## 1. Name of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic name</th>
<th>The Anderson Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other names/site number</td>
<td>DO 09:0122-042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street &amp; number</th>
<th>701 S 24th St; 2243 Jones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City or town</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip code</td>
<td>68102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this [ ] nomination [ ] request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property [ ] meets [ ] does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant [ ] nationally [ ] statewide [ ] locally. ([ ] See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

/S/ Michael J. Smith                                      October 2, 2009
Director, Nebraska State Historical Society
State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property [ ] meets [ ] does not meet the National Register criteria. ([ ] See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official                        Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

## 4. National Park Service Certification

I, hereby, certify that this property is:

[ ] entered in the National Register.
[ ] see continuation sheet.

[ ] determined eligible for the National Register.
[ ] see continuation sheet.

[ ] determined not eligible for the National Register.

[ ] removed from the National Register.

[ ] other, (explain):

Signature of Keeper                        Date of Action
### 5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Private</td>
<td>X Building(s)</td>
<td>Contributions: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Public-local</td>
<td>__ District</td>
<td>Noncontributing: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Public-state</td>
<td>__ Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ Public-federal</td>
<td>__ Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ Object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total**: 1
- **Noncontributing**: 0

**Name of related multiple property listing**: Apartments, Flats and Tenements in Omaha, Nebraska from 1880-1962

**Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register**: 0

### 6. Function or Use

**Historic Functions**:
- DOMESTIC: Multiple Dwelling
- COMMERCE/TRADE: Business
- COMMERCE/TRADE: Specialty Store

**Current Functions**:
- DOMESTIC: Multiple Dwelling
- COMMERCE/TRADE: Business
- COMMERCE/TRADE: Specialty Store

### 7. Description

**Architectural Classification**: LATE 19th and EARLY 20th CENTURY AMERICAN MOVEMENTS: Sullivanesque

**Materials**
- Foundation: Brick
- Walls: Brick
- Roof: Synthetic
- Other: Terra-Cotta Detailing

**Narrative Description**: (Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)
### 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.)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Property has yielded, or is likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria Considerations**  
(Mark "X" in all the boxes that apply.)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Removed from its original location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A birthplace or a grave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A cemetery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A reconstructed building, object, or structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A commemorative property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Statement of Significance**  
(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

### 9. Major Bibliographical References

#### Bibliography
(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- Preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- Previously listed in the National Register
- Previously determined eligible by the National Register
- Designated a National Historic Landmark
- Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey
- Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record

#### Primary location for additional data:

- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State agency
- Federal agency
- Local Government
- University
- Other

Name of repository: Omaha Public Library
10. Geographical Data

Acreage of property  Less than one acre

UTM References (place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>253139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4570812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbal Boundary Description
(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification
(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title  Jennifer Honebrink, AIA, LEED AP
organization  Alley Poyner Macchietto Architecture P.C.
date  July 2009
street & number  1516 Cuming Street
telephone  (402) 341-1544
state  Nebraska
zip code  68102

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps
A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property’s location.
A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs
Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional items
(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items.)

Property Owner

(Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

name/title  Kneisel Enterprises, LLC.
street & number  P.O. Box 540818
telephone  (402) 680-1661
state  Nebraska
zip code  68154-0818

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:  This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determined eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings.  Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, (15 USC 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement:  Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form.  Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.
SUMMARY
The Anderson Building is a mixed-use three-story brick and terra-cotta Sullivanesque building located among other two to three story multiple bay/multiple lot commercial and apartment buildings on the Southwest fringe of downtown Omaha. It fills the square shaped property completely at the basement and first floors and changes to a “U” shaped plan on the second and third floors, with the open end of the “U” facing the rear (South side) of the property. The building includes two primary facades that reflect its multiple functions. A commercial façade containing 5-store fronts aligns with South 24th Street on the west, and a residential façade offers access to the apartments from Jones Street to the north.¹

This apartment building meets the criteria outlined for the Commercial Apartment building type as described in the Multiple Property Document (MPD) “Apartments, Flats and Tenements in Omaha, Nebraska from 1880-1962.” It was constructed in Omaha in 1924, is three stories in height, contains 30 apartments, five commercial bays and fills the entire lot.

Structural System
The Anderson Building is constructed of concrete columns and footings, which support a concrete pan joist system.

Exterior
The Anderson Building is distinctive for its well-executed rendition of the second stage of Sullivanesque style architecture - both in planning and in façade composition.

