence
___ site	**Public Acquisition**	**Accessible**	___ entertainment	___ religious
___ object	___ in process	X yes: restricted	___ government	___ scientific
	___ being considered	X yes: unrestricted	___ industrial	___ transportation
(TR)	N/A	X no	___ military	___ other:

4. Owner of Property

name See individual district continuation sheets

street & number

city, town ___ vicinity of state

5. Location of Legal Description

courthouse, registry of deeds, etc. Wake County Register of Deeds

street & number Fayetteville Street

city, town Raleigh state North Carolina

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

title N/A has this property been determined eligible? ___ yes XX no

date ___ federal ___ state ___ county ___ local

depository for survey records

city, town state

7. Description

Condition		Check one	Check one
X excellent	___ deteriorated	X unaltered	X original site
X good	___ ruins	X altered	___ moved date _____
X fair	___ unexposed		

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

Description:

Between 1906 and 1910 three suburban neighborhoods -- Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park -- were platted on the northwest, west and southwest sides of the City of Raleigh (see map). Similar in origin, intention, design and subsequent evolution, they share a common historical significance which is directly related to patterns of growth and change locally, regionally and nationally. Though all were designed to attract Raleigh's growing middle class, they differ somewhat architecturally, reflecting their location as well as the variety of inhabitants they did attract. At present they share the common characteristic of being substantial, reasonably intact inner city neighborhoods which are undergoing revitalization. The following brief description will compare and contrast their distinguishing physical features.

The first common characteristic of the neighborhoods is their location on portions of the relatively few extensive local lands held by important local families. Glenwood is on Mordecai and Devereaux land, Cameron Park is on Cameron property and Boylan Heights is on the Boylan property which originally derived from Joel Lane's Wakefield Plantation.

Each district has common natural features: deciduous and evergreen trees, boundaries which derive their origins from natural features and very uneven terrain. These features worked in differing degrees to determine the design and platting of each neighborhood. Of the three, Glenwood seems the least affected by its topography; Cameron Park, the most.

Except for Boylan Heights, all three neighborhoods were linked to the City street system by major residential thoroughfares on two or more of their boundaries. Cameron Park and Glenwood were both on the streetcar lines. Cameron Park's south boundary was Hillsborough Street, the streetcar line from downtown west to the A. and M. College (now North Carolina State University). The streetcar access for Glenwood was down the center of Glenwood Avenue which bisected the neighborhood. Boylan Heights was located two blocks from Hillsborough Street which was connected to the neighborhood by Boylan Avenue (map).

The common design features that the three neighborhoods share include narrow, deep lots, service alleys bisecting the blocks and short facade setbacks which have produced dense street facades and deep, shaded interior spaces. Yet they differ. Glenwood is basically laid out as a gridiron with Glenwood Avenue as the bisecting focus (map). Boylan Heights is much more carefully platted as a curvilinear grid which conforms to the contours of the site (map). Cameron Park is the most irregular with streams that dictate parks surrounded by streets which are connected at either end by a curving street. A slightly more regular grid exists on the level portions and connects the streets between the parks (map).

The most conspicuous design difference in the three plans for the neighborhoods is that Cameron Park and Boylan Heights possess park spaces while Glenwood did not include any parks.

Statement of Methodology:

In this particular study, which focused on three early 20th century suburban neighborhoods in Raleigh the research and analysis were governed by two major goals. The first was to describe the role of these areas in the history of the development of Raleigh. The second was to provide the documentation necessary to meet the criteria for inclusion of these neighborhoods in the National Register of Historic Places. The two basic questions were: what does the development, appearance and evolution of these neighborhoods tell us about the people and values that influenced the City's growth; and how do these events relate to the history of the development of the State and the region? The following methods were used to answer these questions.

First, a systematic photographic survey of the built fabric was undertaken. This produced essential stylistic and morphological (-a study of structure or form) data that permitted a fairly accurate but general chronological development of the neighborhoods to be established.

At the same time research in county and municipal records permitted a more accurate determination of the actual land transactions which opened the residential neighborhoods for development.

As this data was being collected, newspapers, General Statutes, City Council minutes, censuses, insurance maps and other published and written information on Raleigh's history was researched, read, and noted. A key element in this process was a series of interviews with Elizabeth Reid Murray who is finishing a scholarly volume on the history of Wake County from 1782 to 1900. The synthesis of this information created a sense of the social, economic, political and cultural climate into which the neighborhood appearances and evolution could be fitted. A similar process was followed for that of the State.

The establishment of an accurate and reasonable objective analysis of the historical situation which produced Glenwood, Boylan Heights, and Cameron Park was reinforced by relating it to the style and form of the built fabric.

It then remained to analyze each area individually. The most reasonable physical boundaries appropriate to the National Register district nomination could only be determined by asking who developed the neighborhoods, for whom, why, how and what determined the appearance of the built fabric. In this way not only extent, but significance could be individually clarified. Newspapers, city directories and interviews, when combined with the other assembled data, answered these questions.

Perhaps most significant was the written and published information that was contemporary with the formative years of these areas. It was not necessary to only speculate about motivations and values; the evidence was frequently available. Newspaper editorials, sales brochures, advertisements, and other publications created a vivid picture of the ideals, ambitions, hopes, and pragmatic realities that produced the three new residential neighborhoods.

At frequent intervals in the development of research and its synthesis, conferences were held with the appropriate personnel in the Survey and Planning and Research Branches of the Department of Cultural Resources. Their suggestions, analysis, and knowledge of National Register procedures facilitated decisions concerning the organization of written and visual data. They also helped determine, on the basis of the evidence, the boundaries to be drawn for the areas proposed as National Register Districts.

At all times a third goal of this research and analysis was to describe not what one might wish had happened, but what could be documented by events, the writing of individuals, and changes in political and social ideology. This is a painstaking process which is never completely finished. It is believed, however, that new data will not significantly alter the basic outline of the National Register nominations. It will clarify and add increasing levels of complexity and comprehension to our understanding of the processes which have produced the realities and the ideals that constitute the City of Raleigh.

Each of the three neighborhoods was developed by realty companies which had political, familial or social connections.

Architecturally, each neighborhood is internally homogeneous, consisting of modest to substantial single with some multiple family dwellings. The majority of the fabric dates between 1907 and 1930. There are three predominant house types represented in varying numbers in each neighborhood (see map C). Each has its origins in the vernacular, popular and high style architecture of this period.

The first major house type is the Queen Anne/Colonial Hybrid (fig. 1). Its origins lie in the late nineteenth century exuberant, multifaceted, roofed, towered and shingled Queen Anne and in the popular revival of interest in Colonial America as represented by the symmetrical late Georgian and Federal houses of Virginia and other early sites.

The basic house type probably began as a two-story gable roofed, double-pile, central hall plan box. But such a form, although deeply rooted historically and perfectly appropriate for the limits of a narrow city lot, lacked variety and vigor when compared to local Queen Anne houses like the Capehart-Crocker house (National Register Property).

To provide more irregular massing, a corner bay was cut back and the entrance moved off center. The projecting bays were roofed by a gable end facing the street and another, intersecting gable or hip roof added to cover the back bays. A kitchen "L" added yet another level of variety to the plan and the total elevation is given further dimension by an attached one-story porch that was least the full facade, sometimes wrapping a corner beyond the cut-back bay. Another pediment could be put on the porch to call attention to the entry.

The basic plan is one in which the entry was by the side bay--into a hall with stairs and a room to one side. A back hall opening off the entry hall separates the rooms placed left and right and leads to the kitchen "L". Upstairs are the hall, bedrooms, back hall and sometimes an extra bedroom over the kitchen. Closets and baths are tucked into niches beside the interior chimneys which are retained for the stacked fireplaces.

The details of this usually balloonframe and weatherboarded wooden house are accumulated in a variety comparable to the more complex, but essentially predictable plan.

The entry door is usually framed by transom and side lights, a reference to Federal rather than Georgian, but generally thought at the time to be "Colonial" in origin. The double hung sash, either double hung single lights or single lower light and multipaned above is framed, like the doors, in a locally milled jamb and header that is double molded. Interior trim consists of a chair rail, if not a wainscot, although one might be included in principal rooms. Simple fireplace surrounds consist of pilasters or attached columns on bases supporting a mantel shelf. Occasionally, this is repeated as a mirrored over-mantel. A simple cornice crowns the high ceiling above the picture rail. Another common feature is columns on bases supporting a plain or arched entablature in the cased openings of the parlor and sometimes the dining room. Wood floors are narrow-boarded hardwood; the walls are plaster on lath. Centered ceiling fixtures and a simple ceiling rosette are common.

Other features of interest might include an oval window on the stair landing with cut, beveled or stained glass in the window, similar to what might be found in the door, transom and sidelights.

