NPS Form 10-900-b (Rev. 01/2009) OMB No. 1024-0018 (Expires 5/31/2012)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is used for documenting property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (formerly 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items

XX New Submission _____ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

APARTMENT BUNGALOW AND CALIFORNIA-TYPE HOUSES OF ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA;

VDHR FILE NUMBER 000-9712

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

THE APARTMENT BUNGALOW OF ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA, 1938-1939

1. **THE CALIFORNIA-TYPE HOUSE OF ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA, 1946-1952**

C. Form Prepared by

name/title **Laura V. Trieschmann, Architectural Historian**

organization **EHT Traceries** date August 2011 Updated November 2011

street & number **1121 Fifth Street, NW** telephone 202-393-1199

city or town **Washington** state **DC** zip code 20001

e-mail ltrieschmann@traceries.com

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.
(_____ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature and title of certifying official	Date

State or Federal Agency or Tribal government

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper Date of Action

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (formerly 16B). Fill in page numbers for each section in the space below.

Page Numbers

E. Statement of Historic Contexts

(if more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.) 1-24

F. Associated Property Types
(Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)

25-44

G. Geographical Data

45-58

H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods
(Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)

59-60

I. Major Bibliographical References
(List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)

61-62

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine 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 (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).
Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18 hours per response including 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, PO Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

E. STATEMENT HISTORIC CONTEXT:

ASSOCIATED HISTORIC CONTEXTS

1 THE APARTMENT BUNGALOW OF ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA, 1938-1939

a) The Federal Housing Administration's Effect on Small House Planning
   i) FHA Prescription for the Affordable Small House
   ii) Following the Small House Principles
   iii) Architectural Styles of the Small House
b) Arlington County Pre-World War II Housing Statistics
c) The Apartment Bungalow of the Modern Movement
   i) Arlington County's Apartment Bungalow
   ii) Builders of the Arlington County Apartment Bungalow
   iii) Limited Success of the Apartment Bungalow
   iv) Conclusion

2 THE CALIFORNIA-TYPE HOUSE OF ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA, 1946-1952

a) Post-war Affordable Housing Needs
b) California Ranch House Defined
c) California-Type House of Arlington County
   i) Builders of the California-type House
   ii) Limited Success of the California-type House
   iii) Conclusion

THE APARTMENT BUNGALOW OF ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA, 1938-1939

The Federal Housing Administration's Effect on Small House Planning

With the nation still in the grips of the Great Depression that had begun with the stock market crash in October 1929, the housing industry, devastated by the calamitous events and poor economy, was in much need of financial stimulation and support. Restoration of the housing market was widely viewed as an essential step to achieving national recovery. In 1934, Congress enacted the National Housing Act, which created the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). As described in a history of the FHA, "The immediate objectives of the Act were to make money available for repairs and new construction, to revive the homebuilding industry, to put men back to work, to restore confidence and to improve general economic conditions. The long range objectives were even more ambitious—to reform mortgage lending practices, to broaden opportunities for home ownership, to raise housing standards."[1]

The principal mechanism through which the FHA achieved its goals was the provision of mortgage insurance on both single-family and multiple-unit dwellings, thus making housing a more secure investment for both the industry and the individual owner. Mortgage insurance was intended to be self-supporting and, thus, the FHA had to aid in establishing the financial soundness of the projects it insured. Through the standards and rating systems it set to qualify for the mortgage insurance, the FHA encouraged the construction of small, affordable suburban houses and large planned communities with provisions for, or access to, good neighborhood services and transportation. It encouraged towns and cities to institute planning and zoning codes. The FHA also opened the housing market to purchasers who could not afford the traditional fifty percent down payment requirements by insuring long-term amortized mortgages of up to 80 (and later 90) percent of the appraised value. For each application the FHA evaluated, it considered the three major factors of mortgage risk: the character of the neighborhood, the quality of the structure, and the credit and character of the borrower.

Although the concept of federally sponsored mortgage insurance was new, many of the FHA's goals and reforms were based on concepts and projects that planners, architects, social reformers, community builders, and others had developed in the first decades of the twentieth century. In 1931, while in the depths of the Great Depression, President Herbert Hoover had called the President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership to make recommendations for reviving the home building industry, promoting good housing for lower income groups, and expanding home ownership. The conference's 3,700 attendees, working through numerous committees, produced a series of recommendations ranging from home financing to design, construction, and landscaping. The recommendations of this seminal conference, which brought together experts in the many professions associated with housing from urban planners to manufacturers of building components, served to guide the FHA as it developed programs in the years following its creation in 1934.[2]

Mindful of the way fine residential neighborhoods in many cities had deteriorated into a collection of untended boarding houses and small, unrelated businesses with a resulting loss of property values, the FHA set criteria that favored economically strong areas protected by zoning requirements and, often, restrictive covenants. The FHA also tended to favor suburban development. Although the 1934 legislation did provide for an initial program for repairs and improvements of existing housing as a stimulus for the building trades, and a program for non-profit development of moderate-income apartment complexes, its principal focus was on stimulating the construction of well-built, moderately priced, single-family housing in well-planned neighborhoods like those being proposed and platted in Arlington County, which was easily accessible to the Washington, D.C.-based FHA for immediate study and evaluation.

FHA Prescription for the Affordable Small House

To aid in the design of livable small houses, the FHA published Technical Bulletin No. 4, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*. The publication carefully explained how to attain "the maximum amount of usable space, with as much comfort, convenience, and privacy as possible" for a minimum amount of money.[3] The FHA contended in order to "achieve this objective, construction, equipment, and room arrangement must be related and considered together to avoid excesses in one or more directions at the expense of inadequacy in others. The starting point of balanced design is the plan, for it is here that all essential elements of a house are brought together and are coordinated."[4]

The FHA's presentation of how a small house could be livable, yet economically built, required a study of the pre-World War II family. Rather than enforce alternate ways for the American family to occupy their home, which inevitably would be rejected as novel and foreign, the FHA began with the many elements that "combined to produce safe, sanitary, comfortable, and convenient living accommodations." Essential to the success of the small house plan was separation of the living and sleeping areas; privacy obtained with a minimally sized hall; adequate closet space; elimination of wasted space; planning rooms with dual purposes when possible; and providing the most wall space permitted for the use and arrangement of essential movable furniture. Economy in planning also was related to the structural elements of the house and the installation of the mechanical equipment.[5]

The living areas were identified as "cooking, dining, and the various family activities associated with the living room. In its most elementary form the living area may combine cooking, dining, and living in one room, a practice at one time common to the early American farmhouse. In more pretentious houses these functions were and still are placed in separate rooms." Adaptation for the small low-cost house required "a compromise in the interest of space economy and combin[ing of] the dining function with either that of cooking or of living. It is a logical compromise, since dining space is required for use for only about three hours each day."[6]

The technical bulletin also made particular notice of how halls could easily be reduced, resulting in a more compact house plan. Necessary to afford privacy and communication between various rooms, the hall was deemed "not usable space and for economy it should not be larger than necessary."[7] The FHA recommended the use of the living room as a passageway between the main entrance, kitchen, and the bedroom-bathroom hall, thus eliminating the central hall. With regard to the sleeping area, the FHA addressed the location of door and window openings, ventilation, closets, accessibility and housekeeping, and furniture placement. The only recommendation for enlarging the plan was by adding width or length. The projection increased the area of an existing room while not destroying the "primary relationship of the rooms and the inherent livability and economy of the basic plan arrangement."[8] The basement, partial or full, was a feature that the FHA left to "personal preference, local need and custom, type of heating plant to be used, and cost of construction."[9]

One important factor affecting the livability of a small house was its orientation, allowing for the relationship of certain rooms to sunlight, winds, and, of course, views intended to enhance interior spaces and room size. Geographical location also played a role in the success of a small house with compact plans that could be rotated or reversed. This allowed a house on a corner lot to be easily oriented so the living areas fronted the public streets and the sleeping areas faced the interior of the lot.[10]

Above all, the FHA prescribed standardization, which restricted construction costs because of the loss of flexibility in planning. The Technical Division conducted surveys and the resulting Technical Bulletin No. 1, entitled *Recent Developments in Dwelling Construction*, suggested new approaches such as factory fabrications and the use of materials and methods of assembly used in such prefabrication.[11] "Based upon a common unit of measurement parts can be made interchangeable. This form of standardization simplifies manufacturing and production and ease of erection. Cutting of materials on the job is reduced and waste is eliminated."[12]

Following the Small House Principles

The FHA's recipe for an ideal small house at a low cost was, of course, the Cape Cod and Minimal Traditional house forms. These two forms were simple in their exterior design and gave the appearance of maximum size. Both of these popular forms included a living room, kitchen with dining area, one full bath, and two bedrooms. The kitchen and living room were aligned across the front of the house with the two bedrooms at the back. Typically, the bathroom was located immediately behind the kitchen, allowing all the plumbing to be concentrated within a single internal wall. Living space was minimal at best but allowed for expansion into the basement or attic at the owner's expense.

The appeal of the Cape Cod form, in particular, was its stylistic recalling of an eighteenth-century prototype with which most American's were familiar. It became extremely popular in the first half of the

twentieth century, meeting the small house principles promoted by the FHA while reminding suburban homeowners of their colonial heritage. The form was typically one to one-and-a-half stories in height with a side-gabled roof and a single end chimney. Unlike its ancestor, the twentieth-century Cape Cod house was often pierced with dormers that allowed the upper story to be utilized. The houses were commonly dressed with Colonial Revival-styled entries and/or porches, and boxed cornices with applied molding. The exterior design followed the FHA's premise that, "the fewer different materials used on the exterior the better the appearance usually will be."[13] Thus, initially, the Cape Cod was constructed entirely of wood frame with weatherboard siding and stylized moldings. Eventually, the structure was built of concrete blocks veneered in brick with minimally applied wood surrounds and moldings.

In order to provide more living space, albeit limited, builders sometimes added a projection to one half of the Cape Cod's façade. As the FHA recommended, the projection enlarged existing living and sleeping areas, rather than providing for an additional room, which would have cost more to frame and finish. The addition of the projecting façade bay resulted in the popular Minimal Traditional form. Like the Cape Cod, the Minimal Traditional was typically dressed in the Colonial Revival style, with a stylized entry surround and boxed cornice. Yet, as designs and materials indicative of the Modern Movement began to affect domestic suburban architecture in the second quarter of the twentieth century, much of the unnecessary applied ornamentation associated with the Colonial Revival style was abandoned as not being cost effective or progressive. Rather, fenestration patterns and modern materials were explored as a low-cost means to accent the modest form. The picture window, in particular, became a feature of nearly all mid-twentieth-century housing, especially the Minimal Traditional form. Falsely enlarging the interiors by providing unobstructed exterior views, these expansive window openings brightly illuminated the living space as the FHA recommended. The picture window of the Modern Movement also reintroduced the casement window, which was being mass produced in a steel rather than wood frame. Masonry construction, typically concrete blocks veneered in brick, was commonplace for the Minimal Traditional house.