The 24th Street Commercial façade is a long rectangle with more emphasis on the center fifth of the façade than the flanking wings. It is finished in a combination of red brick and cream-colored terra cotta. Additionally, the brick joints are raked horizontally and flush-struck vertically. On the first floor, it is broken into five storefronts with brick piers between each storefront. Each storefront contains its original painted steel display window system, which sits on a terra cotta knee wall, as well as a recessed entry door, a projecting cover for a retractable awning and a prism glass transom window system. The top of the knee walls step down and the size of the transoms grow larger towards the South as the grade steps down. The entrance doors are adjacent to each other in the outer bays and centered in the middle bay. Furthermore, each storefront has at its head a terra cotta lintel with Sullivanesque scroll lugs at each end.

On the upper floors, the 24th Street Commercial façade is completely symmetrical. The brick pilasters extend up through the upper floors and become implied as they blend with the flush face of the adjacent brick masonry. Between the piers in the outer bays are two sets of wooden six-over-one double-hung windows. The window pairs are slightly inset from the main body of the building and tied together between floors with a plain brick spandrel panel. Additionally, these windows are grouped at the second floor by continuous terra cotta sills with square Sullivanesque lugs and at the third floor by a decorative Sullivanesque terra cotta square at the top of the dividing vertical mullion. The center bay contains four evenly spaced wooden six-over-one double-hung windows at the second and third floors. These windows are inset further into the main body of the building than those in flanking bays. At the second floor level, all four are tied together by a continuous terra cotta sill with square Sullivanesque lugs. The outer vertical mullions in this window group are slightly wider than

¹ See Figures 2 and 3 in Section 10.
the mullion between the second and third windows. The two larger mullions are capped by large, elaborate Sullivanesque capitals, while the smaller center mullion is capped by the same decorative Sullivanesque terra cotta square found between the other second story windows. Linear terra cotta accents span across the center of the wall surface over the windows in bays one and two, and three and four, ending in decorative Sullivanesque pieces. The top of the parapet is capped by a simple terra cotta coping which steps up and around a Sullivanesque medallion and flanking finials in the center of the façade; a distinctive second stage Sullivanesque detail. The weight of these centralized elements and the symmetry of the remaining ornamentation, especially on the upper floors, creates a strong and balanced composition that effectively follows the models illustrated in the Midland Terra Cotta Company catalogue.

The Residential Jones Street façade is a long rectangle, divided into almost even thirds, the center of which is slightly taller and narrower than the longer, matching, flanking wings. It is also finished in a combination of red brick and cream-colored terra cotta. The brick joints are raked horizontally and flush-struck vertically. At the first floor of the flanking wings, the windows are wooden six-over-six double-hung units evenly spaced across the façade with terra cotta sills. Centered in the wall above each window is a terra cotta accent band the width of the window with Sullivanesque detailing. Above this on the second and third floors are wooden six-over-six double-hung window units grouped in an A, B, B, A pattern, where A is three windows over 3 windows and B is a single window over a single window. Each group is accented in a manner similar to that employed on the Commercial façade. Like-wise linear terra cotta accents span across the center of the wall surface over the windows in each wing, ending in decorative Sullivanesque pieces. The top of the parapet in these areas is capped with a simple terra cotta coping. The center third of this façade is noticeably recessed from the wings and sports additional decorative terra cotta elements to emphasize the entrance location. At this center bay, the window pattern changes on all three floors to C, B, D, B, C, where C is a pair of windows and D is a set of three windows in which the outer two windows are one-fourth the width of the center window. Additionally the proportions of the D window change to accommodate the interior stair behind them adding interest to the center element. The apartment entrance is further emphasized by a projecting portico, crowned with a medallion and finials that break the parapet line in a classic second stage Sullivanesque design. This same feature is echoed at the top of this portion of this façade.

The Alley/Rear (South) façade looks like a “U” in elevation, with the first floor continuous across the bottom and the ends of the second and third floors at either end. It is finished in red brick with tan brick windowsills. There are no decorative terra cotta elements on this façade. At the first floor level, openings are punched as necessary to accommodate windows for the commercial and common spaces, including a modern steel paneled garage door for the garage bay under the center of the building and a modern steel pedestrian door for the covered exit stairs to the roof of the first floor at the interior of the “U”. Windows into the utility spaces are one-over-one double-hung steel units, while the remaining windows are one-over-one wooden double-hung units. At the upper floors, windows are arranged in groups of two and three one-over-one wooden double-hung units. The parapet is capped by a red terra cotta coping.