Interior colors are light and varied although there is a great devotion to floral papers. Paneling might be stained dark.

In general, exterior colors are white or light to somber with white trim, grey porch floors and blue porch ceilings. The porch members themselves could either be vaguely or quite correctly executed classical columns, or boxed or turned posts, but the former is more common. A plain balustrade of turned or square members runs between the columns set on molded or plain stretchers.

Other occasional decorations are carved fans or Palladian windows in the gable ends and in the pediment over the entry. The roof itself is usually slate or tin. The cornices are molded boxes, supporting gutters and downspouts. The eave overhang is very restrained.

An important variant is the one-store Queen Anne/Colonial Hybrid (fig 2). Reduced in scale and usually placed on a high foundation, this variant alludes to the Victorian cottage which must have influenced its production.

In either the one- or two-story form the Queen Anne/Colonial Hybrid is a strong form in the brilliant southern sun and in the flickering shadows provided by shade trees. As can be seen by the description, the formal origins of design and details are many, but the overall impression is vaguely Colonial with latent, remembered or observed variety drawn from the earlier, more exuberant Queen Anne. The high ceilinged rooms and large porch are appropriate to the climate and to social habits of this region.

The variety obtainable in this house type was further enhanced by its presence, cheek by jowl with the Colonial Two-Story Box, a type that has many origins in common with the Queen Anne/Colonial Hybrid.

The Colonial Box appears in two distinct forms. The first is the two-story, double pile, hip roof, three bayed wood frame and weatherboarded type (fig. 3). Its emphasis is vertical--high foundations, steps to the porch, its second floor accented by the hip roof and centered on the front of the roof, a shed or gable roofed single dormer. This last feature which focused attention on the entry, also reinforces the plan--usually a center hall plan with open stair. Initially late Georgian in North Carolina, this plan was adopted by the vernacular builders with Federal, then Greek Revival detailing. It occurs in both the Gothic Revival and Italianate and persists, with other plans, until the advent of the ranch house. Along with the Colonial Revival Style, sources for this form are the nineteenth century vernacular I-house and the North Carolina "Triple-A" House, a common rural and small townhouse type featuring a projecting attic gable extended above the entrance on the facade.

The one-story shed-roof porch is attached, almost or completely full facade. Occasionally a false pediment is centered on the shed-roof. Sometimes it may be located left to right; when this occurs, it usually reflects the location of the entry door in the left or right, rather than the center bay.

The tendency to relocate the entry door away from the center, which then indicated a change in plan to a side hall plan, does some violence to what otherwise began as a bilaterally symmetrical plan. But it did lend variety to neighborhood exteriors and in the interior also.

Between 1910 and 1930, the Colonial Box evolved in a variety of ways. One was towards a more sophisticated use of Georgian details. A gable roof replaces the hip roof, shutters are placed beside windows and a central one-story portico with some academic detailing replaces the porch. The porch was then moved to the side and balanced on the other by another porch or enclosed "sun" porch. The other variant, recalling the pre-Revolutionary period, uses a gambrel or shed dormered roof with steep slopes and overhanging eaves on the front and back facades between the first and second floors. The entry bay may have been pushed forward under a steeply pitched gable that cut through the roof line at the first floor. Chimneys may have been moved from one end or the rear to the front. There was a greater abundance of materials; shingles may have been used for the second floor above weatherboarding or brick veneer on the first. The entire house may have been brick veneered with deep window surrounds and paneled shutters relieving the materials of the first floor. This variant probably signalled a greater willingness to use all the forms possible from earlier revivals in an eclectic and interesting way.

The Colonial Box shared interior and exterior details with the Queen Anne/Colonial Hybrid, although the columns of the porches and some interior decoration like chair rails and wainscot showed more restraint, resembling Federal forms. Light and somber colors remained in use.

The second major form was the two-bayed, double pile, two-story type of the Colonial Box (fig. 4). It may have occured as the result of a search for economy; it certainly misses the point of the bilaterally symmetrical center hall plan of the three-bayed Box. It could also owe its form to the side hall plan found in more densely populated urban settings. Nevertheless it is, like its larger relative, a detached single family house. The two-bayed Colonial Box introduces a slightly irregular note with its symmetrical entry but this is mitigated by the attached one-story, full or almost full facade length porch and by the compact hip roof usually found on this house. It was also subject to more variations in roof treatment and materials than its larger relative. One important variant was a bungalow version with a gable roof, end to the street, with deep overhanging eaves resting on triangular brackets above a full facade gable-ended one-story porch. Another variant is the use of the gable roof, gable end to the street, with an intersecting cross gable toward the rear of the house. These roof forms produce a pediment on all four sides and leave room, particularly in the gable ends, for a change of materials or details. It also permits the raking and horizontal cornices to return eight times, and this, in combination with broadly overhanging eaves recalls both the Queen Anne and the picturesque.

The plan of this house is either a traditional side hall, or the entry is simply into the "front" room with a stairway to one side. A dining room usually opens off the main room, and from the dining room, a hall or butler's pantry leads to the kitchen. Bedrooms are upstairs except in some cases where a one-story shed-roofed "L" is added to accommodate a kitchen, thereby providing space for a first floor bedroom.

Interior details are comparable to the three-bayed Colonial Box, although in some versions they could have been spare and meager. The use of different materials provided variety and contrast.

The need for economical, rental or speculative houses produced many types whose forms, designed to appeal to the rising middle class in these neighborhoods, were in part influenced by the Queen Anne/Colonial Hybrid and the Colonial Box. Of equal importance for the small house, however, was the bungalow--the third major house type found in Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park.

The bungalow was derived from a myriad of sources: the climate and needs of the west coast, the English Colonial architecture of Lutygens, some Japanese forms and some craftsman influences which emerged from the ideas of the Stickley Brothers. The key to the bungalow was the search for more freedom and commodiousness in plan and a more accommodating relationship with the environment. Green and Green, the California architectural firm usually associated with the creation of the bungalow in its definitive form, introduced the use of the pergola, the sleeping porch, the widely overhanging eaves and casement windows associated with the style. Equally characteristic was an emphasis on revealing both interior and exterior beams of the roof and ceilings and a tendency to focus on elegant carpentry in screens, lattices, doors, frames, built-in cabinet work and other features mentioned above.

The potential for a vernacular adaptation of these ideas to North Carolina was great; the deep engaged porch, the sleeping porch and the less formal plan found sympathy in the climate, materials and needs of the South. The bungalow's tendency to emphasize broad, low-lying horizontal lines also struck notes of familiarity with those who had grown up in one-story coastal vernacular cottages where one found a low-sweeping gable-roof form with engaged porch. In Raleigh, we can identify a number of types which originated with the bungalow.

The first type is the one-story basic bungalow: a compact house, long front to back, gable-roofed with the pediment end to the street (fig. 5). A deep porch is attached to the front and sheltered under a secondary gable pushed slightly off center. The eaves of both gables rest on brackets, overhung substantially and are usually finished with a wide fascia board. The porch roof is supported on posts or boxed columns, usually tapered to the top. These posts in turn rest on stubby brick or masonry piers, which rise from the continuous foundation through the porch floor. The front door is usually off center, but is centered under the secondary gable. The entry door opens into a living room, or the reception hall. If the entry is into the living room, the dining room is adjacent, while a hall sometimes causes the dining room to be positioned behind the living room. With either arrangement, the rest of the rooms are arranged along a transverse hall behind the living room or one perpendicular to the living room. The kitchen is usually located in a back corner and separated from the dining room by a butler's pantry or

breakfast nook or both. The height of the upstairs determines whether it is used as attic or for more bedroom space. If there are stairs, they are usually located in the back hall. The rear of the house might incorporate a screened or sleeping porch under the extended rear gable. Dormers located along the flanks or in the rear indicate the use of the upstairs. Overhanging eaves along the flank provided protection from the sun and the rain. The projections of bays for built-in cabinetry or for bay windows give variety and interest to the long flanks of the house. The windows are either 8, 10, or 12 pane casement, six-over-six sash, or single light, double hung sash.

The house is a wood frame building which is weatherboarded, brick veneered or stuccoed. Shingles are used occasionally. Exterior colors tend toward the dark or subdued earth colors; trim might be painted in contrasting shades. The undersides of the eaves are usually treated in a contrasting lighter shade or even painted white. The porch color scheme varied although the usual is a dark green or grey floor with a light ceiling.

The interior usually features plaster walls, sometimes rough finished, deep base moldings, wide window and door frames and occasionally exposed or box beams in the main rooms. Another ceiling treatment is matchboarding, left, like the rest of the wood trim, to age naturally or varnished lightly.