Between 1930 and 1955, several thousand Cape Cod and Minimal Traditional houses were constructed in Arlington County for the burgeoning middle-income population wishing to become homebuyers, many for the first time. Together with the two-story, three-bedroom houses, the Cape Cod and Minimal Traditional houses were a favorite of Arlington builders and homeowners. A *Washington Post* article describing the county's "hectic building pace" noted that, "Such homes meet all zoning regulations. Financing is easier, customer acceptance has been favorable." The article remarked that, "Since the…homes are essentially out of the same mold, prices vary little for the same product. Land cost and extra trimmings make up the difference."[14]

Architectural Style of the Small House

Although the FHA made clear that it did not set standards for architectural styles, its predilection for the conservative and traditional design of the Colonial Revival was evident. It advised that "simple, direct designs which rely for their effect upon mass, scale, and proportion are more attractive, and the resultant structures are sounder investments than those which strive for picturesque or unusual effects through elaboration of motif and ornament or a startling use of materials" and that a "property should be able to retain permanent acceptance and not be so faddish that it is soon outmoded."[15]

Residents and developers of Arlington County were unwavering in their devotion to the Colonial Revival style. The style emerged following the Centennial celebrations of 1876 in Philadelphia, fulfilling the nostalgia of the romanticized Enlightenment values and the achievements of the era of the founding of the republic.[16] The style, which borrowed heavily from early American architecture, "quickly became the height of fashionable taste as the American public came to embrace rather than deny its national past."[17] The Colonial Revival style, heightened by the 1927 restoration of Colonial Williamsburg, enjoyed ongoing appeal, becoming a mainstay of housing design in America from its origins about 1880 through the post-World War II era.[18] By the 1930s, the Colonial Revival style was the "most important of the many revival styles that formed America's huge new suburbs."[19] James C. Massey and Shirley Maxwell state in *House Styles in America* that "suburban streetscapes took on an increasingly sedate air. Blocks of unassuming Colonial Revival buildings filled pleasant neighborhoods where the houses seemed to share a comfortable family resemblance. Variety for the sake of variety had been replaced by a subtle and, to the millions of Americans who lived in such homes, deeply satisfying traditionalism."[20] This description accurately described Arlington County in the late 1930s through to the early 1960s.

Recognizing exterior architectural treatment, or stylistic design, was merely a label and apt to be short lived, the FHA was forced to acknowledge changing fashions and their influences. "Radical trends in design have appeared and seem to be growing in favor. It is advisable, before passing judgment upon them or determining action in respect to them, to investigate the factors which impel designers to proceed…. In the first place, the appeal of novelty is not to be neglected."[21] Yet, the FHA recognized the long-term implications of the Modern Movement, saying that, "in spite of many faddish features displayed by [modern design,] the movement is one of more than a transitory nature, and…the basic elements which characterize it will in all likelihood sooner or later become characteristic of a large body of our stock of housing." Accordingly, the FHA issued a technical bulletin addressing modern design for their mortgage-evaluation staff and interested builders.[22] The staff was advised to evaluate projects designed in modern styles on their successes in achieving the prescribed goals, noting it was important to distinguish between "stylistic labels which are purely surface treatment, and those which proceed from developments in plan or structure."[23]

Architecture of the Modern Movement rejected the decorative features of traditional architectural styles

that evoked historical periods and events. Instead, with an aesthetic that relied heavily on massing, form, and materials, the Modern Movement celebrated new materials, new technologies, and a concern for creating simplified, functional, and efficient living spaces. Moreover, Modern Movement styles, like the European-inspired Art Deco and Streamline Moderne, embodied the "hypnotizing promise of more and more things tomorrow, advanced by America's machine technologies and rising standard of living."[24] Modernism emphasized the utilitarian, deliberately seeking to reduce costs and encourage simpler living by providing a less expensive design that was technologically advanced. Following the principles prescribed by the FHA since its founding in 1934, the architecture of the Modern Movement espoused a better tomorrow for the middle class that was difficult to ignore after the dark years of the Great Depression and World Wars.

Arlington County Pre-World War II Housing Statistics

The need to provide adequate housing for the middle class, especially those arriving in the Washington metropolitan area to work for the federal government on the eve of World War II, was tremendous. By 1940, the burgeoning population of Arlington County had risen by 114 percent in just ten years, with just under half of the eligible labor force employed by the federal government.[25] Developers catered to this market, providing more freestanding single-family dwellings than any other house type. Between 1935 and 1940, over 8,000 dwelling units had been constructed in Arlington County. This was a marked increase compared to the 7,600 dwelling units built countywide during the years between 1900 and 1934.[26]

In the late 1930s, real estate advertisements published in the *Washington Post* for single-family houses in Arlington County ranged from $4,990 to $16,250 depending on the property's location, size of the rooms, inclusion of a separate dining room, and number of bedrooms and baths. In 1938, an attached single-family dwelling with two bedrooms in Glebewood Village was offered for $4,990; a three-bedroom house in Foxcroft Heights cost $5,750; and a Cape Cod with two bedrooms in Leeway was $6,790. One year later, in 1939, a two-bedroom Cape Cod dwelling with a separate dining room in Virginia Highlands sold for $7,950, and four-bedroom houses in Aurora Hills were offered for $9,750 to $16,250, depending on room sizes and modern amenities provided.[27] According to the housing statistics collected by the United States census in 1940, the median value of an owner-occupied dwelling in Arlington County was $6,564.[28]

Although the value of these single-family houses seems comparatively low when compared to real estate prices of 2011, they were a challenge for many residents of Arlington County in the late 1930s. The median yearly wage for urban dwellers of Virginia was $800 to $1,000, with the majority of workers earning $100 to $799 a year.[29] Thus, it was not surprising that 76% of the 8,499 Arlington County property owners reported having a mortgage in 1940.[30]

The Apartment Bungalow of the Modern Movement

By the end of the 1930s, with such a tremendous demand for single-family houses and multi-family apartments, real estate developers and builders in Arlington County could ill afford to experiment. Yet, this same demand provided them with a rare opportunity to explore beyond the Cape Cod form and the Colonial Revival style. A select number of successful developers, while adhering to the prescribed principles of the FHA's *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, showed interest in the designs and materials of the Modern Movement. The resulting small house was appropriately christened the ***apartment bungalow***.[31]

Fittingly descriptive, apartment bungalow was not an uncommon epithet for a small house that provided all necessary amenities required by an American family. The term was commonly used in advertisements in the mid-1920s and early 1930s by builders attempting to briefly describe the many assets of a small house. Different-sized apartment bungalows, promoted as the "Bungalow De Luxe," were constructed by Monroe & R.B. Warren overlooking Rock Creek Park in Washington, D.C.[32] Everett A.R. Searl used the term "apartment honeymoon bungalow," which reproduced the typical colonial effect in miniature. The Searl apartment bungalow sold for $7,950.[33] Both Warren and Searl were promoting modest dwellings with a Minimal Traditional form and Colonial Revival-style elements with which the home-buying public was very familiar. Wardman Construction Company, the most prolific building company in the District of Columbia, offered "apartment bungalow homes" with "wide lawns and other novel features." The Wardman versions, being sold as cooperatives, were truly multi-family buildings with "homelike arrangement of the apartments."[34] In Arlington County, builders such as T.J. Brumback and E.P. Evans used the descriptive term for mass-produced Minimal Traditional houses in Lyon Village, Lyon Park, Country Club Hills, and Clarendon.[35] Unlike the 1938-1939 apartment bungalows, these earlier versions were exceedingly traditional in materials and style, blending seamlessly with Cape Cod and two-story rectangular Colonial Revival-style houses already so popular in the county. This version was a one-story dwelling veneered in brick and Colonial Revival in style with a cross-gabled roof, double-hung windows symmetrically set at the center of the walls, front entry porch, exterior front chimney, and an L-shaped plan. Typical of the FHA's small house, the Evans apartment bungalow provided "large rooms, oak floors, modern kitchens, slate roofs, furred walls, and full basements". The Brumback model sold for $6,500 and the Evans houses were offered at $5,750 to $5,950. The term apartment bungalow as utilized by these real estate developers and builders in the 1920s and early 1930s was ultimately abandoned, being replaced by more generic terms that spoke of the house's new and modern condition, durable construction materials, and affordable size.

Yet, by the end of the 1930s, the need to define a modern, affordable, compact house rejuvenated the idiom of apartment bungalow. Arlington County's apartment bungalow of 1938 and 1939, more so than its traditional prototypes, adhered to the FHA's mantra that a small house must provide the "maximum amount of usable space, with as much comfort, convenience, and privacy as possible" for a minimum

amount of money.[36] One advertisement proclaimed, "Until you have seen this new house you cannot realize that a new era has been inaugurated in low cost housing…in every respect, they're different!"[37] Touted as "the last word on the housing problem" and "up-to-date," the apartment bungalow was affordable, a point the realtors and developers used when comparing it to luxury apartments on Connecticut Avenue in northwest Washington, D.C. American Homes Corporation proclaimed, "Now you can own your own apartment at half or a fourth of your rent for a comparable apartment…. WHY WASTE $18,000 IN RENT IN 25 YEARS (AT $60 PER MONTH)? ...A few blocks away is the beautiful modern Colonial Home, same price and terms…." One builder deemed the apartment bungalow, "the newest type homes in the low cost field."[38]

As the name implied, the 1938-1939 apartment bungalow was the quintessential small house, providing approximately 900 square feet in a 30-foot by 30-foot plan. The four-room apartment bungalow, much like the traditional bungalow, was compact, square in plan, one story in height, and covered by a shallow pitched roof with overhanging eaves. Yet, it lacked the applied ornamentation common to the Craftsman-style bungalow. As a freestanding single-family dwelling, it included all of the amenities expected by a homeowner in the late 1930s, including a modern kitchen, two bedrooms with tiled bath, sufficient closet space, laundry facilities, air conditioning, and landscaped yard.

The apartment bungalow's compact form necessitated the elimination of wasted space, especially halls. The main entrance opened into the living room and, thus, negated the need for the entry hall or vestibule common to nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century dwellings. Space was unified by arched openings that led from the living room into the kitchen, which included a small but sufficient dining area. A minimum-sized hall in the sleeping area was square in plan. It afforded privacy from the living room, yet enabled communication. Notably, of the square halls examined in a survey of apartment bungalows in the Clarenford subdivision of Ballston/Virginia Square, each presented a slightly different plan that was misshapen by the addition of closets and built-in cabinets.