The East façade and the inner face of the “U” on the upper floors are very utilitarian in comparison to the primary façades. They are finished in a combination of red brick and exposed concrete structure where the exposed structure is painted to match the brick. Windows are punched into the façades singly or in groups according to which best suits the needs of the apartment on the interior.
The interior of The Anderson Building is thoughtfully designed with an eye toward function. Although the building first appears to be symmetrical, closer examination reveals that modifications were made to accommodate various programmatic needs. Overall, the symmetry of the North façade hides the fact that the East side protrudes six inches more than the West side. Additionally, the East leg of the “U” is narrower on Floors 2 and 3 than the West leg of the “U”. This was likely done to leave room for a light well in the event that an equally substantial building was constructed on the lot to the East.

In the basement, along the West side of the building, each commercial tenant bay has a basement storage area equal in size to their space above. Individual stairs in the rear of each tenant space connect the two spaces. Restrooms for each commercial tenant are provided in the rear of the first floor space or in the basement. Delivery access was originally provided through a sidewalk stair in the center of the commercial façade. This has been blocked off, but the common hallway across the front of the west side that it led to is still intact. Centered in the building, a coal room accessed from the alley leads to the boiler room, which backs up to a crawl space. Adjacent to this, a hallway connects a janitor’s apartment, common laundry room, storage spaces and another crawl space that line the East side of the building. Finishes throughout the basement typically consist of raw concrete floors, painted block walls and painted, exposed concrete ceilings.

On the first floor, the West half of the building is taken by five commercial tenant bays; each running east to west with main entrances on the West façade. All of the bays are finished in original materials; terrazzo floors, plaster walls and flat plaster ceilings. The Southern bay contains two original offices as well as a safe and built-in cabinets. The Northern bay contains a modern vestibule and office/ storage space. In the center of the building, behind four of these bays is a garage bay with access off the alley to the South. To the North of this is the apartment entrance and main staircase. From this point, an “L” shaped hallway connects the apartments on this floor to the entrance and to a stair at the South end that leads both down to the basement and up to the roof deck in the center of the “U” shaped plan.

The second and third floors are “U” shaped and surround a lowered roof area with a sealed wooden roof deck. Exposed concrete stairs with pipe metal rails at the East and West legs of the “U” connect the upper floors to the roof deck. Centered at the south end of the roof deck is an exposed concrete fire exit stair with corrugated green plastic canopy that leads to the alley. On the interior, a double-loaded “U” shaped corridor is not quite centered in the “U” shaped plan of the floor. It connects the main stair to the stairs mentioned previously and all of the apartments that line both sides of the hallway. The stair and hallway floor were originally finished in terrazzo. At an unknown date however, the center of the hallway floor was cut out to receive the rubber flooring which now exists. The original plaster walls and ceilings are still intact. The transom windows between the apartments and hallway however, have been sealed off and painted. The outer apartments are deeper, while the inner apartments are shallower and longer, wrapping around the interior corners of the “U”. Apartment plans vary depending on their location within the building, but each typically contains a kitchen, dining room, living room, bedroom and bathroom. Most spaces have modern floor finishes including vinyl in the kitchen and dining room, as well as carpet in the living and bedrooms, although tile in most bathrooms is original. Walls and ceilings are generally finished in original plaster with simple, painted original wood trim around doors and windows.
The Anderson Building

Name of Property

Douglas County, Nebraska

County and State

Alterations
The building has received no alterations, additions, disturbances, or other changes that affect the property's representation of its property type. All alterations have been minimal in scope. In the basement, the original laundry room has been built-out into an apartment unit for a live-in custodian, and the original locker room has been converted to a laundry room and several storage rooms. The commercial spaces are generally intact, with minor modifications to the interior side of the display windows and a small length of demising wall reconstruction due to water damage. The Northernmost bay has received the only significant alteration, with the creation of a vestibule on the interior approximately 10' into the building, as well as an office raised over a storage room in the front of the space. In the public spaces of the apartments, the transoms have been sealed shut and painted over, the light fixtures have been replaced with modern light fixtures and the center of the terrazzo corridor floor has been removed and replaced with rubber flooring. Minor alterations have taken place within several apartment units as well. The most significant was the conversion of one apartment unit into two on floors 1-3. The remaining alterations were very minor, such as the removal of the wall between the dining room and the living room and new carpet in the living rooms; however, the general layout and finishes remain true to the original.