The fireplace is located at one end of the living room. It might have a raised hearth and the chimney breast and stack, often of rough brick or stone, is left exposed. Sometimes a "rustic" mantel shelf is added above the fireplace opening. Small windows, frequently casement and filled with beveled or stained glass, flank the chimney stack above built-in book cases. Other built-in accommodations include a china cabinet in the dining room bay with high windows above and closets and cupboards built into the butler's pantry. Cased openings between living room and dining room and halls sometimes hold multi-paned "french" (windows) doors to allow a room to be closed off.

The basic bungalow is found in many variants. The more common types are the one-story hip roof with single gable porch; the one-story single gable, end to the street, with engaged porch; and a gable roof variety with gable perpendicular to the street with a low sloping roof with engaged porch and an eyebrow dormer centered above. The small houses are relatives of the other small houses found in the neighborhood. These are the hip-roofed bungalow and the single gable shotgun variety.

The hip roof bungalow is a single story, three-bayed house or cottage with attached or engaged full facade porch. The clue to its origins are in the roof form and the porch. Like its more elaborate two-story relative, the Colonial Box, it has a hip or gabled dormer centered above the centrally located entry door. The dormer sometimes features a fan or an abstracted Palladian window. The porch is supported on columns or box piers, and bases, but more restrained than the stubby, flared bases characteristic of the bungalow. In fact, in some forms of this small house the engaged porch is cut back under the hip roof. When this occurs, the presence of a plain architrave above plain columns relates it to the engaged porch and entablature of the mid-nineteenth century one-story Greek Revival Cottage. This cottage, in its debased form, is simply a low country cottage on high piers, with rough hewn posts supporting the overhanging roof, a cottage type as characteristic of rural North Carolina as the one-story Triple-A. Both these one-story houses were advertised and sold as cottages, usually of six rooms, three on either side of a central hall.

This house could also be built as a shotgun, but the form did provide for ventilation and the retention of high ceilings; the porch and the dormer made it more important than the plainer mill village house.

Like the hip roofed cottage, the gable roofed cottage is a one-story house. It usually lacks the detail and variety of the bungalow which is its source. Its gable turned end to the street and the engaged porch help define the compactness of the shotgun plan.

Although the bungalow is typically a story or story-and-one-half in North Carolina, this should not be interpreted to mean that the type is for the less affluent or the poor. The form could become (and had been at its origins) a vast two-story collection of rooms, porches, sun and sleeping porches, verandas and balconies. This potential is apparent in the examples of the large bungalow.

The last bungalow type to be considered is the large two-story type. The exterior is dominated by a gambrel or jerkin-head roof which extends over the deep engaged porch. The porch is supported on sturdy boxed posts or stubby brick or stone piers. One of three bays on the entry facade, the entry received additional focus by the location of a gable, hip or shed roofed sleeping porch, usually with casement windows above. The gambrel or jerkin-head was adopted because of its colonial origins, but also because it permitted a complete second floor.

Both plan and interior details are derived from the basic bungalow, although the three-bay facade and the entry into the parlor with the dining room on the left or right were retained well into the nineteenth century in North Carolina. Raised on a continuous high foundation, this house sometimes looks like a benign, sleeping creature of the earth. Set close to the ground, it is almost turtle-like and clearly related to its one-story relatives.

Another large bungalow variant is the two-story gambrel roof with intersecting gambrel. This product is a spacious house with a bungalow's freedom of planning. It is sometimes built in materials and details completely comparable to those described above or it may be found with engaged porches, either full facade or wrapping one corner, giving it a "Colonial" flavor.

The large bungalow types also are related to the more picturesque versions of the Colonial Box. The presence of the variants also demonstrates a growing awareness of different forms and styles available and the increasing eclecticism of American domestic architecture in the 1920s. The presence of the few Tudor Revival buildings, Mission/Spanish and/or California style buildings also attest to this phenomenon. But on the whole, however, the three neighborhoods are stylistically conservative as demonstrated by the predominance of a few house types.

It is this fact which gives the neighborhoods a continuity enhanced by the consistent scale and an emphasis on pedestrian access and movement. The limited street width, sidewalks, trees and plantings produce a very dense street facade and a tight complex pattern which contrasts with the open space of the streets and parks. The light is filtered and tempered as it falls on the open spaces which are usually overhung with trees. These three neighborhoods, together with Oakwood (National Register Historic District), Mordecai and Hayes Barton, provide an interesting and increasingly valuable contrast to Raleigh suburbs that developed after 1960. The emphasis in these newer areas lies on vehicular circulation and broad, unrelated lots and building facades.

8. Significance

Period	Areas of Significance—Check and justify below				
___ prehistoric	___ archeology-prehistoric	_X_ community planning	___ landscape architecture	___ religion	
___ 1400–1499	___ archeology-historic	___ conservation	___ law	___ science	
___ 1500–1599	___ agriculture	___ economics	___ literature	___ sculpture	
___ 1600–1699	_X_ architecture	_X_ education	___ military	___ social/ humanitarian	
___ 1700–1799	___ art	___ engineering	___ music	___ theater	
___ 1800–1899	_X_ commerce	___ exploration/settlement	___ philosophy	___ transportation	
XX 1900–	___ communications	___ industry	___ politics/government	___ other (specify)	
		___ invention			

Specific dates See individual entries **Builder/Architect** See individual entries

Statement of Significance (in one paragraph)

Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park are three suburbs that were developed in Raleigh between 1906 and 1910. Each became a successful neighborhood that contributed to the spatial and architectural development of the City of Raleigh. Each neighborhood remains largely intact.

Their historic significance to the City of Raleigh is based on six factors: 1) they are the first planned and consciously developed twentieth century suburbs in Raleigh that can be clearly documented; 2) their presence results from the first significant period of urban growth in Raleigh in the twentieth century; 3) they reflect the significantly changed patterns of landownership and tenancy which emerged in Raleigh and Wake County after the Civil War and Reconstruction; 4) they were developed by individuals whose prominence derived from nineteenth century familial and political connections but whose activities reflect the changed economic climate of the state; 5) they were affected by the social, economic and political policies of the era of white supremacy; and 6) they form internally homogeneous units with an architectural and visual fabric which dates from their major period of growth -- between 1906 and 1930. This fabric also tells us much about the environmental development of Raleigh and the significant role that a desire for image played in the development of these neighborhoods.

These neighborhoods are also significant for their reflection of some important regional and national trends: 1) the growth of industrialization in the south, 2) changes in agricultural patterns and rural in-migration, 3) urban out-migration and the creation of suburbs, 4) increased social, economic and racial segregation and 5) economic and technical changes which permitted more widespread homeownership while fostering conservative attitudes in design that produced a lively but somewhat eclectic architectural fabric whose diversity reflects this period of change and ideological uncertainty.

Criteria Assessment:

Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and:

A. As products of the early twentieth century urban boom in North Carolina and the south are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

B. That are associated with people like James H. Pou, J. Stanhope Wynne, F. K. Ellington, V. O. Parker and Carey N. Hunter, and other New South leaders whose lives are significant in our past;

C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type -- popular suburban building, and a period -- early twentieth century -- that represent a significant and distinguishable entity within the spatial and visual development of the City.

Between 1906 and 1910, three "up-to-date" suburbs -- Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park -- were platted on the northwest, southwest, and west sides of Raleigh. Spurred by competition, the success achieved by each of the three neighborhoods relates them to a significant phase in the history of the city, the state and the nation.

Their historical significance to the City of Raleigh is based on six factors: first, they are the first planned and consciously developed 20th century suburbs in Raleigh that can be clearly documented; second, their presence results from the first significant period of urban growth in Raleigh in the twentieth century; third, they reflect the significantly changed patterns of land ownership and tenancy which emerged in Raleigh and Wake County after the Civil War and Reconstruction; fourth, they were developed by individuals whose prominence derived from nineteenth century familial and political connections but whose activities reflect the changed economic climate of the state; fifth, they were occasioned by the social, economic and political policies of the era of white supremacy, and sixth, they form internally homogeneous units with an architectural and visual fabric which dates from their major period of growth -- between 1906 and 1930. This fabric also tells us much about the environmental development of Raleigh and the significant role played by a desire for a sophisticated image of the capital city.

The appearance of these neighborhoods may also be related to some important regional trends; first, the growth of industrialization in the South following the Civil War and Reconstruction; second, changes in agricultural patterns relating not only to the diminution of plantations which produced differing landholding and tenancy patterns, but also rural in-migration; third, the related appearance of a larger middle class; fourth, the increase in social patterns of segregation; and fifth, economic and technical changes which permitted more widespread homeownership while fostering conservative attitudes in design.