The living room was commonly the largest space in the apartment bungalow. The houses were typically oriented so that the living room offered the best views and as much sunlight and ventilation as possible. Without an entry vestibule or center hall, the living room served as a passageway between the kitchen and bedrooms, and, depending on how the furniture was arranged, could provide a dining area. The lack of a fireplace opening and mantel, a costly element indicative of most bungalows and Cape Cod houses, allowed for more practical arrangement of furniture and movement. Several of the living rooms examined in Clarenford had coved ceilings, which visually enlarged the spaces and augmented the radiance of natural and artificial light.

Economy in planning the apartment bungalow was foremost to its success. The house was constructed solely of concrete blocks, which could be made on site in standardized dimensions and, therefore, reduced the need for manipulation of materials. Although not a novel material, concrete's many uses

were being explored with its expansion into the building industry in the early 1930s. The houses were all square in form, with just a select number augmented by projecting bays on the facades. The square, the FHA stated, was "the most economical shape since it provides the maximum amount of floor area with the least amount of wall area…. The square or rectangular shape also simplifies the structural framing system of both floor and roof and thus effects [*sic*] economies."[39] The structure of the apartment bungalow was typically covered in an insulating stucco finish or veneered in bricks or, for an additional cost at the owner's request, in formed stone; a few exhibited exposed concrete blocks that were painted. The lack of diversity of materials followed the FHA's premise that, "the fewer different materials used on the exterior the better the appearance usually will be," and most certainly, the more economical.[40] On the interior, as the FHA recommended, stock millwork such as door frames, door and window sash, kitchen cabinets, and finish trim were used throughout. The interior walls were finished with a rough plaster that could be applied directly to the lath of the concrete blocks.

The full basements, typically partially aboveground to allow for natural light and ventilation through narrow windows, allowed utility rooms, laundry facilities, and all mechanical equipment to be separate from the living and sleeping areas. The use of an interior chimney, one of the character-defining features of the apartment bungalow, "resulted in more economical construction, better chimney draft, and better operating economy."[41] The enclosed stair to the basement was placed adjacent to the kitchen, reducing its square footage.

Simplicity of the design, as proposed by the FHA and followed meticulously by the builders of Arlington County, gave the apartment bungalow the appearance of maximum size, economical construction, and above all, modernity. Stylistically, it did not favor the traditional Colonial Revival and lacked the applied, costly ornamentation traditionally adorning the main entry, windows, and roofline. The design, adhering to the small house principles, "abandoned costly and unnecessary gables and dormers, overelaborate [*sic*] cornices and all nonessential features."[42] The lack of stylized ornamentation and the emphasis on construction materials placed the apartment bungalow more in line with the Modern Movement than traditional influences and historical precedents. The use of steel-frame casement windows was the most typical feature of Modern Movement design presented by the apartment bungalow.

All of the builders of the apartment bungalow, regardless of the neighborhood in which they worked, used Fenestra steel casement windows. "The sash was made from special rolled stock of a material combining strength with weather resisting qualities…."[43] Manufactured by the Detroit Steel Products Company in Michigan, the Fenestra steel window was commonly used in the early twentieth century for garages, factories, public buildings likes schools, and office buildings. Their residential window collections were known as Fencraft and Fenwrought. The casement windows provided modern advantages, such as "finger-touch operation, outside cleaning of glass from the inside, more daylight and fresh air, extraordinary weathertightness [*sic*], and fire safety."[44] The steel-frame casement was also

popular for multi-family garden apartment buildings, which like the apartment bungalow, required expansive windows to augment the compact living and sleeping spaces.

Distinctive to the apartment bungalow was the placement of the Fenestra steel casement windows at the corner of the building. Indicative of the Modern Movement, and not commonly presented on Colonial Revival-style Cape Cod dwellings or Craftsman-style bungalows, the corner window was proclaimed by the FHA as "advantageous as a means of securing increased wall space in small rooms and still provide adequate light and ventilation."[45] The corner windows, the FHA contended, ensured maximum wall space for furniture, ease of housekeeping by allowing "sufficient space to permit the bed to be made from two sides," and prevented cross drafts over the bed.[46] Most significantly, like the more expansive single-paned picture window, the corner steel casement windows provided more sunlight than traditional double-hung sash windows placed at the center of the wall. This proved essential to the compact plan of the apartment bungalow. The casement windows of the apartment bungalow wrapped around the corners of the structure and, like the picture window, visually increased the size of a room by uniting the interior with the landscaped lawns of the exterior.

Arlington County's Apartment Bungalow

The developers of the apartment bungalow were masters at real estate advertising. The selling price of the Arlington County apartment bungalow, regardless of neighborhood or amenities provided by the individual builders, was offered for $4,990, with FHA terms "arranged as low as $33 a month." Touting a location near a "built-up neighborhood of high-class homes, near 2 bus lines, chain stores and 2 blocks past" the high school, the advertisements always noted the houses' distance from downtown Washington, D.C. The modern amenities of the sample house, which strategically fronted the highly traveled Washington Boulevard in Clarenford, included:

> 2 bedrooms, full basement, oil burned, air-conditioned, colored tile bath, built-in dinette with colored leather seats, Armstrong inlaid linoleum, Magic Chef table-top insulated gas range, electric clock, chimes; Venetian blinds and bronze screens for all windows, Johns-Manville rock wool insulation, Fenestra steel windows, oak floors, beautiful wooded landscaped lot with large oak trees.[47]

The "Majestic Apartment Bungalow" at 3822 7th Street South was proclaimed by American Homes as their "sensation of the modern low-cost field." It was offered for $4,990 with FHA financing at $32 per month. Like the house in Clarenford, the sample house in Alcova Heights provided:

> Two bedrooms, full basement, oil burner, air conditioning, rock wool insulation, oak floors, steel casement windows, Domestic Science kitchen cabinets, Armstrong inlaid

> linoleum, Magic Chef table-top gas range, shades and screen, beautiful wooded lot sodded and landscaped.[48]

As these two advertisements indicate, all of the apartment bungalows featured many of the same items despite their construction by different, unrelated builders in various Arlington County neighborhoods. This was particularly true for appliances, insulation and mechanical equipment, construction materials, windows, and flooring. Interior moldings, not accounted for in the advertisements, were also stock items with an identical profile. These similarities suggest that the apartment bungalow was akin to a prefabricated house, much like a Sears kit house or the mass-produced, enamel-paned Lustron. No documentation has yet to be uncovered to support this thesis, but the similarity of form, fenestration, materials, and design beyond that proscribed by the FHA does more than suggest the possibility. Moreover, apartment bungalows have been identified in other locations, including the City of Winchester, Virginia, and Prince George's County, Maryland.[49] All examples, regardless of their location or builder, date from 1938 and 1939.

Although the apartment bungalow was constructed in other localities, one building company felt it necessary to claim the design as their own, assuring potential homebuyers of its authenticity and warning competitors of imitations. American Homes Corporation was careful to open their exhibit home at 3908 7th Street South for inspection by "home buyers and housing experts ONLY…." In their advertisement, the company proclaimed:

> This is the large improved model originated by us. Do not be fooled by imitators building small or artificial stone front copies of our old experimental models; despite notice we will protect our legal rights in all of our designs, whether perfected or experimental.[50]

Builders of the Arlington County Apartment Bungalow

During the late 1930s, a number of diverse real estate developers and builders worked tirelessly to meet the middle-class housing demands affecting Arlington County. This local talent was proficient in their use of the FHA's publications and standards. These builders quickly recognized that the specific housing needs of the Washington metropolitan area homeowner required more than the mere subdivision of a neighborhood by a developer, who would then sell the vacant lots to individual owners responsible for their own desired improvements. This process proved too costly for the average middle-class family, which required immediate housing upon their relocation to the nation's capital. Thus, developers were forced to function as community builders, applying the principles of mass production, standardization, and prefabrication to house construction on a larger scale than they had previously worked. This allowed buyers to immediately purchase a new house and ensured the necessary financing was easily secured.

The small residential neighborhood of Clarenford, which included the greatest concentration of apartment bungalows in Arlington County, was established in the late 1930s by community builders who

offered the complete package. The developers of Clarenford, as required by the FHA for its mortgage insurance, established and ensured the availability of roads and infrastructure, standardized lots, set-back lines and lot coverage restrictions, and utility lines. The readily available houses were uniformly set on narrow interior roads lined with concrete-paved sidewalks. Schools, churches, businesses, and other community facilities necessary to entice homebuyers were not provided, thus keeping costs down; these were, however, readily accessible in the growing Ballston/Virginia Square area. Washington Boulevard, acting as the southern perimeter of Clarenford, was a primary transportation corridor that led to Clarendon, Washington, D.C., and the City of Fairfax. Public transportation regularly traveled along this historic corridor.

The primary builder working in Clarenford was Thurman Davis "TD" Sowers (1885-1971). A native of Virginia, Sowers began his career in Washington, D.C., as a real estate salesman. He expanded into the construction field by the mid-1920s, acting as the primary contractor for the Lyon Park Christian Church in 1928. By this time, Sowers was a resident of Arlington County's Lyon Park neighborhood, a middle-class suburban community that was developed after World War I by speculative developer Frank Lyon. Sowers was very active in the neighborhood, serving on the local citizens' association and overseeing construction of numerous single-family dwellings. He was responsible for building more than twenty-five of the forty or so apartment bungalows in the Clarenford neighborhood. Other builders and firms responsible for construction of apartment bungalows in Clarenford included Berse & Sale, Sol Adelman, R.D. Burton, and American Homes, Inc. Although these individuals and firms each only built two to four models, the materials, finished details, and plans are exceedingly similar to those constructed by TD Sowers. The apartment bungalows erected by Sol Adelman also have a below-grade garage, projecting bay that enlarged the master bedroom, and front porch with sweeping metal awning roof.

Limited Success of the Apartment Bungalow

Although it certainly met, and on some points exceeded, the principles prescribed by the FHA for small houses, the apartment bungalow's success was surprisingly limited. Its tenure spanned just two years—1938 and 1939. A few notable factors, such as material and style, seem to account for its lack of success in Arlington County.