Integrity
The Anderson Building has maintained all seven aspects of integrity; including design, location, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The building was beautifully designed in the Sullivanesque style. It has not been moved and continues to be surrounded by a low-rise, mixed-use neighborhood, similar to its surroundings when it was constructed. Most of the buildings along Jones Street continue to be residential in nature and most of the buildings along South 24th Street and near-by Leavenworth have remained commercial structures. The excellent workmanship and quality materials used on this building have guaranteed its endurance against weathering and deterioration, and most materials are in good condition. Furthermore, the continuous occupancy of the building has protected it from vandals and vagrants. Overall, the building still conveys the feeling and association of a typical Omaha Commercial Apartment building of the 1920s and would be recognizable to a contemporary if he were to see the building today.

Future Plans
The apartments of the building are currently occupied and the commercial spaces are now empty. The owners are presently studying the feasibility of upgrading the mechanical system for the entire building.
SUMMARY
The Anderson Building is significant under two criteria as outlined in the MPD “Apartments, Flats and Tenements in Omaha, Nebraska from 1880-1962.” First, it is locally significant under Criterion A5 in the area of Community Planning and Development, “buildings that reflect changes in the form of the building type” as a representative of the Commercial Apartment building type. The Anderson Building represents the only type of apartment building that developed here in Omaha as a response to the need for commercial as well as housing space. All other apartment building types were completely residential in nature. Furthermore, the Anderson Building was constructed in 1924, during one of Omaha’s apartment building boom periods when such Commercial Apartment buildings were most commonly constructed.

Secondly, The Anderson Building is significant in the area of Architecture at the local level under Criterion C2 “buildings that illustrate significant expressions of architectural styles” as a well-executed example of Sullivanesque architecture. Typical of most buildings on the National Register, the building is significant in the year it was constructed, 1924. In this case, the year coincides with the year of Sullivan’s death when many architects designed a building in the Sullivanesque style as a tribute to his work.

The Commercial Apartment Building
The MPD “Apartments, Flats and Tenements in Omaha, Nebraska from 1880-1962,” collectively refers to apartments, flats and tenements as “Apartments”. Together, these buildings are defined as those constructed with the intention of being rental multi-family dwellings which are divided into self-sufficient units (with private kitchens and baths) by party walls. The dwelling units are difficult to separate and they commonly exist above and below each other. As demonstrated in the physical description, the Anderson Building fits the criteria of the related property type “Commercial Apartment” as outlined in the above-referenced MPD. This building type accounts for just 9% of all apartment, flat and tenement building types ever constructed in Omaha. With only 3% standing today, representatives of this building type are a rarity in Omaha.

The above definition of rental multi-family dwellings (Apartments with a capital “A”) is generally considered a broad classification. In contrast, when the general public thinks of apartment buildings, most do not include tenements and flats. They think more in terms of one of four types of buildings: High Rise, Garden, Low-rise and Commercial apartments. With-in these four types, Commercial Apartment buildings account for 46% of all apartment building types constructed in Omaha, making it a significant expression of multiple family housing in the minds of the general public.2

The impact of commercial apartment buildings on community development in Omaha was noticeable. Of the Low-rise, High-rise, Garden and Commercial building types commonly thought of by the general public as apartment buildings, Commercial Apartment buildings were the most visible. Commonly located on major streets within Omaha, they became part of the social memory of our neighborhoods even for those who never stepped foot in them. Moreover, of all the apartment types, the commercial aspect of these buildings meant that more than those who lived there experienced these types of buildings.

2 See Pie Chart, Figure 2, Section 10, Page 12.
Going one step further than many Commercial Apartment buildings, the Anderson Building takes full advantage of its corner location providing two primary facades and by separating the type of access considered most appropriate for each use. Most noticeably, it provides five storefront bays on one of Omaha’s major streets, South 24th Street, which has provided a strong connection between downtown Omaha and South Omaha since its annexation in 1915. This connection gives the building visibility in an area that is often traveled by those who live in other parts of Omaha as well as those who live and work in the neighborhood. Also in the second decade of the twentieth century, Jones Street developed into a dense residential neighborhood with the development of Drake Court and the Drake Court Annex. The Anderson Building continues this trend with its residential primary facade on this street, where it flanked the entrance to the residential street and provided a highly tactile and memorable façade. Thus, with both primary facades, the Anderson Building has embedded itself into the social memory of the development of this neighborhood.