Similarly, the national patterns of increased industrialization, the rise in per capita income, and new patterns of development which include urban out-migration in the form of suburbs are also reflected in the creation of Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park. They also show a continuation of revivalism and eclecticism in architectural design which characterized the diversity, energy, and ideological uncertainty of this period of American life.

It is not the purpose of this nomination to exhaustively examine but rather to suggest the ways in which these neighborhoods relate to all these historical factors. The historic significance of these neighborhoods lies in their unique characteristics which are highlighted by comparison with these national and regional events and trends. Similarly, the historic significance of each neighborhood is based on its unique features which enlarge our understanding of the whole.

In 1907, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry boosted the first expansion of the Raleigh city limits since 1857. The city limits were extended in each direction so that the boundaries were one mile from Union (Capitol) Square.[1] "Greater Raleigh," as it was called, had 19,218 inhabitants by 1910, an increase of approximately 40% over that of 1900. (See Census Table Appendix.) This era of growth also coincided with the rise of the politics of white supremacy -- a complex political movement based on racism but which encompassed the growing conflicts initiated by the transformation of a predominantly agrarian society and economy into an urbanized, industrialized one.[2] These complex attitudes are reflected in the plans of the developers of Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park as are attitudes fostered by the political and economic powers which had been at work within the city since the 1880s. Patterns of growth were initiated during these two decades which helped determine the appearance and location of these three neighborhoods. Some review of Raleigh's early development following the Civil War and Reconstruction is necessary to appreciate the historic significance of these neighborhoods.

It is important to understand at the outset that Raleigh was a planned capital.[3] With its broad avenues, squares, large house sites, and trees it was an incipiently grand residential city. Raleigh, however, remained essentially a small town until about 1870 (see Census Tables). This was a result partly of location, and partly of its business -- state and county government -- but probably it was largely the result of the essentially rural nature of the state. This produced a dispersed population with few large urban centers. From the beginning, therefore, and for many generations after, efforts were directed at creating a vital image for what, in fact, was a very small town.

The need to create an appropriate image for the state capital is evidenced in many ways. The magnificent new capitol designed by Town and Davis was finished in 1840. Its austere classicism reflected the aspirations of the state, just as early city ordinances for clean streets and trees encouraged a setting appropriate to the building and to the image of the city as a whole.[4]

Similarly, other architectural projects in the 1850s were occasions for the enhancement of the status of certain groups as well as the city. The congregation of Christ Church (Episcopal) replaced their old building on the northeast corner opposite Union Square with a handsome stone Gothic Revival structure designed by New York architect Richard Upjohn. The English architect, William Percival, designed a new church for the Baptist congregation in the Gothic style for another corner opposite the Capitol. While in Raleigh Percival also designed two suburban Italianate villas for two prominent Raleigh families, the Tuckers and the Boylans. An elegant board and batten carpenter Gothic chapel was added to complement the austere Greek Revival forms on the campus of St. Mary's College. The main building of Peace Institute (chartered in 1859) was designed in the Greek Revival style.[5]

The images conveyed by these examples are of a restrained but informed taste. This was paralleled by a similar quality in domestic design. Only Fayetteville Street, the "commercial street" interrupted the simple spaciousness of the town (see Bird's Eye View of Raleigh, 1872). The Civil War and Reconstruction was to change the city and alter its form, but not an incipient desire for formal, visual elegance. The growth of Industry, particularly the building industry,[6] of state government,[7] and the appearance of a number of important educational institutions[8] in the town would all account for future lines of development.

Moses Amis, writing in 1887, says that Raleigh's real growth began in 1870, and that "...In seventeen years the appearance of the greater part of the city has been changed almost entirely and fully a third of the sixty miles of streets have been laid off and adorned with buildings. The city has far more than doubled its population in the seventeen years. The number of buildings has more than doubled, and Fayetteville, North Blount, East North, and Hillsborough Streets have become the handsomest thoroughfares in the South."[9] He also noted the presence of a new neighborhood (Oakwood) in the northeast corner of the city.

Minutes of the Board of Aldermen show that the study for a waterworks began in 1881, numbering for a postal service (on the Philadelphia plan) in 1883, and electrification in 1885.[10] Amis writes "...the city inaugurated a system of paving and in December 1886, opened its streetcar lines for traffic. These lines now have a length of over eight miles and cover the most desirable parts of the city. The result is that suburban property has taken a natural rise in value, and the extension of the City in all directions is accelerated."[11]

There were also many new educational institutions added to those already in Raleigh. Peace, founded before the Civil War and located at the north end of Wilmington Street, opened in 1872 as a school for young white women. Meredith College for Women which opened in 1899, was supported by the Baptists. Located in the northeast end of town, its romantic turrets enhanced the new Blount Street neighborhood near the new Governor's Mansion. To the west on Hillsborough Street beyond St. Mary's, the State Agricultural and Mechanical College, chartered in 1887, opened its doors in 1889.

Two black institutions also were located in Raleigh. Shaw Collegiate Institute, founded in 1865, located its Italianate collegiate buildings in southeast Raleigh at the end of Wilmington Street in 1870. St. Augustine's Normal School and College, founded in 1867, was established east of Oakwood beyond the 1857 city limits.[12] The location of these two institutions was also related to the fact that southeast Raleigh had become increasingly black. The state's decision to place the State School for the Blind and Deaf Negroes on South Bloodworth Street also shows a recognition of this trend which would affect the future growth of the city by helping to establish black or white areas.[13] At the same time, however, the presence of these institutions demonstrates the growing importance of education as a major means for livelihood in the capital city. Whether black or white, the educational institutions supplied new capital, created or enhanced markets and significantly increased the image of Raleigh as a center for education and culture -- an image which may have helped to attract the institutions in the first place.[14]

Another factor which affected Raleigh's physical growth was the growth of the building supply industry. Taking advantage of the fact that Raleigh had been a major rail center since the 1840s, building supply companies such as Briggs and Dodd, Ellington and Royster, and the North Carolina Car Company grew rapidly. The rails supplied raw materials and transported sawn lumber, sashes, blinds, doors, frames and other building components throughout the state. This standardization of parts and their pre-assembly also made building cheaper. The companies, therefore, supplied not only new sources for work and capital, but also helped to meet the additional demands for housing. More people meant more building.[15]

In addition to education and building supplies, Raleigh had also emerged as an important center for the printing industry. Prior to the Civil War, at least ten major newspapers had been located here.[16] Education and government required books and printed materials as well as paper and related supplies.[17] That the government was gradually becoming more bureaucratic in its form is evidenced by the movement of government offices from the capitol. Building land was purchased along Fayetteville Street and around Union Square, reinforcing the orientation of government in the central city.[18] This trend began after the Civil War and has continued into this century.

These special interests in Raleigh were augmented by its share of the normal trades associated with a growing town and county center -- food, clothing, hardware, farm supplies, and livery stables were also present and expanding. A comparison of the city directories between 1880 and 1900 records a substantial increase in almost every trade and the appearance of some new ones. Law, banking, and the early insurance industry were also associated with the growth of the town.[19]

Along with this growth, some manufacturing concerns also appeared. The Raleigh, Pilot, and Caraleigh Mills began operations in this period and small mill villages grew up in close proximity at the edges of the City. At the same time, however, there appears to have been no attempt to tie Raleigh's future to one major industry as in Roanoke Rapids (textiles) or Durham where the tobacco industry became the major source of wealth.[20] And, in fact, future historians may argue that there was a conscious attempt to prevent such an occurrence in the capital city.[21]

These factors, and many which cannot be completely accounted for, transformed Raleigh. New buildings give us insight into the character of the city and its inhabitants. Domestic buildings along North Blount and Hillsborough Streets represented the gamut of the Victorian revival styles realized for the most part in wood -- a traditional material not usually associated with great wealth.[22] The new Governor's Mansion on Blount Street was brick but few others used their resources for that degree of opulence. Oakwood (National Register Historic District), the new neighborhood of the 1880s, readily demonstrates not only the architectural conservatism of the place but the importance of the building supply industry. Developed by Briggs and Dodd, it was made up of smaller, simpler, cheaper versions of the Blount Street mansions.[23]

Along Fayetteville Street, iron fronts and conservative two-story and three-story masonry blocks made up the commercial and banking area. Buildings such as Briggs Hardware, and Heilig-Levine were characteristic.[24] "Skyscrapers" which arrived in New York, Baltimore and Chicago by 1885, were still at least two decades away in Raleigh at that time. There was neither the need nor the prosperity for the explosive innovations or the pure Beaux Arts classicism that occurred in larger, more progressive, more prosperous urban centers.[25]

This period of Raleigh's growth coincides with many national changes or changes which had occurred earlier in more populous, prosperous regions of the nation. As pointed out before, North Carolina was a largely rural and not very prosperous state. The Civil War and Reconstruction intensified these difficulties in many ways. The agenda for the state after the war was not just recovery but building a more economically diversified and viable society. Incipient industrialization, rural in-migration, the growth of a middle class and even some form of urban spread--Oakwood--produced the changes documented in Raleigh following 1870. What these optimistic reports of Raleigh's growth do not discuss, however, is the context of political conflict in which they occurred.[26] The coincidence of this urban growth with Post-Reconstruction politics affected city growth producing patterns which emerged more clearly after the turn of the century and which are reflected in the development of these neighborhoods. The new patterns were those of residential segregation and discrimination designed to regain, sustain or enhance the economic hegemony of whites. A few examples of this will suffice to indicate the directions established in this period.