One of the most character-defining features of the apartment bungalow was the wrap-around corner opening with its steel-framed casement windows. This type of window proved popular, with its thin mullions and expansive glassed openings that allowed for more light, ventilation, and wider views. The steel-frame windows were just one of many items that promised a Depression-weary audience a brighter future. Yet, by early 1939, the likelihood of a general war in Europe was widely acknowledged, although most believed America would not participate. When Nazi forces crossed the Polish border in September of that year, American sentiment quickly changed in support of the Allies. At first, the effects on the economy were negligible. But in the first months of 1940, workers and industries were more directly

affected, forcing control of materials to be forefront to the national economy as well as defense. Initially, the restrictions were mostly voluntary, but by mid-autumn, it "became clear that the current system could not prevent disruptive shortages of materials: some aluminum alloys had become scarce, and it was growing difficult to acquire metals such as magnesium, tin, copper, and chromium."[51] Fenestra was ultimately forced to terminate production of their steel-framed Fencraft and Fenwrought collections, and builders of the apartment bungalow were left with no adequate replacement window.

Moreover, with the United States' entry into World War II in December 1941, building construction came to a halt in many parts of the country. Construction of moderately priced housing in the Washington metropolitan area, which had been designated as a defense area in April 1941, did continue in earnest despite material restrictions and minimal construction workforce. Although meeting the FHA's requirements for Defense Housing Insurance, the compact apartment bungalow and its single-family contemporaries were quickly abandoned in favor of garden-apartment complexes and low-rise apartment buildings. Less than 100 single-family dwellings were constructed in Arlington County during the years of World War II, while several thousand multi-family units were added to its suburban landscape.

Finally, the apartment bungalow followed the tendencies of the Modern Movement. This proved the most significant challenge for developers and builders working in a county devoted to the traditional Colonial Revival style. Real estate companies attempted, albeit ineffectively, to compare the apartment bungalow in form to the true bungalow and Cape Cod. A 1938 article in the *Washington Post*, when describing the apartment bungalow as being influenced by the Cape Cod, actually illustrated the basic fundamentals of the FHA small house:

> The ideal in a bungalow is one that provides the comfort and convenience of the modern city apartment plus the charm and privacy of an individual home. One of this type is now on the market. It is a Cape Cod design with [hipped] roof. Containing two bedrooms, living room, combined kitchen and dinette, built-in tub and shower, and full basement….[52]

Although the apartment bungalow loosely compared to the traditional Cape Cod, Minimal Traditional, and even bungalow, it was much more compact in its plan with smaller rooms. In form and massing, the house was restrictive and did not easily allow for additions. The interior plan was somewhat restrictive as walls could not be altered to enlarge spaces without the complete or partial loss of another room. The shallow pitch of the hipped roof did not allow additional living space to be captured at the attic level. Moreover, the addition of a stair to the attic would have greatly reduced the size of the already modest living area.

Stylistically, nothing about the apartment bungalow paid homage to the Colonial Revival style. The

window openings were devoid of molded surrounds. The sills were structural rather than applied. The main entry openings were sheltered with cantilevered hoods or pediments that were streamlined and lacked ornamentation. Entry stoops or porches were minimal, more functional than ornamental, and were not framed with columns or stylized balusters. The overhanging eaves were finished with a boxed cornice that, again, was more functional than ornamental, lacking molded trim. In the period spanning 1938 and 1939 when the apartment bungalow was being constructed in Arlington County, several hundred Colonial Revival-style single-family houses and garden apartment buildings were built throughout Arlington County. This trend continued during and after World War II.

Conclusion

A comprehensive architectural survey has identified 40 extant examples of the apartment bungalow in Arlington County. Historic maps, physical evidence, and oral histories suggest an additional ten to fifteen may have existed. Although constructed by a variety of real estate development companies and local builders, the apartment bungalow was restricted predominately to the Clarenford subdivision of what is now Ballston/Virginia Square. A number have been identified in Alcova Heights and several were constructed in Waverly. Single examples are located in Bluemont and Arlington Ridge. The 1963-1964 construction of Interstate 66 necessitated the relocation of four apartment bungalows, three of which can now be found in the Highview Park subdivision of Langston Brown.

The rarity of the apartment bungalow makes this housing form significant to our understanding of pre-World War II domestic architecture, housing needs, and the influential principles of the FHA as reflected in Arlington County. The apartment bungalows allow for a thorough study of the Modern Movement and how it was interpreted by real estate developers and builders for the middle-class homebuyer within a county devoted to the traditional architecture of the Cape Cod and Colonial Revival.

THE CALIFORNIA-TYPE HOUSE OF ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA, 1946-1952

Post-war Affordable Housing Needs

In the years leading up to and during World War II, Arlington County flourished as a residential suburb of Washington, D.C. Capitalizing on new transportation improvements in the region, the population doubled in four years—from 57,000 in 1940 to 120,000 in 1944. By 1948, the population had reached 123,832. Since 1947, basic employment in the federal government, the majority of which was located in the nation's capital, had substantially increased to over 50,000 as a result of the rearmament program. Although there was a decline in federal employment immediately after the war, employment in the executive branch had reached nearly 200,000 in the metropolitan area.[53] Jobs continued to be available from the federal government and were increasing steadily at the private level as business returned to pre-war activities. Yet, the average family income for residents of Arlington County in the early 1950s was $6,000; only ten percent of families earned less than $3,000 a year and nine percent earned more than $10,000 annually.[54]

With the close of World War II in 1945, the building industry turned its attention from war housing to, first, homes for returning veterans and, second, economy housing for all. The Housing Act of 1948 was aimed at stimulating the private production of residential buildings and at aiding in the transition from emergency to peace-time conditions in home financing. By 1949, the FHA had launched their economy campaign with an emphasis on large-scale production that resulted in low-cost, reasonably priced housing. This reduced the median value of new houses financed under Section 203 (low-cost housing) under Title VI of the National Housing Act by three percent and also reduced the average house size, making dwellings more affordable yet notably smaller. On April 20, 1950, the National Housing Act was amended to encourage greater production of housing for middle-income families, who made up 80 percent of the residents of Arlington County.[55]

The continued need for housing of a form and style that would draw homebuyers to Arlington County challenged mid-century developers and builders. The industry, which included the FHA, began a period of competitive marketing to attract residents with publications and bulletins like those available in the pre-war period. A commonality in these publications was a domestic form known as the ranch house, a one-story dwelling that came to represent informal living. This widely popular domestic form, which easily expressed the vocabulary of the mid-century Modern Movement, was commonly altered to meet the needs of local residents and design interests of developers and buildings. In Arlington County, one such builder-designed version was the **California-type house**.

California Ranch House Defined

As *Sunset Magazine* admitted in 1947, there was no definite form for the ranch house. Yet, despite its geographical or site location, the ranch house was characterized by its one-story structure "with a low, close-to-the-ground silhouette…. When a long, wide porch is added to this form, almost everyone accepts the name. And when wings are added and the house seems to ramble all over the site, the name is established beyond dispute." Although the low-lying silhouette was a distinct character-defining feature, it was secondary in importance to the unity of interior and exterior spaces and the "ability to move in and out of your house freely, without the hindrance of steps…."[56]

As *Sunset Magazine* espoused in its publication, *Western Ranch Houses*, the true ranch house embodied three basic concepts—livability, flexibility, and an unpretentious character.[57] Architectural Historian David Bricker explained:

> Coupled with the importance of using climate as an element of design, these concepts were applied to conditions of the site and orientation of the house. Outdoor living areas extending beyond the house on the same level were also emphasized, so that interior space merged with the exterior, separated merely by large areas of glass and sliding glass doors. Other typical characteristics included a linear arrangement of rooms, elevations composed asymmetrically, and a telescopic effect of low wings spreading out from the rectangular core of the plan. And additions and alterations to a ranch house were foreseeable since they were part of its architectural tradition.[58]

The building industry claimed the ranch house exuded "friendliness, simplicity, informality, and gaiety…." Most significantly, as *Sunset Magazine* exclaimed, "the house was very expandable," with rooms spilling out "onto the veranda and, if necessary, into the patio, without losing connection with the house."[59] The marriage of indoor and outdoor living spaces as offered by the ranch house, even when placed on a small suburban lot like those in Arlington County, enlarged—however falsely—the small family home. Under the heading, "The Expansible House—The House That Grows With The Family," the FHA acknowledged the ranch house had become a recognized architectural form essentially because it was "freely extensible," offering many veterans the dream houses they envisioned building/owning upon their return to civilian life.[60] By the 1950s, the ranch house had become the predominant residential choice nationwide; nine out of every ten new houses was labeled a ranch house (or the equally descriptive "rambler").[61]

While the "adobes and wood-frame-and-sheathed ranch buildings built during the more rugged nineteenth century" had been an architectural inspiration of the western ranch house, the ranch house of Arlington County, and of the Washington metropolitan area, was largely based on the compact Cape Cod and the Minimal Traditional forms of the east coast states. Holding tightly to their past, the residents of Arlington County favored the Colonial Revival-style Cape Cod and Minimal Traditional houses.

Consequently, developers and architects were once again faced with coddling homebuyers by presenting the trendy, yet progressive ranch house as a mere modification of the traditional, proven forms that improved much of the county. The resulting mid-century ranch house of Arlington County was one story in height, with a low-lying roof framed by overhanging eaves, concrete-block construction with a variety of cladding materials, and asymmetrical fenestration with openings of differing sizes and unconventional placement. The roof, albeit notably shallower, continued to present a gabled pitch and, at first, was often finished with an understated ogee-molded cornice; true to the California ranch house, the cornice and any bed molding were eventually abandoned in favor of simple square-edged eaves. A single brick chimney stood on the side elevation, anchoring the structure as it had done on colonial buildings since the eighteenth century. But in general, ornamentation, as mid-century Modern Movement design and the economy continued to demand, was minimal, often being expressed by the structural and cladding materials rather than applied adornment.

California-Type House of Arlington County

The ambiguity of features encouraged misuse of the ranch house name and failure to reproduce the historic appearance or characteristics as the form migrated eastward from California. The narrow restrictive lots, suburban curb cuts and rectilinear streets, and tract housing typical in such subdivisions as those platted in Arlington County were not conducive to the true California ranch house. Yet, realtors, developers, and builders quickly saw the promises evoked by the fashionable ranch house and its unique features. Promoted by the press nationwide, the ranch house was featured as modern and adaptable, offering the newest amenities and construction techniques, and perfect for a suburban setting. The building industry, targeting a homebuyer aware of popular architecture, used such phrases as “mid-western design,” “beautiful and livable ranch type home,” “spread-out modern plan,” “small ranch design,” “new ranch type,” and, of course, “California type home” to describe the ranch house of the Washington metropolitan area.[62]

A select number of developers and builders in western Arlington County used descriptive terms to label their interpretation of a ranch house, which was referred to as a California-type house. In form, the California-type house was true to the ranch house, certainly reflecting its livability, flexibility, and an unpretentious character. The buildings were low-lying with a horizontal silhouette capped by a hipped or pyramidal roof finished with wide overhanging eaves. Expansive corner windows and sliding glass doors united the compact interior plan with its defined suburban lot. Unlike the traditional western ranch house, the California-type house did not have porches or integrated patios to serve as added outdoor living space.