Additionally, the Anderson Building fits many of the community development characteristics described in “Early Apartments in Omaha, 1880-1930,” in the related MPD. It was constructed in 1924 during a peak era of construction in downtown Omaha as well as one of Omaha’s apartment building booms. It also fills the entire lot on the lower floors to provide enough space for its commercial uses and some common amenities for the building tenants. Thus, as the Omaha community developed, the architect and owner of the Anderson Building recognized these common planning practices as beneficial and designed the building to take advantage of them.

Unfortunately for many Commercial Apartment Buildings, their location along major thoroughfares has likely been the cause of their decline as Commercial Apartment buildings were sold and replaced with new buildings constructed for other purposes. As Omaha developed, compared to the other three building types most commonly considered apartments, these have the smallest percentage of buildings remaining. The Anderson Building however, stands as a high-quality representative of the Commercial Apartment building type of Omaha during one of its flourishing periods.

The Sullivanesque
The Anderson Building is also being listed in the area of architecture under Criterion C2 “buildings that illustrate significant expressions of architectural styles” as described in the MPD “Apartments, Flats and Tenements in Omaha, Nebraska from 1880-1962” as a wonderful local level example of the Sullivanesque style of architecture. Divided into two stages, the first stage of the Sullivanesque style was dominated by the skyscraper work of Sullivan himself and lasted from 1895-1910. The second stage was a relatively minor movement lasting from approximately 1910-1930 and reflected the smaller work of Sullivan in his final years. The Sullivanesque style was unique during its time as it was the first originally American architectural style. During its second stage it remained comparatively obscure within the overall period of design eclecticism dominated by revival styles (1880-1940).

The Sullivanesque style of architecture derived from the buildings and writings of architect Louis H. Sullivan. It was he who first said that “form follows function” but in his prose, his true intent was lost. His design precepts were much more complex than a few simple words could convey. In the end, only his closest associates, including William Gray Purcell, George Elmslie, and Frank Lloyd Wright, ever really understood the fundamental concepts behind his designs. These men went on to establish the Chicago School and Prairie Style; each unique schools of thought in their own right that overshadowed Sullivan, but which were tied to Sullivan’s foundations by a similar approach to thinking about architecture.

Since his death, scholars have been able to review Sullivan’s written and built works and interpret his basic principals into language more easily understood by the average architect. To Sullivan “form follows function” was more than creating a building that reflected its use and expressed the structural nature of the building — it also enhanced these qualities, clarifying them and giving them human meaning. Furthermore, in order for buildings to have meaning that humans could understand, ornament was a fundamental part of the building’s design. As interpreted by Hugh Morrison,

“Ornament was the most subtle and gracious aspect of expression; after the basic form of the building had made itself expressive, the creative impulse was carried on into the ornament. It was organic, growing out of the mass rather than applied to it, expressing the nature of the material, and partaking of the fundamental rhythms of the building itself. But it appeared, not as something merely receiving the spirit of the structure, but as a thing expressing that spirit by virtue of differential growth... Buildings possessed as marked an individually as that which exists among men.”

In Sullivan’s best works, buildings were able to create a form that reflected the use of the building and incorporate ornament in such an integral way that it strengthened the design and gave the building scale and meaning at both a civic and humanistic level.

During Sullivan’s lifetime, however, it was the Midland Terra Cotta Company, and not other architects, who best grasped his design principals. They used this knowledge to promote the sale and use of their material, and in doing so, promoted the Sullivanesque style. “Midland embraced Sullivan’s design solutions, reinterpreted them, infused its own vitality, and made the resulting buildings more obtainable by making them more affordable. Without written treatise or philosophy, Midland holistically conveyed the Sullivanesque possibilities through simple but effective graphics.” Put into words by Professor Ronald E. Schmitt, the Sullivanesque style promoted by Midland Terra Cotta Company exhibited the following key character defining features:

---

5 “It is the pervading law of all things organic and inorganic, of all things physical and metaphysical, of all things human and all things superhuman, of all true manifestations of the head, of the heart, of the soul, that the life is recognizable in its expression, that form ever follows function. This is the law.” Louis H. Sullivan, “The Tall Office Building Artistically Considered,” Lippincott’s Magazine vol. 407 (March 1896) 403. Over the span of his career, Sullivan’s phrase, “form ever follows function” evolved into “form follows function”.