The ascendancy of North Blount, North East, and Hillsborough Streets recorded by Amis alludes to the subtle changes taking place in terms of housing patterns. Before the Civil War, no one section of town had clear pre-eminence of social status. The Capitol was at the north end of Fayetteville Street, the Governor's Mansion at the other. Prominent citizens lived all over town.[27] Two decades after the Civil War, Blount Street was chosen as the site of the new Governor's Mansion. Begun ca. 1884, and completed in 1891, this impressive dwelling, designed by Samuel Sloan of Philadelphia and built under the direction of A. G. Bauer, gave the street a heightened status.[28] At about the same time (1884) Murphy School on North Person Street was established. Its location made it immediately more fashionable than the Centennial School that had been operated since 1876 in the old Governor's Palace. The property was finally acquired by the city and a new school built in 1885.[29] The almost simultaneous development of Oakwood to the northeast and (earlier) Peace College to the west of Blount Street created newer, more fashionable neighborhoods which took white population away from the south part of Raleigh. Similarly, Hillsborough Street between St. Mary's and the "A. and M." began to be even more important as a site for prestigious dwellings.[30]

It is also true that a major portion of land made available for development by the freed blacks was located on the east and south sides of the city. As already indicated, two major black educational institutions were located there. Both prior to and subsequent to their location, black land development companies were able to purchase sites off New Bern Avenue, between New Bern and Wilmington Streets and near the old Fairgrounds on the east side of town. An unpublished master's thesis has documented this development, although the forces that determined this development have not been made clear. Nevertheless, this north/south division affected city politics from Reconstruction onward, as evidenced by the city politics of the Reconstruction and post-Reconstruction eras.[31]

During Reconstruction there had been black aldermen, but by the 1880's the 2nd and 4th wards (southeast and southwest respectively) were predominantly black--sending 5 aldermen to the board in 1883. This was clearly too much for the white political powers. The City asked for a ruling from the Attorney General's office of the state which prohibited these blacks from serving on the Board by reason of a conflict of interest--they were employed by the Federal Government. That these individuals were clerks, postmen or janitors--hardly in the position of making policy--was the basis for this exclusionary tactic.[32] After 1883, there were black aldermen but the number dwindled consistently until the 15 member board was once more white and Democratic.

The tendency of the city's political structure to be operated along party and racial lines was reflected in developments of city amenities. Parks, streets, and streetcar lines ran to the north, west and northeast of the town, with service to the downtown stopping at Cabarrus Street. The second and fourth wards in the south of town were avoided.[33]

Raleigh's particular problems with race which were generated by the growth of industrialization, the agricultural depression and resulting rural in-migration were congruent with those of the rest of the state. This is no better demonstrated than in the gubernatorial election of 1900 when the Democratic party swept to victory on the White Supremacy platform which included the passage of an amendment to the North Carolina Constitution that effectively disenfranchised blacks.[34] This legal reality cannot be viewed as the result of a single issue, however. It was based on complex fears and doubts bred in the changing society. As Raleigh itself shows, segregation was still neither so clear nor so decisive, for the town was still small, and blacks and whites lived beside each other. C. Vann Woodward quotes a northern journalist who, in 1880, remarked on "the proximity and confusion, so to speak, of negro and white houses ... /in southern cities/."[35] Black and white Raleigh were obvious neighbors on the periphery of Oakwood, and the city directory shows that the area around Moore Square, for example, was racially mixed. It is claimed that many people moved from there to Boylan Heights.[36] This specific migration, whether real or imagined, nevertheless is symbolic of what, in fact, appears to have happened--white migration to new suburbs. The circumstances which surround the development of these three neighborhoods demonstrate the diversity of forces which caused their evolution, as well as reflecting some of the policies associated with White Supremacy.

First, the development of the neighborhoods reveals that Raleigh was finally beginning to achieve a size associated with an urban center. The old fabric simply was not adequate for its needs. Single family dwellings on large lots had been traditional, and even when lots were subdivided to provide more building space the large number of boarding houses attests to the pressure of the population. As the Manufacturer's Record shows, two major themes were of unparalleled growth and an unparalleled need for housing in the South.[37]

Second, the impetus for a diversified economy, which is found both regionally and nationally, is reflected here in a shade particular to Raleigh. In contrast to single industry cities like Durham or Winston, the neighborhoods provided housing for the growing number of people employed by the traditional as well as the newer institutions of the city. Although there were mills, the housing associated with them was not what was required by educational, government or commercial workers.

Third, although the city directories do suggest that population movement was toward greater racial segregation, it also suggests class separation--a class separation based on the incipient social and economic institutions which had begun in the 1880s. This puts a complex interpretation on the information which suggests that the desires for wealth, position, image, as well as the simple pressures of growth were of significance in motivating the developers as well as the inhabitants of these suburbs.[38] This hypothesis is borne out by a number of related factors which affected the character of the neighborhoods.

First, the developers of these neighborhoods were men who politically, socially, familially or historically were connected with the factors which had already contributed to Raleigh's pre-1900 growth. Their businesses furnished capital, gas, electricity, water, sewer, streets and streetcar lines. These men would gain much by the systematic development of new neighborhoods which followed established patterns, and which provided for their employees, clients, or customers.[39]

For example, Major J. Stanhope Wynne, who served from 1909 to 1911, had also served on the Board of Aldermen almost continuously since the turn of the century. Wynne was an industrialist who founded the Raleigh Savings Bank in 1899. About the same time he joined with F. K. Ellington to form the Raleigh Real Estate and Trust Company. This company was the parent company of the Greater Raleigh Land Company that was chartered to develop Boylan Heights.

F. K. Ellington, its president, was a director of the Chamber of Commerce in this first decade, and president also of the Suburban Realty and Auction Company, noted for its success in land sales.[41]

James H. Pou, a lawyer, was president of the Glenwood Land Company and in 1905 also served on the board of the Raleigh Electric Company which became Carolina Power and Light in 1908. Also on that board was Albert Murray who was the Glenwood Land Company's Secretary/General Treasurer. Pou became General Counsel for CP and L in 1911.[42]

The Hunter-Parker Realty Company, which was responsible for the development of Cameron Park, had its resources in Greensboro. Hunter was deeply involved in the insurance industry and two Raleigh natives, Charles Gold and Joseph G. Brown, were instrumental in forming the Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Company from companies in Raleigh and Greensboro.[43] Hunter was probably not unfamiliar to the North Carolina Trust Company in Greensboro which financed the purchase of the Cameron land from its heirs.

Brown, who purchased land in Glenwood, was president of Citizens National Bank, a director of the Chamber of Commerce, was an alderman and vice president of Raleigh Savings Bank (Wynne's Bank) which merged with Citizens National Bank in 1910.[44]

The Andrews, Col. A.B. (Vice President of Southern Railway) and his son William, were both directors of the Raleigh Electric Company, and Col. Andrews was vice president of Citizens National Bank. F. H. Briggs, son of Thomas Briggs of Briggs and Dodd, was treasurer of the Wake Water Company in 1910 and served as treasurer of the Raleigh Electric Company in the same decade. Henry B. Litchford was cashier of Citizens National Bank, vice president of The Greater Raleigh Land Company and vice president of the Wake Water Company.[45]

From these few examples it can be seen that money and power were allied through personalities. Closely tied to the banking and mortgage industry (which made mortgages and, therefore, homeownership possible), these men controlled a market they felt they knew and a market--land--which tradition had determined to be secure. Sometimes working together, sometimes in competition, these people and their associates also controlled the resources necessary for growth--capital, water, sewer, electricity, gas, and transportation. They had interests in publishing and insurance. Their devotion to the well-being of the city was without question and their ambitions for the city viewed with pride. White, intelligent, responsible, these individuals knew each other, were sometimes related by historical or familial ties, and they asserted the power of the purse. The establishment of three new, white, successful, economically advantageous suburbs drew upon their knowledge and control of the resources of the city and of the image that their power created in the minds of the rising middle class. Tradition decreed that land and home ownership were symbols of success. Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park proffered that opportunity, an opportunity insured through its associations with established power.