As with the apartment bungalow of the late 1930s, the California-type house presented a simple exterior composition, thus giving it the appearance of maximum size. The main entry opening was placed within the center bay of the façade, set slightly off-center as was the tendency of Modern Movement

architecture. The single-leaf door lacked a stylized or molded surround, and was most typically set within a deep recess or inset vestibule that rendered it secondary to the fenestration pattern of the façade. Set to the side of the main entry opening, a large chimney marked the primary elevation rather than the side elevations as was common throughout Arlington County. Constructed of brick, sometimes clad in stone, the exterior chimney protruded just above the overhanging eaves of the building's roof. Distinctive to the California-type house were the corner, or outer bay, window openings and the smaller single window set between main entry and chimney.

The uniform cladding of stucco or brick veneer was only minimally contrasted by rowlock brick sills. The sills on the window openings, which lacked any other ornamentation, served to accent the otherwise blank voids of the exterior. Many houses included an integral planter that projected from below one corner window. Fading into the façade, the planter was clad in the same material as the main structure and, like the sills of the window openings, was accented by contrasting brick coping. The lack of exterior ornamentation, although indicative of the economic forces then driving the building industry, was also typical of the mid-century Modern Movement.

The California-type house adhered to many of the principles prescribed in the pre-war years by the FHA for small houses and Modern Movement architecture. The compact form was rectangular, almost square, providing the maximum amount of usable space with as much comfort, convenience, and privacy as possible for a minimum amount of money—all of which also were the criteria of the ranch house. Yet, the plan retained the entry foyer and center hall of the traditional Cape Cod house, which the FHA had believed was wasteful and costly in a small house. The sizes of the living rooms were enlarged to meet the needs of the average post-war family, while the sleeping rooms remained small. A separate dining area was not common to the California-type house. The asymmetrical placement of the main entry door most likely was the direct result of the dining area being incorporated into the living room, adjacent to the kitchen. Like many suburban houses, the sleeping areas were separated from the living areas, with the former facing the interior of the suburban lot to ensure privacy. The lack of foundation-level windows suggested no additional living space was provided by a basement, leaving utilities to occupy space on the primary floor. As the FHA promoted in their 1940 bulletin for small house planning and successfully utilized by the apartment bungalow, corner windows were advantageous to the design of the California-type house by offering adequate light and ventilation, and increasing wall space.[63]

Containing only two bedrooms, the California-type house was comparatively a small house. It lacked a recreation room, additional living space in the basement, and separate dining room, all features common to the mid-twentieth-century home. Yet, as the real estate brokers indicated, this one-story house was affordable. The average post-war salary of residents in the neighborhoods where the California-type house was constructed was $5,000 to $6,500, which was the median income for county residents.[64] The California-type houses constructed in 1948 within the established Glencarlyn neighborhood were offered at $13,950. Comparable ranch houses, commonly labeled as ramblers, in Virginia, Maryland, and the

District of Columbia, sold for $13,750 to $17,950. Cape Cod and two-story Colonial Revival-style houses were advertised at $13,250 to $31,500, depending on the neighborhood. As the cost of housing rose over the years, the prices of the Arlington California-type house increased, but only slightly. Models located in Leeway-Overlee were listed in 1952 at $16,950, while the average house in this same neighborhood was offered at $21,500.[65]

Builders of the California-type House

The vast majority of the California-type houses were constructed and brokered by M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc., one of the most prolific building firms in Arlington County in the mid-twentieth century. The company, which developed, built, and sold houses, was founded by Michael Pomponio in New Jersey. A resident of Arlington County since 1944, Pomponio was born in Potenza, Italy, having immigrated to New York City and settled in South Plainfield, New Jersey. He worked with his sons to create a real estate and building firm responsible for developing single- and multi-family housing throughout the country.[66] With the death of Michael Pomponio in 1948, the firm's name was changed to Pomponio Realty, Inc. Arthur Rocco Pomponio, the eldest son, served as president of the firm, which also offered insurance facilities.[67] The firm constructed and oversaw the sale of more than fifty of the extant California-type houses constructed between 1947 and 1950 in the neighborhoods of Leeway-Overlee and Glencarlyn.

M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc. enthusiastically advertised their California-type house:

> This California-type house continues to meet with public approval. All of the rooms are large and on the one floor. We have a beautiful foyer entrance and center hall. Extra large living room has wood-burning fireplace, 2 twin-sized bedrooms with delightful cross ventilation. Heating needs amply taken care of by the very dependable Chrysler Air-Temp gas unit. Closets? Lots of them. Tubing—all copper. Also included are refrigerator, stove, Bendix washer, screens and Venetian blinds and weather-stripping throughout.[68]

The Pomponio advertisement for the California-type houses they built in Glencarlyn read:

> This new subdivision of California-type homes has just been completed and is available for immediate occupancy. The last word in distinctive housing in Arlington. Some of the features are: Foyer entrance and center hall; all rooms on one level with cross-ventilation throughout; extremely large kitchen with more than enough cabinets; two twin-size bedrooms; large living room with fireplace; beautiful parquet floors; heated by the very dependable Chrysler Air-Temp gas unit; plenty of closet space and attic storage; all copper plumbing; Refrigerator, stove, Bendix washer, screens, Venetian blinds included. All lots are nicely wooded.[69]

Limited Success of the California-type House

Like the apartment bungalow, the California-type house met with limited success. The extant examples identified date from 1946 to 1952, and are geographically confined to Glencarlyn, Bluemont, and Leeway-Overlee, from which it spilled into the adjacent neighborhoods of East Falls Church and Highland Park-Overlee Knolls.

Yet, by the 1950s, the average American family had grown larger and required more space than the 1,141 square feet provided by the modest California-type house. Although this house, like all true ranch houses, was considered expansible because it opened to outdoor living, enlargement of its indoor living space had to be considered when the building was planned and constructed. In fact, the compact and well thought-out plan proved ineffectual to additions, and limited growing families to just two bedrooms on one floor. As family activities changed, new house forms were required to provide a more distinct separation of living and sleeping spaces, allowing for increasing noise levels and soundproof zones. The resulting split-level served the changing need for privacy by separating the location of the bedrooms to an upper level within a half-story above the main living area, and by adding an all-purpose recreation room on a lower level.[70] Additionally, although the basic house form may have changed from the traditional Cape Cod and two-story rectangular structure, Arlington County residents strongly held onto elements of the Colonial Revival style, which was lending itself to the increasingly popular split-level.

Moreover, by the early 1950s, the population of Arlington County was becoming static, reaching 135,449 in 1950. As developers busied themselves improving the county's many platted subdivisions and neighborhoods, the Washington metropolitan area's newest residents looked beyond the immediate suburbs of Arlington County to the outlying areas of Fairfax County, which was proving to be more affordable.[71] By 1951, over 10,000 acres in Arlington County had been developed, constituting 76.26 percent of the total land. This included houses, businesses, industries, parks, and streets. Single-family housing occupied 5,539 acres, which was by far the highest use; it was followed by 2,114 acres devoted to streets and highways. Two-family houses and multi-family dwellings collectively occupied less than 1,000 acres.[72] The lack of buildable lots ultimately forced area developers and builders to relocate their efforts outside of Arlington County.

Conclusion

A comprehensive architectural survey has identified 110 extant examples of the California-type houses in Arlington County. The compact form of the house and its ambiguous label as a ranch house make investigation of additional California-type houses difficult as it cannot be easily discerned on historic maps and through oral histories. Although constructed by a variety of real estate development companies and local builders, the California-type house was restricted predominately to Glencarlyn and Leeway-

Overlee, both of which developed in the post-war years. A few have been identified in Richmond Hill and Overlee Knolls subdivisions of Highland Park-Overlee Knolls and the Norwood subdivision of East Falls Church, as well as the Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village in Bluemont.

The rarity of the California-type house makes this housing form significant to our understanding of post-World War II domestic architecture, housing needs, and the influential principles of the FHA as reflected in Arlington County. The California-type house enables a study of the ranch house as this overly popular domestic form migrated eastward, being adapted by builders for suburban needs and marketed by developers and realtors for middle-income buyers.

Endnotes

[1] Federal Housing Administration, *The FHA Story in Summary, 1934-1959* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, n.d.), 4.
[2] Marc A. Weiss, *The Rise of the Community Builders* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1987), 143-147.
[3] Federal Housing Administration, *Technical Bulletin No. 4, Principles of Planning Small Houses*, (Washington, D.C. Federal Housing Administration, 1936, revised July 1, 1940), 3.
[4] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 3.
[5] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 4.
[6] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 5-6.
[7] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 7.
[8] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 5-6.
[9] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 9.
[10] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 14.
[11] Federal Housing Administration, *Technical Bulletin No. 1, Recent Developments in Dwelling Construction*, (Washington, D.C. Federal Housing Administration, September 1, 1936), 2.
[12] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 31.
[13] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 37.
[14] Conrad P. Harness, "Arlington Continues Hectic Building Pace," *Washington Post*, 11 April 1948, R1.
[15] Federal Housing Administration, *Architectural Planning and Procedure for Rental Housing*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office, 1939), 8.
[16] Rachel Carley, *The Visual Dictionary of American Domestic Architecture*, (New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company, 1994), 188; Abby Moor, "Eclectic Revivals," *The Houses We Live In*, Jeffery Howe, editor, (London, England: PRC Publishing Limited, 2002), 273.
[17] Moor, "Eclectic Revivals," 273.
[18] Moor, "Eclectic Revivals," 273.
[19] James C. Massey and Shirley Maxwell, *House Styles in America*, (New York, NY: Penguin Studio, 1996), 185-186.
[20] Massey and Maxwell, *House Styles in America*, 186.
[21] Federal Housing Administration, *Technical Bulletin No. 2, Modern Design*, (Washington, D.C. Federal Housing Administration, 1 March 1941), 4.
[22] Federal Housing Administration, *Modern Design*, 2.