The Anderson Building faithfully follows this model. Terra cotta for the building was commissioned through the Midland Terra Cotta Company as job number 114, commissioned April 28, 1924, indicating that the building’s architect, William Gernandt, may have used the company’s brochures to produce an accurate reflection of the Sullivanesque style. On its two primary facades, The Anderson Building displays the following features:

- Ground level openings allow the separation of the commercial and residential functions; especially at the entries. The commercial façade is divided into 5 bays, within which storefront openings are paired in the outer bays and centered in the middle bay, while the apartment entrance is centered in the second primary façade.
- Both primary facades are symmetrical and extensively decorated on the upper floors, providing a strong sense of balance although the ground floor varies to accommodate changes of the surrounding grade.
- The majority of the wall surfaces are finished in red brick, with terra cotta detailing.
  - Each façade contains a medallion centered along the parapet. Additionally, a medallion is centered in the lower parapet over the projecting apartment entrance.
  - All terra cotta is finished in a white glaze that improves the contrast of the shadows and emphasizes the design of the relief.
- Ornament:
  - Elaborate terra cotta pieces call attention to important elements such as entrances, and provide balance to the overall façade composition
  - Decorative terra cotta pieces at the smaller structural members such as storefront heads, window sills, and pilaster capitals leaves the brick work to cover the larger structural beams and columns and imply the underlying structural frame

Altogether, the building is a successful rendition of the Sullivanesque style. Other local buildings which exhibit the Sullivanesque style are:

- Some of the apartments of Drake Court (Jones Street, 20th to 22nd streets)
- Terrace Court (836, 840, 842, Park Ave)
- Turner Court (3102, 3106 Dodge)
- Securities Building (305 S 16th Street)
- First National Bank (1600 Farnam Street)

In evaluating these buildings however, they are not peers of The Anderson Building for several reasons. During the second stage of the period, the Sullivanesque became a regional style. Commonly used on smaller buildings in the upper Midwest (especially Illinois, Minnesota and Iowa), it was most often employed on commercial storefronts, banks, and automobile garages, and not on apartment buildings, such as the Drake Court, Terrace Court and Turner Court buildings. As a partially commercial building, The Anderson Building fits this model better. Additionally, compared to the other small buildings in the local list, The Anderson Building adheres more closely to the design principles of the Sullivanesque style outlined earlier. It has more than a handful of Sullivanesque pieces of terra cotta, placed appropriately, including the medallions at the parapet and the overall façade has a more consistent composition. Finally, the Securities and First National Bank Buildings fall into the first phase of Sullivanesque because of their size and the national prominence of the architects responsible for the work. In conclusion, locally The Anderson Building is the most accurate reflection of the second phase of this style of architecture.

CONCLUSION
Overall, The Anderson Building is a strong local example of a Commercial Apartment building, displaying all of the key features outlined in the associated MPD, “Apartments, Flats and Tenements in Omaha, Nebraska from 1880-1962”. As a building with a high level of integrity in an increasingly rare historic type of apartment building, it deserves recognition. In the area of community planning and development, it is a good example of the design and planning practices used for Commercial Apartment buildings during one of Omaha’s apartment building booms. Furthermore, in the area of architecture it is a beautiful local-level example of the second stage of Sullivanesque architecture. Utilizing terra cotta from the company best known for promoting this style, it stands as a textbook example of the Sullivanesque design principals as promoted by Midland Terra Cotta Company.

---

15 Constructed 1915; designed by A. Moorman and Company
16 Constructed 1918; designed by Graham-Burnham Company, formerly the firm Burnham and Root.
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Verbal Boundary Description

The property includes lot 13, the East 7.8 ft of lot 11 and all of lot 12 as well as 7.8 x 101.12-57.7 x 101.97 57 x
102.87 of Block 0 of the Hillcrest Addition to the City of Omaha.

Boundary Justification

The nominated property includes the parcels historically associated with the Anderson.
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Figure 1: Commercial Apartment Buildings, comparing total constructed with those extant.

Figure 2: Commercial Apartment Buildings as a Percentage of all apartment building types ever constructed in Omaha.
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Figure 3: Sanborn Map of Omaha 1934, Partial View of p. 55 Showing Anderson Building and Surrounding Neighborhood
Figure 4: Sanborn Map of Omaha 1934, Enlarged View of p. 55 Showing Anderson Building.
Photo 4 of 9; East facade looking southwest, Jennifer Hoebelke; APHA, 7/7/09
Anderson Building; Omaha, Douglas County; Nebraska
NE; Douglas County; Anderson Building - 0004

Photo 5 of 9; South facade looking northeast, Jennifer Hoebelke; APHA, 7/7/09
Anderson Building; Omaha, Douglas County; Nebraska
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