The neighborhoods were able to take advantage of what already existed, and what was planned or could be successfully proposed. Therefore, it is not surprising that an examination of streetcar lines--either existing or proposed--shows that their routes were ones of close proximity to these new suburbs. Tracks ran down the center of Glenwood Avenue to the north side of town. The single track down Hillsborough Street to the A. & M. College was doubled in 1908. It was on the south border of Cameron Park and only two blocks from Boylan Heights.

All the new suburbs were also located between the downtown and important existing or planned amusement parks. Pullen Park was west of Boylan Heights and slightly to the west and south of Cameron Park which also had easy access to the fairgrounds, located then at the present site of the Raleigh Little Theater (see map). Bloomsbury, a park planned and developed by Carolina Power and Light Company, was to be at the end of the Glenwood Avenue streetcar line.[46]

Platted on land that was once the site of great plantations, the suburbs represented an economic system for maintaining wealth and power based on new patterns of landholding and tenancy. Some areas of these new neighborhoods were speculatively developed and all were controlled by covenants concerning the relative costs of houses to be built.[47] The density and spareness with which they were designed--in regard to lot size and interior park spaces--suggests that their development was planned to bring the highest possible return on the initial investment when the land was purchased.

At the same time, this planning reinforces one's sense of the changes being wrought by growth, industrialization, and urbanization. Families no longer needed large building lots; outbuildings were now much more limited in number because of utilities. People could literally confine all activity to a single dwelling and still have a yard and garden on a small plot, which is precisely what happened in Glenwood, Boylan Heights, and Cameron Park.

The architectural and social make-up of the neighborhoods supports the idea that they were developed for profit and for the emerging lower middle and middle classes whose need for security and status related directly to the complex, changing social and racial structure of the city and state.

The idea of suburbs, as it had emerged in America after 1850, and especially as propagated by Town and Davis, and by Olmstead and Vaux, was based on wealth, mobility and status as well as the desire to remove people from unpleasant urban life to a picturesque, sometimes romantic, rural-like setting. These amenities were achieved by controlled density, heavy planting, parks, walks, natural features of great beauty and an architecture commensurate with those features which emphasize the rustic, romantic and evocative.[48]

The brochure which proclaims the advantages of Cameron Park pictured something of the tradition of a rural, picturesque suburb, but the streets and service alleys are narrow, lots deep and narrow, facade setbacks shallow and park space limited. Boylan Heights is comparable and its layout impressive, but it is dense nevertheless. Glenwood, the earliest of this group, was platted with the smallest lots. Families frequently purchased more than one lot for their single home. There was no park at all.

On the other hand, all the neighborhoods had trees, water and sewer, electricity, graveled or sanded roads and sidewalks which gave easy access to public transportation and, therefore, the downtown and parks.[49]

These features represented modernization at its best. Fred Olds, a noted Raleigh newspaper columnist and secretary of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry for many years, greeted these suburbs with genuine enthusiasm. He praised the rapidity with which they were platted and sold and the public-spiritedness of the developers. And, as he said, these suburbs also permitted you to know who your neighbors might be.[50]

The people the neighborhoods attracted were, for the most part, not the wealthy old families from Blount, Hillsborough, or North East Streets, but the new--newly arrived or those newly ascended to the middle class.[51] They were from the growing service and support professions for the state, the educational institutions of the city and the growing commercial life which these fed. And they were white. The restrictive

Covenants included a provision against persons of Negro blood, not to be construed to deny servants access but to prevent permanent movement into the neighborhood by blacks.

One of the three neighborhoods, Cameron Park, was sold through a sophisticated public relations campaign and its advertisements touch every nerve of the upwardly socially mobile white American of the 1910s.[52] Words such as character, independence, self-respect, freedom and decency were designed to attract the "highest social types." We may be sure that no less than this was intended by the developers of Glenwood and Boylan Heights.

The developers were successful. The architecture of these neighborhoods creates a remarkable image. The high density produced by small lots creates an image comparable to that of Blount Street and Oakwood; the large houses, trees and sidewalks achieve a complex pattern of scale, changes in elevation and privacy which repeats qualities of Blount Street without its residential magnificence. The predominance of wood, of bungalows and vernacular classical and colonial revival houses reads as conservative, lower middle to middle class, upwardly socially mobile, substantial to modest and occasionally cheap.

There were no romantic extravagances, shingled masses or innovative vernacular designs. Raleigh's building supply firms furnished the frames, siding and roofing, the sashes, blinds, chimney pieces and doors. The neighborhoods present a conservative, tasteful, skilled and workman-like architecture which reflected its owners. The inhabitants of Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park lived as they believed Raleigh to be--a residential city of beauty and elegance, spaciousness and trees, and above all respectability, white respectability.

There were no milltown streets or shanty town rows within close proximity. The neighborhoods trailed off into the fields: Cameron Park in Cameron's Woods, Boylan Heights into the spacious lands and the branch bottom between it and the state asylum; Glenwood into the parkland of the Methodist Orphanage and with the Williamson Woods beyond. At their street boundaries, they merged imperceptibly with older, more impressive and established Raleigh. They encapsulated history by place names: Glenwood with Wills Forest, Devereux and Hinsdale Streets: Cameron Park with Benehan Street, for a Cameron progenitor; or by artifacts, like Montfort Hall in Boylan Heights. Tradition says that Cameron Park's irregular street pattern derived from original slave paths to cabins that dotted the woods when it was platted.[53] Again, whether the story is real or imagined, this story symbolizes the linkages and resonances with a not so distant past which formed the foundations of the future. The past, however, we now know to be romanticized: the reality was the changed relation between black and white and between the emerging class structure of a society that was finally becoming urbanized and industrialized.

In 1920, Raleigh extended its city limits again. For the first time in its history the city grew unevenly. The extension was to the north, northwest, and west and southwest, completely absorbing Glenwood, Cameron Park and Boylan Heights and several newer suburbs which followed their development.[54]

When the new Needham Broughton High School at the corner of St. Mary's and Peace Streets was opened in 1929, the children of Cameron Park and Glenwood were assigned there, but the Boylan Heights children were assigned to the older, Hugh Morson School downtown, in southeast Raleigh, an area that was changing into a more predominantly black neighborhood.[55] Although the schools were still segregated, the inhabitants of Boylan Heights began to move away, to the north and the west and Boylan Heights began its decline. The decline of the other two inner city neighborhoods would come somewhat later and more slowly with death, taxes, and the pressure on the inner city for more habitable space,a pressure exemplified in the building of three large apartment complexes near Cameron Park and Glenwood in 1938.[56] These too were designed for the middle class, a white middle class the city could not absorb quickly enough.

The expansion patterns initiated in the late 19th and early 20th century determined these locations and this determination has continued with unabated intensity to the present: suburban development has proceeded north and west, almost exclusively.

Today, one can speak of West Raleigh, South Raleigh, and North Raleigh with the fairly certain assurance that one knows both the race and class of the residents without indicating it overtly. To be sure, this is now changing, changing under the same kinds of pressures of economic growth, diversification, rural in-migration, urban out-migration, and industrialization that produced the original neighborhoods of the early 20th century; but the patterns that were established have yet to be completely overcome, if they ever will be.

This historic significance of the three neighborhoods: Glenwood, Cameron Park and Boylan Heights, lies both in what they document of the past--the broad patterns of culture they both explain and define--and in the impact of that development on the present. As man-made artifacts on the landscape, their architecture as well as their locations are testimony to the rise of the middle class with its inherent conservatism and its search for a place to belong: a place to belong in a changing world in which the city itself would change so rapidly as to be no longer a source for identity. The neighborhoods themselves would provide the identification and the status whether in a major metropolitan area or a small burgeoning southern city, a capital city of great hopes and potential.

FOOTNOTES

1. Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Raleigh: Epitome of the City's Growth and Progress and Industries (Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1907), pp. 8-10

2. Hugh T. Lefler and Albert R. Newsome, North Carolina, The History of a Southern State, 3rd ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1973), pp. 452-611; C. Vann Woodward, The Strange Career of Jim Crow, 3rd rev. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 11-49. Additional sources for the treatment of Reconstruction, racism and the politics of White Supremacy are Wilmoth Carter, The Urban Negro in the South, (New York: Vantage Press, 1962); Helen Edmonds, The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894-1901 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1951); Sarah M. Lemmon, "Raleigh--An Example of the 'New South?'" North Carolina Historical Review, XLIII (Summer, 1966), pp. 261-485; and Frenise A. Logan, The Negro in North Carolina, 1876-1894 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964. The absence of an adequate current history of Raleigh and Wake County has been mitigated by the generosity and helpfulness of Elizabeth Reid Murray, whose history of the county and city will be published in the near future. She confirms the basic historical framework for Raleigh which I have derived from general sources for North Carolina and from earlier publications on the city.