[23] Federal Housing Administration, *Modern Design*, 4.
[24] American Experience, "People & Events: Chicago Century of Progress Exposition (World's Fair), 1933-1934," Public Broadcasting Service, http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/streamliners/peopleevents/e_fair.html.
[25] The 1940 Population Census indicates that 11,514 of the 26,680 eligible labor force worked for the federal government; United States Department of Commerce, *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Population, Volume II, Characteristics of the Population*, (Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1943), 262.
[26] United States Department of Commerce, *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Housing, Volume II, General Characteristics*, (Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1943), 639.
[27] Real Estate Advertisement Displays, *Washington Post*, 1938-1939.
[28] United States Department of Commerce, *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Housing, Volume II, General Characteristics*, 630.
[29] United States Department of Commerce, *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Population, Volume II, Characteristics of the Population*, 786.
[30] United States Department of Commerce, *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Housing, Volume II, General Characteristics*, 630; Only 8,499 of the 8,740 property owners reported their mortgage status.
[31] Advertisement, "Apartment Bungalow with Full Basement," *Washington Post*, 30 June 1935, R15.
[32] Advertisement, "Bungalow De Lux," *Washington Pos*t, 17 March 1926, 3.
[33] "Honeymoon Homes Lavishly Praised," *Washington Post*, 29 May 1932, R1.
[34] "Wardman to Build Largest Group of Cooperatives Here," *Washington Post*, 26 July 1925, R4.
[35] Real Estate Advertisements, *Washington Post*, 27 November 1932, 9 April 1933, 30 June 1933, 30 June 1933, and 6 August 1933.
[36] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 3.
[37] Advertisement, "Sensational Low-Cost Homes," *Washington Post*, 29 May 1938, R4.
[38] Advertisement, "Last Chance to See This New Model Apartment Home," *Washington Post*, 5 February 1939, R6; Advertisement, "It Can Be Yours—For $33 a Month," *Washington Post*, 2 April 1939, R3.
[39] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 30.
[40] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 37.
[41] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 36.
[42] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 37.
[43] "Fenestra Steel Sash," *The Horseless Age*, vol. XXIV, No. 1, (New York, NY: 7 July 1909), 565.
[44] "Advertisement," *The Architect and Engineer*, vol. 109, No. 1, (San Francisco, CA: April 1932), 75.
[45] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 38.
[46] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, 5-6.
[47] Advertisement, "The Apartment Bungalow in Arlington, VA.," *Washington Post*, 5 February 1939, R6.
[48] Advertisement, "Majestic Apartment Bungalow," *Washington Post*, 4 September 1938, R4.
[49] Contemporary newspaper advertisements show the apartment bungalow in Prince George's County was constructed by Phillips H. Clark Co, and was offered at $3990, which was $1000 less than the examples sold in Arlington County.
[50] Advertisement, "Last Chance to See this New Model Apartment Home," *Washington Post*, 5 February 1939, R6.
[51] Donald Albrecht, editor, *World War II and the American Dream: How Wartime Building Changed a Nation*, (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995), 46-49.
[52] "Cape Cod Design Used in Bungalow," *Washington Post*, 29 May 1938.
[53] Homer Hoyt Associates, *Economic Survey of the Land Uses of Arlington County, VA*, (Arlington, VA: Homer Hoyt Associates, September 1951), 1-2.

[54] Homer Hoyt Associates, *Economic Survey of the Land Uses of Arlington County, VA*, 4.
[55] Homer Hoyt Associates, *Economic Survey of the Land Uses of Arlington County, VA*, 30.
[56] Editorial Staff of Sunset Magazine, *Sunset Western Ranch Houses*, (San Francisco, CA: Lane Publishing Co., 1946), ix.
[57] David Bricker, "Ranch House Are Not All the Same," *Preserving the Recent Past 2*, edited by Deborah Slaton and William G. Foulks, (Washington, D.C.: Historic Preservation Education Foundation, National Park Service, and Association for Preservation Technology International, 2000), 2-116.
[58] Bricker, "Ranch House Are Not All the Same," 2-116.
[59] Sunset Magazine, *Sunset Western Ranch Houses*, 25-26.
[60] National Housing Agency, *Planning the Expansible House: Six Schemes for Houses that Grow*, (Washington, D.C., Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the Administrator, 1947), 4.
[61] Witold Rybczynski, "The Ranch House Anomaly: How America fell in and out of love with them," *Slate* Magazine, posted 17 April 2007, http://www.slate.com/id/2163970?nav=ais.
[62] Various Advertisements, *Washington Post*, 1946-1952; Sunset Magazine, *Sunset Western Ranch Houses*, passim; *Garlinghouse Ranch and Suburban Homes*, (Topeka, KA: L.F. Garlinghouse Company, Inc., 1948), passim.
[63] Federal Housing Administration, *Principles of Planning Small Houses*, passim.
[64] Homer Hoyt Associates, *Economic Survey of the Land Uses of Arlington County, VA*, 30.
[65] Advertisements, *Washington Post*, 1948-1952.
[66] "Realty Roundup," *Washington Post*, 19 December 1948, R5.
[67] "M. Pomponio & Sons Occupy Own Building," *Washington Post*, 22 August 1948, R1.
[68] Advertisement, *Washington Post*, 28 March 1948, R7.
[69] Advertisement, *Washington Post*, 5 September 1948, R7.
[70] National Register of Historic Places, Historic Residential Suburbs in the United States, 1830-1960, Multiple Property Document, E-35.
[71] Homer Hoyt Associates, *Economic Survey of the Land Uses of Arlington County, VA*, 29.
[72] Homer Hoyt Associates, *Economic Survey of the Land Uses of Arlington County, VA*, 30.

F. ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES:

Properties identified by plan, form, and massing as associated with the historic context "Apartment Bungalow and California-Type Houses of Arlington County, Virginia" include the following type:

1. *Single-Family Dwelling*

PROPERTY TYPE DESCRIPTION

A definition of this property type presents the following physical characteristics:

1. *Apartment Bungalow*
   A one-story single-family dwelling, constructed only from 1938 to 1939, with a square form, concrete-block construction, and a pyramidal hipped roof. Steel casement windows wrap around the corners of the building and an interior chimney rises from the center of the roof.

2. *California-Type House*
   A one-story single-family dwelling, dating from 1946 to 1953, with rectangular form, concrete-block construction, and hipped roof. Steel casement windows at the corners of the building and an exterior chimney projects from the façade adjacent to the main entry.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSOCIATIVE QUALITIES

Physical Characteristics

All of the eligible properties attached to this Multiple Property document must be designed, constructed, and continue to function as a single-family dwelling in Arlington County, Virginia, exhibiting the elements common to the *Apartment Bungalow* and the *California-Type House*. The following signature design elements are key aspects of all these single-family dwellings constructed between 1938 and 1953 in Arlington County: 1) concrete block construction, 2) pyramidal or hipped roofs, 3) wrapping or corner steel casement windows, and 4) interior center or exterior façade chimney. In unison, these fundamental elements all contribute to the feeling of a small house that provides the comfort and convenience of a modern city apartment plus the charm and privacy of an individual low-cost home.

Apartment Bungalow

1. Building Heights:
    a. One story in height with a basement set partially above grade
        i. Full-height basement noted (one example)

2. Building Massing and Form:
    a. Square form
    b. Square projecting bay on façade

3. Structure, Cladding, and Finish:
    a. Smooth wall finish with lack of surface ornamentation
    b. Concrete-block structure
        i. Brick veneer in stretcher bond
        ii. Stucco finish (typically painted)
        iii. Formed or simulated stone
        iv. Painted

4. Roof Form and Covering:
    a. Pyramidal Hipped
        i. Slight overhang
            1. boxed cornice (covered typically by gutter)
        ii. Gabled or semicircular roof vent
            1. front and rear slopes
    b. Asphalt shingles

5. Chimney Placement and Material:
    a. Interior center
    b. Interior slightly off-center
    c. Exterior Side (two examples noted)
    d. Exposed Brick with plain cap
    e. Stuccoed Brick with plain cap

6. Entry Surrounds:
    a. Brick or formed stone surrounds
        i. Quoins (concrete with beveled edges)

7. Porches and Stoops:
    a. Semicircular arched or shed roof
    b. Pedimented or hipped roof

- c. Metal awning
- d. Curved porch
- e. Concrete stoop
  - i. Front entry
  - ii. Side entry
  - iii. Metal railing

8. Doors:
   - a. Single leaf
   - b. Center bay
   - c. Side elevation (centrally placed off kitchen)
   - d. Vertically placed rectangular flush door

9. Windows:
   - a. Steel frame casement
     - i. Fenestra Solid Steel Windows (Detroit Steel Products Company)
       - 1. Four three-light casements per elevation
   - b. Basement
     - i. Three-light fixed or awning
     - ii. Vinyl fixed or casement replacement (typical)

10. Window Surrounds and Sills:
    - a. No applied surrounds
    - b. Sills of exposed brick or painted stucco
      - i. Projecting from plane of wall

11. Pattern of Openings/Fenestration:
    - a. High ratio of wall to opening
    - b. Windows: Primary
      - i. Wrap corners to cover elevations
    - c. Asymmetrically placed basement window openings
    - d. Smaller single pane casement window for bathroom

12. Garage:
    - a. Most lacking garages
    - b. Few attached, below grade
    - c. Some freestanding, to rear of property

13. Siting and Landscaping:

a. Set within residential neighborhoods
b. Presence of mature trees and plantings
c. Maintain setback of their respective neighborhoods
    i. Lots typically 40 feet by 125 feet
    ii. House setback typically 30 feet from street
d. Driveways
    i. Asphalt driveways
    ii. Concrete driveways
    iii. No driveways
e. Walkways
    i. Concrete walkways
    ii. Stone walkways (granite or slate)
    iii. Gravel walkways
f. Wood or metal fencing

California-Type House

1. Building Heights:
    a. One story in height with a basement set partially above grade.

2. Building Massing and Form:
    a. Rectangular form
    b. Square projecting bay on façade
    c. Planter under corner/wrapping window
        i. Brick coping
        ii. Finish same has main block of house

3. Structure, Cladding, and Finish:
    a. Smooth wall finish with lack of surface ornamentation
    b. Concrete-block structure
        i. Brick veneer in stretcher bond
        ii. Stucco finish (painted)

4. Roof Form and Covering:
    a. Hipped or Pyramidal, shallow pitch
        i. Wide overhang
        ii. Soffit with ogee bedmolding
        iii. Gutters
    b. Asphalt shingles
5. Chimney Placement and Material:

a. Exterior façade
    i. Pierces roof overhang or interrupts roof cornice
    ii. Shallow shoulders
b. Exposed or painted brick with corbeled or cap
c. Stucco Brick with corbeled or plain cap

6. Entry Bay and Surrounds:
    a. Deeply recessed entry bay
    b. Abutting projecting bay
    c. No surrounds

7. Porches and Stoops:
    a. Concrete stoops, lacking balustrade or rail
    b. Concrete stoops, some with brick veneer and metal rails
    c. Shelter provided by wide overhang of main roof
    d. Lack porches typical of ranch houses

8. Doors:
    a. Single leaf
    b. Center bay
    c. Side elevation (centrally placed)

9. Windows:
    a. Steel frame casement
        i. Four three-light casements per elevation
        ii. Vinyl double-hung or casement replacement (typical)
    b. Glass block fixed
    c. Double-hung sash (replacement)