3. When the site was chosen for the City of Raleigh, it was platted by Senator William Christmas of Warren County. Resembling the Philadelphia Plan the city was laid out as a rectangle with the highest point, Union square, being reserved for the capitol. From the center of each side of the square, major streets proceeded to the cardinal points. In each of the four quadrants a square was reserved for the state. The squares, with the exception of Union which was approximately 6 acres, were approximately one acre each, as were most of the other blocks in the city. The city blocks were further divided into four building lots each. See map, Appendix A. For further discussion and sources see: McKelden Smith, "Capitol Area Historic District," National Register of Historic Places, Survey and Planning Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C. and Laws for the Governance of the City of Raleigh containing all Legislative Enactments Relative Thereto, and the Ordinances of the Board of Commissioners, Now in Force: From the First Act of Incorporation in 1854 (Raleigh, Seaton Gales: 1854).

4. Jack Zehmer and Sherry Ingram, "Capitol, Raleigh, North Carolina," National Register of Historic Places Property, Survey and Planning Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C.

5. Linda L. Harris and Mary Ann Lee, Raleigh Architectural Inventory (Raleigh: Raleigh City Planning Department and The Division of Archives and History, State of North Carolina, 1978).

6. Moses N. Amis, Historical Sketches of the City of Raleigh (Raleigh, Edwards & Broughton, 1887), p. 125.

7. For general discussion of the growth and consequent problems of the location of the archival collections accompanying the state bureaucracy see H.G. Jones, For History's Sake (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966). As to the growth of the numbers involved in state bureaucracy in Raleigh the major work done in this line has been by Jerry Cross, Research Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina, who has documented the physical growth, i.e., movement of offices from the capitol, purchase of land and building of new buildings or the purchase of existing ones and their conversion. He agrees that the growth of state government in Raleigh is a major factor in the city's growth but agrees that adequate documentation has yet to be done. Telephone interview with Cross, September 1980.

8. Fred Olds, Annual Report of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1910), p. 8. While it is true that the reports of the Chamber of Commerce are skewed (i.e. to promote Raleigh in its best light) what is important is that this is what they believed made a difference in the growth of the town. Statistics and additional data might prove otherwise but at this point Olds' ideas and assertions constitute appropriate information for understanding how the citizens of the city perceived the city.

9. Amis, Historical Sketches, 1887, pp. 67-68.

10. Minutes of the Board of Aldermen, City of Raleigh, October 1881, proposal for Water works; December, 1881, begin discussion with Bell Company for telephone wires and poles; August, 1883, postal service discussion begins. Electrification is discussed periodically throughout the year but especially October, 1886. Wake County, Raleigh Municipal Records, Division of Archives, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina. See also, Jack Riley, Carolina Power and Light Company: A Corporate Biography, 1908-1958 (Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1958), pp. 15-21

11. Amis, Historical Sketches, 1887, p. 68; Riley, Carolina Power and Light, pp. 15-25.

12. Harris and Lee, Raleigh Architectural Inventory, entry for each institution. Olds, Annual Report, 1910, concludes that their presence has been significant for Raleigh's growth, see especially p. 8.

13. Harris and Lee, Raleigh Architectural Inventory, pp. 36, 150.

14. Chamber of Commerce, Epitome, p. 5; Olds, Annual Report, 1910, pp 3, 8. 10.

15. Amis, Historical Sketches, 1887, pp. 111, 125, 127, 128. For further information on Briggs and Dodd see: Ruth Little-Stokes, Oakwood Historic District, National Register of Historic Places, Survey and Planning Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina. The North Carolina Car Company and similar building supply houses will also be treated in Carl Lounsbury's dissertation on 19th century building technology in North Carolina, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., to be completed, 1982. Mr. Lounsbury was good enough to share information with me.

16. Principal antebellum newspapers in Raleigh were: Minerva, 1799-1821; Raleigh Register, 1799-1868; Star, 1808-1856; Standard, 1834-1870; Constitutional and States Rights Advocate, 1831-1833; Microcosm, 1838-1848; State Journal, 1860-1864; Spirit of the Age, 1851-1865; Southern Weekly Post, 1850-1855; plus the Biblical Recorder and numerous denominational papers. I am indebted to Elizabeth Reid Murray who generously supplied this list.

17. Olds, Annual Report, 1910, p. 9.

18. Telephone interview with Jerry Cross, September 1980.

19. Charles Emerson & Co., Raleigh Directory 1880-81 (Raleigh: Edwards & Broughton, 1879); Branson's North Carolina Almanac and Directory of Raleigh, 1891 (Raleigh: L. Branson, 1891); Maloney's Raleigh, N.C. City Directory, 1889-1900 (Atlanta: The Maloney Directory Co. 1899). The difficulty with using city directories to measure change and growth is that unless the publishers are kind enough to be consistent about categories they can be misleading. Nevertheless, the following tabulations are interesting:

Trade or Profession	1880	1890	1900	
Attorneys, ind, or firms	30	57	42	
Architects	0	2	4	
Banks	3	4	7	
Boarding Houses	7	38	38	
Cotton Comm. Merchants and Cotton Factories	26	10	5	
Dry Goods	14	24	57	(includes boots & shoes)
Groceries & Provisions	63	40	100	(approximately)
Insurance Agents	6	31	36	
Publishers	NL	8	10	

In 1890, Branson listed 86 individuals as employed by printers. The other two directories offer nothing immediately comparable.

20. Chamber of Commerce, Epitome, p. 20, gives a brief description of the mills in operation, their value and the number of employees each has. The number is small (6) compared with the other business and industries the C. of C. touts.

21. This idea has been a source of constant discussion between Elizabeth R. Murray, the other consulting historians and me. This is based on our reading of the documents and what is not really there: i.e., a huge push to attract new industry. For example, there seems to have been a serious attempt to make Raleigh a cotton market in the 1870s and 1880s, but it just never came off; partly because of the agricultural depression in the early 1890s. But a feeling persists that major industry was just not sought. See also my Statement of Historic Significance, Proposed Glenwood Historic District.

22. David Black, Report for National Register of Historic Places Nomination for Blount Street Historic District, Survey and Planning Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina.

23. Ruth Little-Stokes, "Oakwood Historic District," National Register of Historic Places, Survey and Planning Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N. C.

24. Harris and Lee, Raleigh Architectural Inventory, pp. 59, 62.

25. The transformation of the American cityscape by commercial development in the last decades of the 19th and the first of the 20th century is treated generally in Leland M. Roth, A Concise History of American Architecture (New York: Harper and Row, 1980); Vicent Scully, American Architecture and Urbanism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967); and Carl Condit, The Chicago School of Architecture (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), and in my course in the history of American architecture which I taught for five semesters at Duke University.

26. Lefler and Newsome, North Carolina, pp. 492-563; Edmonds, Fusion Politics treats the issues in more detail than the discussion in Lefler and Newsome.

27. See Bird's Eye View Map of Raleigh, 1872, and W. A. Shaffer's map, 1887.

28. Harris and Lee, Raleigh Architectural Inventory, p. 78.

29. City Council Minutes, February to November, 1885.

30. Harris and Lee, Raleigh Architectural Inventory, pp. 163-171.

31. Interview with Karl Larsen who is preparing a Master's Thesis on Blacks in Raleigh following Reconstruction, January 1981.

32. City Council Minutes, May-June 1883.

33. Chamber of Commerce, Epitome, p. 6, notes efforts to extend street railway south, but it was never accomplished. See also, Riley, Carolina Power and Light, pp. 15-25.

34. I am grateful to Dr. Jerry Cashion of the Research Branch who supplied this neat summary of the election of 1900. See also, Edmonds, Fusion Politics.

35. C. Vann Woodward, Jim Crow, p. 32.

36. Interviews with residents of Boylan Heights, William Bushong, Summer 1980. See proposed Boylan Heights District nomination.

37. The Manufacturers' Record, published in Baltimore is an incredible source for a variety of kinds of information about this period. In many ways it was a booster publication for the South, but it also recorded much that was built. The following articles on North Carolina cities gives some flavor of the nature of the information: (F.B. Arendell), "The City of Raleigh, N.C.," MR, XXI (July 22, 1892) p. 27. "Durham, The Queen City of the Golden Belt of North Carolina," MR, XVIII (Nov. 15, 1890), p. 9; (B.S.P.), "Greensboro," MR, XI (Jan. 19, 1887), p. 44.

38. See Proposed District Nominations for Glenwood, Boylan Heights and Cameron Park for discussion of individual selling campaigns.