10. Window Surrounds and Sills:
    a. No surrounds
    b. Sills of exposed brick or painted stucco

11. Pattern of Openings/Fenestration:
    a. High ratio of wall to opening
    b. Windows: Primary
        i. Set at corners or outer edge of end bays
    c. Asymmetrically placed basement window openings
    d. Smaller single pane casement or glass block window set between main entry and chimney

e. Smaller single pane casement window for bathroom
f. Lack of foundation-level window openings

12. Garage:
    a. Most lacking garages
    b. Few attached, below grade
    c. Some freestanding, to rear of property
    d. Carports

13. Siting and Landscaping:
    a. Set within residential neighborhoods
    b. Presence of mature trees and plantings
    c. Maintain setback of their respective neighborhoods
        i. Lots typically 40 feet by 125 feet
        ii. House setback typically 30 feet from street
    d. Driveways
        i. Asphalt driveways
        ii. Concrete driveways
        iii. No driveways
    e. Walkways
        i. Concrete walkways
        ii. Stone walkways (granite or slate)
        iii. Gravel walkways
    f. Wood or metal fencing

Geographical Information

Apartment Bungalow:
Constructed only in 1938 and 1939, the apartment bungalows of Arlington County, Virginia, are remarkably similar in form, detailing, material, and fenestration. They stand within planned residential neighborhoods, typically within close proximity to each other (signifying the work of a single home builder developing existing subdivisions). The apartment bungalow has been identified in the following locations:

Neighborhood	Subdivision
Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford (27)
Waverly Hills	Waverly Hills (1)
Arlington Ridge	Addison Heights (1)
Alcova Heights	Alcova Heights (5)

Bluemont	Veitch and Bon Air (2)
Ballston/Virginia Square	Resubdivision of Clarenford (1 relocated from Clarenford)
Langston Brown	Highview Park (3 relocated from Clarenford)

The dwellings share common setbacks and orientations as found in their respective neighborhoods, which are teeming with traditional architectural styles and forms, such as the popular Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, bungalow, Cape Cod, ranch house, and split level.

California-Type House:
Constructed in the post World War II years from 1946 to 1952, the California-type houses of Arlington County, Virginia, are, like the apartment bungalows of the county, remarkably similar in form, detailing, material, and fenestration, but with minor variations depending on the neighborhood and developer/builder. They stand within planned residential neighborhoods, typically within close proximity to each other (signifying the work of a single home builder developing existing subdivisions). The California-type house has been identified in the following locations:

Neighborhood	Subdivision
Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village (46)
Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens (8)
East Falls Church	Norwood (8)
Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Richmond Hill (4)
Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Overlee Knolls (3)
Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Highland Park (1)
Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn (24)
Glencarlyn	Carlin Springs (2)
Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village (14)

The dwellings share common setbacks and orientations as found in their respective neighborhoods, which are teeming with traditional architectural styles and forms, such as the popular Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, bungalow, Cape Cod, ranch house, and split level.

Boundaries

The boundaries of all of the eligible properties are typically the original lot lines as determined by individual surveys or subdivision plats.

Four of the apartment bungalows are known to have been moved from their original location in the Clarenford subdivision of Ballston/Virginia Square due to the construction of Interstate 66 in 1963 and 1964. Three of these houses are now located in Langston Brown (Highview Park subdivision) and one is

located in the "Resubdivision of Clarenford" in Ballston. These houses contribute to the historic context of the apartment bungalow within Arlington County, despite their relocation. They are set within residential subdivisions, much like Clarenford, and maintain setbacks typical to their new neighborhoods.

Variations Occurring within the Property Type

Structural and interior materials do not vary for the eligible properties, as originally constructed; however, distinctions were made by the home builders, and very possibly at the request of the original property owners. These variations include exterior veneers, shapes of the roof vents, protrusion of chimneys through eaves, chimney locations, and exterior finishes, and, most particularly, entry porches and stoops. Some examples have a projecting bay reminiscent of the Minimal Traditional form that slightly enlarged the building's interior living space.

The lots on which the houses were built also allowed/dictated changes, particularly to the interior floor plans. This minimally affected the fenestration (secondary door and window placement) and/or location of the chimney. A house on a corner lot had the living room and kitchen with dining area fronting along the intersecting streets, while the bedrooms and bath were located on the interior of the lot for privacy. This reconfiguration moved the secondary door from the side elevation to the rear elevation. The smaller bathroom window was moved from the rear elevation to the side elevation facing the interior of the lot.

The undulation of the natural landscape, as well as lot locations, allowed for the exposure of full basements, especially on the rear elevations. Basement entry doors were included; windows do not appear to have been enlarged. Generally, however, as was customary, home builders altered the existing topography to create level, uniform lots.

Locational Patterns of the Property Type

All of the properties exist within Arlington County, Virginia, beyond the confines of Washington, D.C., in what would be considered a suburban setting by the mid-1930s. The greatest collection of apartment bungalows is located in the center of the county in Ballston/Virginia Square. A few examples are located in the south center part of the county in Alcova Heights. The California-type house is found in the western part of the county, within Leeway Overlee, Highland Park-Overlee Knolls, Bluemont, and Glencarlyn. All examples are set predominately within single subdivisions of their respective residential neighborhoods. The properties' locational patterns, dates of construction, and platting and development of their respective neighborhoods, suggest that these houses were built by home builders on vacant lots in growing neighborhoods.

Condition of the Property Type

(NOTE: See Registration Requirements below for more specific information on integrity as it relates to eligibility.)

Many of the dwellings have replacement windows and doors. Often, the original Fenestra Solid Steel casement windows are not replaced in-kind, but rather with a vinyl double-hung sash or sliding window. The original primary and secondary entry doors have also been replaced, with the openings remaining single leaf. The replacement doors vary in material, lights, and ornamentation. The replacement of the original steel casement windows and entry doors is a common change that compromises the integrity of the individual resources. When viewed collectively as an historic district, the replacement of windows and doors may be acceptable, depending on the totality of alterations to each resource.

The windows of the apartment bungalow, in particular, wrap around the corners of the main block in a distinctive pattern. The primary single-leaf entry opening is set at the center of the façade, although some examples of the apartment bungalow have a single-leaf entry opening at the center of one side elevation. The original windows of the California-type house wrap around the corners of the building or are set to the outer edges of the end bays, above planters that are structurally part of the main block. The original entry opening is typically deeply recessed at the center of the façade. For those examples that have projecting bays like that seen in the Minimal Traditional house, the original single-leaf entry opening is flush with the exterior wall, covered by the overhanging eave of the building's roof. Original elements, particularly the steel casement windows, are character-defining features for apartment bungalows and California-type houses. The thin metal muntins of the casement windows and the sash that swings open along its entire length on hinges are essential to the sense of time, feeling, and design for these buildings.

A few of the dwellings have been enlarged by a modest addition, often very compatible in character with a smooth wall finish and lack of surface ornamentation. The additions are overwhelmingly located on the rear of the houses, preserving the form, massing, fenestration, and chimney placement of the original main block. For the most part, following the *Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation*, the additions have not compromised the integrity of design or setting for the individual buildings. A few examples have been raised to two stories, requiring the removal of the original roofs and alterations to the original chimneys.

Specific Period of Time and Location of Eligible Resources

Apartment Bungalows:
The eligible apartment bungalows were built in 1938 and 1939, and all exist in Arlington County, Virginia. This period begins just after the institution of a national program by the FHA that would regulate home building practices for many decades. The FHA's *Principles of Planning Small Houses,*

was first published in May 1936 and updated in 1940, coupled with other FHA publications such as *Recent Developments in Dwelling Construction* (1936, revised 1937) and *Minimum Construction Requirements for New Dwellings* (1937), affected how the apartment bungalow was to be designed, constructed, and maintained.

California-type Houses:
The eligible California-type houses were built in the post-World War years, specifically 1946 to 1952, in Arlington County This domestic form, drawing from pre-war plans like the Minimal Traditional house, adapted the true California mid-century ranch house for Arlington County residents. The inspiration was purely a product of the Modern Movement era that began to affect domestic suburban architecture in the second quarter of the twentieth century. The form was dictated by restricting suburban lot sizes and the tremendous need for housing in the Washington metropolitan area, specifically Arlington County. Home builders of the California-type house were also aware of the FHA's *Planning the Expansible House: Six Schemes for Houses that Grow* (1947), a document that provided direction on how to economically enlarge a dwelling within the small house principles.

The period of significance for these two specific house forms should reflect only their construction date. The ending date will be the date of completion of the dwelling. Alterations and additions to the buildings should not be the determining end dates.

PROPERTY TYPE SIGNIFICANCE

A comprehensive architectural survey has identified 40 extant examples of the apartment bungalow and 110 extant California-type houses in Arlington County. Historic maps, physical evidence, and oral histories suggest more may have existed. Although constructed by a variety of real estate development companies and local builders, these houses were restricted predominately to certain residential neighborhoods.

The rarity of the apartment bungalow makes this housing form significant to our understanding of pre-World War II domestic architecture, housing needs, and the influential principles of the FHA as reflected in Arlington County. The apartment bungalows allow for a thorough study of the Modern Movement and how it was interpreted by real estate developers and builders for the middle-class homebuyer within a county devoted to the traditional architecture of the Cape Cod and Colonial Revival. Similarly, the limited number of California-type houses makes this housing form significant to our understanding of post-World War II domestic architecture and housing needs, and enables a study of the ranch house as this overly popular domestic form migrated eastward and was adapted by builders for suburban needs and marketed by developers and realtors for middle-income buyers.

The apartment bungalows and California-type houses located in Arlington County, Virginia, are significant in the areas of **Architecture** and **Community Planning/Development**. These specific single-family dwellings are significant indicators of pre- and post-World War II small house Modern Movement-era architectural ideals. **(National Register Criterion C)**.

Criterion C applies when:

> A house reflects the small house ideals blended with Modern Movement-era elements such as concrete block construction, steel casement windows that either wrap or are located at the outer edge, and pyramidal roofs with interior chimneys or hipped roofs with exterior façade chimneys. The apartment bungalow and California-type house reflect simplistic designs created principally by building form, construction materials, and minimal material finishes.

PROPERTY TYPE REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

For National Register eligibility, the apartment bungalow and California-type house must possess sufficient historic integrity by visibly reflecting the overall physical appearance it gained during their respective periods of historic significance. Generally speaking, historic integrity is composed of seven qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. (Note: See National Register Bulletin 15 for basic definitions of the seven aspects of integrity.)