39. See individual nominations cited above.

40. Grady L.E. Carroll, They Lived in Raleigh: Some Leading Personalities from 1792 to 1892 (Raleigh: Southeastern Copy Center, 1977), p.65.

41. Raleigh Illustrated, 1910 (Raleigh: Edwards & Broughton, 1910), p. 21.

42. Interview with Mrs. Virginia Pou Doughton, December 1980.

43. See proposed District Nomination for Cameron Park.

44. Raleigh Illustrated, 1910, Gold, p. 8; Brown, pp. 8, 21, 36.

45. Raleigh Illustrated, 1910, Andrews, p. 36; Briggs, p. 18; Litchford, pp. 18, 36.

46. Riley, Carolina Power and Light, p. 70.

47. This conclusion is based on the following information: first, initial sales of land in the three neighborhoods to either a single individual or a realty company, for example, 45 lots to Daniel Allen on the periphery of Boylan Heights (see Proposed District Nomination for Boylan Heights, abstracts of deeds filed with nomination); second, the presence of rental property in these neighborhoods which is attested to by advertisements; three, the building of identical, small, cheap houses on the periphery of the suburbs and their location side by each. For a discussion of this see Thematic Description and descriptions of individual neighborhoods filed with this nomination.

48. John Reps, The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), pp. 339 ff. Reps is the standard text for a survey of this period. This is supplemented and supported by the references listed in Footnote 25, above, and by the study of primary documents like Downing's Cottage Residences and essays by Frederick L. Olmsted on the suburbs, parks and city spaces he helped to plan. (See S.B. Sutton, Civilizing American Cities, A Selection of FLO Writings on City Landscapes, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971), see especially River Forest, Illinois proposal).

49. Chamber of Commerce, Epitome, p. 15; Olds, Annual Report, 1910, p. 5. See also individual Proposed District Nominations.

50. Fred Olds, "Glenwood Sales," News and Observer, June 5, June 8, 1908.

51. It is interesting to contrast the way in which the three neighborhoods were "sold." Extensive newspaper research revealed only one advertisement for Glenwood (Special Edition, News and Observer, June 7, 1907) and no advertisements for Boylan Heights. The reverse was true for Cameron Park, the sale of which is treated extensively in the individual Proposed District Nomination.

52. See Proposed District Nomination, Cameron Park.

53. Elizabeth R. Murray related this notion to me. We both wonder if, in fact, the paths were not to Oberlin, the black community on the northwest corner of the Cameron property which developed after the Civil War.

54. Harris and Lee, Raleigh Architectural Inventory, pp. 14-15; pp. 183-197.

55. See proposed District Nominations for Boylan Heights and Glenwood.

56. Interview with A. C. Hall, Director of City Planning, City of Raleigh (now retired), March 1981.

9. Major Bibliographical References

See continuation sheet.

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of nominated property _____

Quadrangle name _____ **Quadrangle scale** _____

UTM References See individual districts

	Zone	Easting	Northing		Zone	Easting	Northing
A				B			
C				D			
E				F			
G				H			

Verbal boundary description and justification

See individual districts and maps

List all states and counties for properties overlapping state or county boundaries

state	N/A	**code**	**county**	N/A	**code**
state		**code**	**county**		**code**

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Dr. Charlotte V. Brown, consultant

organization City of Raleigh **date** July 8, 1982

street & number Mimosa Place **telephone**

city or town Raleigh **state** North Carolina

12. State Historic Preservation Officer Certification

The evaluated significance of this property within the state is:

___ national ___ state X ___ local

As the designated State Historic Preservation Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the National Park Service.

State Historic Preservation Officer signature William S. Price, Jr.

title State Historic Preservation Officer **date** July 8, 1982

For NPS use only

I hereby certify that this property is included in the National Register

Carol D. Shull **date** 7-29-85

Keeper of the National Register

Attest: See Continuation Sheet for other Designations **date**

Chief of Registration

BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS

Amis, Moses N. Historical Sketches of the City of Raleigh. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1887.

Black, David. Report for National Register of Historic Places Nomination for "Blount Street Historic District," Survey and Planning Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C.

Branson, Levi. Branson's North Carolina Almanac and Directory of Raleigh, 1891. Raleigh: L. Branson, 1891.

Carroll, Grady L. E. They Lived in Raleigh: Some Leading Personalities from 1792 to 1892. Raleigh: Southeastern Copy Center, 1977.

Carter, Wilmoth. The Urban Negro in the South. New York: Vantage Press, 1962.

Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Raleigh: Epitome of the City's Growth and Progress and Industries. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1907.

Condit, Carl. The Chicago School of Architecture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Edmonds, Helen. The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894-1901. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1951.

Emerson, Charles and Co. Raleigh Directory 1880-81. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1879.

Harris, Linda L. and Mary Ann Lee. Raleigh Architectural Inventory. Raleigh: Raleigh City Planning Department and the Division of Archives and History, State of North Carolina, 1978.

Jones, H.G. For History's Sake. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966.

Laws for the Governance of the City of Raleigh containing all Legislative Enactments Relative Thereto, and the Ordinances of the Board of Commissioners, Now in Force: From the First Act of Incorporation to 1854. Raleigh: Seaton Gales, 1854.

Lefler, Hugh T. and Albert R. Newsome. North Carolina, The History of a Southern State, 3rd ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1973.

Lemmon, Sarah M. "Raleigh--An Example of the 'New South?'" North Carolina Historical Review, XLIII (Summer, 1966), pp. 261-285.

Little-Stokes, Ruth. "Oakwood Historic District," National Register of Historic Properties, Survey and Planning Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C.

Logan, Frenise A. The Negro in North Carolina, 1876-1894. Chapel Hill:University of North Carolina Press, 1964.

Maloney Directory Co. Maloney's Raleigh, N.C., City Directory, 1899-1900. Atlanta: The Maloney Directory Co., 1988.

Olds, Fred. Annual Report of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1910.

Raleigh Illustrated. 1910. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1910

Reps, John. The Making of Urban America: A History of City Planning in the United States. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Riley, Jack. Carolina Power and Light Company: A Corporate Biography, 1908-1958. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1958.

Roth, Leland M. A Concise History of American Architecture. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

Scully, Vincent. American Architecture and Urbanism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

Smith, McKelden. "Capitol Area Historic District," National Register of Historic Places, Survey and Planning Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C.

Sutton, S. B. Civilizing American Cities: A Selection of FLO Writings on City Landscapes. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971.

Woodward, C. Vann. The Strange Career of Jim Crow, 3rd. rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Zehmer, Jack, and Sherry Ingram. "Capitol, Raleigh, North Carolina," National Register of Historic Places Property, Survey and Planning Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Raleigh, City of. Minutes of the Board of Aldermen,/Municipal 1880-1886 Records, Wake County, Raleigh. Division of Archives, Department of Cultural Resources, State of N.C. Raleigh, N.C.

INTERVIEWS

Interview with Jerry Cross, Research Branch, Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources, State of N.C., September 1980.

Interview with Mrs. Virginia Pou Doughton, December 1980.

Interview with A.C. Hall, Director of City Planning, City of Raleigh, retired. March 1981.

Interview with Karl Larsen, January 1981.

PERIODICALS

"Glenwood, Beautiful Glenwood," News and Observer, Special Edition, June 7, 1907, p. 44.

Manufacturer's Record. "The City of Raleigh, N.C. XXI (July 22, 1892) 27; "Durham, The Queen City of the Golden Belt of N.C." XVIII (Nov. 15, 1890) 9; "Greensboro," XI (Jan. 19, 1887) 44.

Olds, Fred. "Glenwood Sales," News and Observer, June 5, June 8, 1908.

NPS Form 10-900-a
(3-82)

OMB No. 1024-0018
Exp. 10-31-84

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only
received MAR 27 1985
date entered

Continuation sheet | Item number | Page

Multiple Resource Area
Thematic Group

dnr-11

Name Early Twentieth Century Raleigh Neighborhoods Thematic Resourses
State NORTH CAROLINA

Cover Carol D Shull 7-29-85
A Schlagel 7/29/85

Nomination. Type of Review			Date Signatured
1. Glenwood		Keeper	Carol D Shull 7-29-85
		Attest	A Schlagel 7/29/85
2. Cameron Park		Keeper	Carol D. Shull 7-29-85
		Attest	A Schlagel 7/29/85
3. Boylan Heights	Substantive Review	Keeper	Carol D Shull 7-29-85
		Attest	A Schlagel 7/29/85
4.		Keeper	
		Attest	
5.		Keeper	
		Attest	
6.		Keeper	
		Attest	
7.		Keeper	
		Attest	
8.		Keeper	
		Attest	
9.		Keeper	
		Attest	
10.		Keeper	
		Attest	