Registration Requirements:

A. Apartment Bungalow

These resources should all be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C and integrity of design and materials should be present, with special emphasis placed on form, massing, fenestration, chimney placement, and roof type. Additionally, the retention of the original fenestration pattern and sill is required. Window sash and door replacements are the norm for this particular housing form; however, these replacements substantially compromise the integrity of design, materials and workmanship for an individual resource. In-kind replacements, specifically casement windows and flush doors with a vertical fixed light, should not compromise integrity of design and feeling. For an historic district, however, replacement of windows and doors should not be viewed as the sole determining factor when assessing integrity of materials and workmanship. Rather, the use of incompatible windows and doors should be measured with other alterations and additions if applicable when reviewing integrity of design and feeling.

Due to the age of these dwellings and their continued use, some degree of deterioration is to be expected. Given the tenuous nature of some of the building materials and the smooth exterior effect inherent to the

period of their construction, cyclical maintenance of these dwellings is paramount. However, their degree of deterioration should be viewed in respect to each other and not necessarily in comparison with dwellings of different architectural styles or forms constructed at the same time in Arlington County. These dwellings were constructed using different materials and construction techniques from many of the contemporaneous houses in the county.

The apartment bungalows that are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places should have integrity of **location, design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling and association.** These resources should meet the following requirements:

Location: An apartment bungalow should be located in an Arlington County, Virginia, residential suburb platted before 1938-1939. The vast majority of the houses are located in the Clarenford subdivision of Ballston/Virginia Square, with a few examples found in Waverly Hills, Arlington Ridge, Alcova Heights, and Bluemont.

Four examples are known to have been relocated to nearby residential subdivisions in Arlington County when Interstate 66 was constructed in 1963-1964. These houses contribute to historic context of the apartment bungalow despite their relocation. They are set within residential subdivisions, much like their original setting, and maintain setbacks typical to their new neighborhoods.

Design and Workmanship: An apartment bungalow should possess the following character-defining elements of the Modern Movement as typified in Arlington County, Virginia, from 1938 to 1939:

a. Square form;
b. Smooth exterior finishes;
c. Pyramidal roof with overhang;
d. Interior chimney;
e. Wrapping corner windows;
f. Projecting bay, if applicable, with porch;
g. Below-grade garage, if applicable; and
h. Lack of stylized ornamentation in favor of economical, simplistic design created merely by building forms and construction materials.

Materials: An apartment bungalow should utilize popular and innovative building materials from the late 1930s reflective of the Modern Movement. The original building materials include the following:

a. The structures are concrete block veneered in brick with stretcher-course bonding or a smooth stucco finish. Often the dwelling is painted. Formed stone is acceptable if it was an original exterior cladding material.
b. The roofs are pyramidal, covered in asphalt shingles.

c. Entry surrounds, if applicable as not all houses presented a surround, are exposed brick or stuccoed quoins. Porches and stoops are masonry, typically concrete faced in brick or stucco.
d. Casement windows of steel are original and a hallmark of the Modern Movement and this particular housing form.
e. Brick interior chimneys are common, some covered in stucco. Two examples of original exterior-end brick chimneys were noted as the work of one independent builder.

Setting: An apartment bungalow should be sited within a residential, single-family neighborhood. Often, these dwellings are located on standardized lots that are typically 40 feet by 125 feet. The houses have a typical common setback of 30 feet from the street with sidewalks along the perimeter. Several, but not all, examples have driveways. Paved walkways from the sidewalk and driveway are common.

Feeling: An apartment bungalow should maintain the necessary physical features, taken together, to convey its historic character, specifically the period during which it was constructed. By retaining the original design, majority of the construction materials, workmanship, and setting, these single-family dwellings can express an aesthetic and historic sense of residential construction in Arlington County in the late 1930s. Individual elements that should be retained or replaced in-kind are the following:

a. Square form;
b. Smooth exterior finishes;
c. Pyramidal roof with overhang;
d. Interior chimney;
e. Wrapping corner windows;
f. Projecting bay, if applicable, with porch; and
g. Lack of stylized ornamentation in favor of economical, simplistic design created merely by building forms and construction materials.

Association: An apartment bungalow should maintain a link between its historic origin and the events that led up to its creation. The resources can reflect this association by remaining a largely unaltered single-family dwelling and resembling mid-twentieth-century Modern Movement small house trends from the late 1930s.

An apartment bungalow in Arlington County dating from 1938 or 1939 will meet registration eligibility requirements if:

1. **Wall Materials:** Original wall materials should be intact and non-historic cladding must not be introduced on the façade and secondary elevations. Replacing portions of damaged original masonry or of replacement veneer/cladding with in-kind masonry or with veneer/cladding to match the original or of comparable appearance to the original shall not compromise the

building's ability to meet eligibility requirements. Replacing portions of damaged stucco or formed stone with in-kind stucco or formed stone to match shall not cause the building to fail to meet eligibility requirements. The application of vinyl or aluminum siding, thereby creating a horizontal emphasis from the siding that was not consistent with the building's historic appearance, shall affect the building's integrity of design, workmanship, materials, and feeling, thus compromising its eligibility. Original exposed brick veneer, painted brick, formed stone, or a stucco finish should not be altered with the application of non-historic exterior finish.

2. **Windows:** Replacement of the original sash or casement windows is common and has been determined to be acceptable for this particular housing form if certain requirements are met: the original fenestration pattern, sill, and opening size must remain intact; the original openings must not be ornamented by non-historic surrounds, lintels, or arches; and the original openings must read as wrapping or outer bay corner windows. The creation of new window openings will compromise the eligibility of the resource. Original window sash must be present or replaced in-kind with sash or casement windows.

3. **Doors:** Replacement of the original main entry doors is permissible and overwhelmingly common. Original doors, however, should be replaced in-kind. The exterior, taken as a whole system, is composed of relatively few elements due to the smooth exterior presented by the dwelling. Any interruption of this, albeit as minimal as a door, will alter the design and character of the dwelling. Further, many of the original door openings are sheltered by minimalist hoods or caps, or are recessed. These hoods and recessed openings must be retained in-kind. Original doors must be present or replaced in-kind with flush door pierced by vertically placed rectangular fixed window.

4. **Roofs:** Original roof form and its overhanging eaves with shallow soffit must remain unchanged. A character-defining feature of the apartment bungalow is its pyramidal roof. Many of the roofs have replacement asphalt shingles due to maintenance needs; this replacement, however, does not compromise the integrity of the building. Gutters are commonly adhered to the edges of the overhanging eaves and shall not affect the eligibility of the resource. Original semicircular and gabled vents with louvers projecting from the front and rear slopes of the roof should be maintained. These vents should not be enlarged. Dormers and rooftop additions (including an upper story or addition that intersects the main roof) will compromise the integrity of the resource and render it not eligible.

5. **Chimneys:** The original form, height, and exterior treatment of a chimney should not be altered. Another character-defining feature of the apartment bungalow is the interior chimney; some are set slightly off center and two are known to have been placed originally on the side elevation. The original chimney stack may be repaired or replaced in-kind. Chimneys should not be added

to the dwelling that can be viewed from the public right-of-way.

6. **Additions**: Modest additions are not common, but have occurred in a few instances. The modest size of the apartment bungalow is a character-defining feature of this particular pre-World War II domestic form and should not be compromised by any additions, even those that are located on the rear.

7. **Garages**: Garages are sometimes integral to the structure of the apartment bungalow if below grade or freestanding. Yet, the majority of the examples do not have garages. Construction of a freestanding garage or carport on the property shall not compromise eligibility. Removal of an original integral garage or the addition of an attached garage, however, will affect the integrity of design and, thus, render the resource not eligible. The addition of a garage below grade will not compromise integrity of the building's design or workmanship, but may affect the integrity of its setting, materials, and/or feeling.

8. **Secondary Resources:** Original secondary resources are not common, but do exist. These resources must remain in their original locations and display their original forms. The introduction of a non-original secondary structure to the property is permissible if it does not negatively affect the dwelling's form and setting.

9. **Landscape:** Landscaping should not deter from the architectural characteristics of the apartment bungalow. Window and door openings should not be obscured by plantings. Importantly, the horizontal emphasis and sense of movement of the structure must be preserved and not interrupted by natural elements or hardscaping introduced by the homeowner. Main entry openings are often accessible by porches or stoops that are ornamented with plantings and paved walkways leading to the sidewalk and driveways. Side entry openings lead to paved driveways, but in some instances open onto the side yards, which lack paved walkways.

10. **Interiors**: The original first-floor plans of the apartment bungalows are substantially unaltered, although upgrades relating to HVAC, mechanical equipment, bathrooms, and kitchens have occurred. These alterations are normal and expected, although the high-degree as to which the owners have taken steps to retain the original interior design and characteristics of the design is notable. The interiors consist of a living room, kitchen with dining area, two bedrooms, and one full bath. The full-size basement originally provided laundry space, and, in most cases, has been finished to provide additional bedrooms, office space, bathrooms, and family rooms. The original floors are four-inch oak or pine with six-inch-high base boards with an ogee-molded cap. The kitchens and basement originally had linoleum floors. The original entry openings in the more public spaces are segmentally arched, lacking casings. The main entry, openings to the bedrooms and bathrooms, and closets are framed with triple stepped casing finished with an interior bead.

The casings are four inches wide, dark-stained pine. The original window openings have a square-edged sill but lack surrounds. Some of the living rooms have coved ceilings. Many of the rooms have textured walls and ceilings. Original built-in cabinets and drawers are common, but not similar in the four examples surveyed. Cedar-lined closets, thought to be original to the interior design, were noted in two of the four examples examined. Original enclosed, straight-flight stairs lead from the basements, at the side doors. The houses contain approximately 900 square feet, measuring 30 feet square.

B. California-type House

These resources should all be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C and integrity of design and materials should be present with special emphasis placed on form, massing, fenestration, chimney placement, and roof type. Window and door replacements are the norm for this particular housing form; however, these replacements should not be viewed as a sole determining factor when assessing integrity of materials and workmanship. In particular, the retention of the original fenestration pattern and sill is required.

Due to the age of these dwellings and their continued use, some degree of deterioration is to be expected. Given the tenuous nature of some of the building materials and the smooth exterior effect inherent to the period of their construction, cyclical maintenance of these dwellings is paramount. However, their degree of deterioration should be viewed in respect to each other and not necessarily in comparison with dwellings of different architectural styles or forms constructed at the same time in Arlington County. These other dwellings were constructed using different materials and construction techniques from many of the contemporaneous houses in the county.

The California-type houses that are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places should have integrity of **location, design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling and association.** These resources should meet the following requirements:

Location: A California-type house should be located in a residential suburb platted before 1946. The vast majority of the houses are located in Glencarlyn and the Tuckahoe Village and Offutt's Leeway Gardens subdivisions of Leeway Overlee and Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village in Bluemont, with a few examples found in East Falls Church and Highland Park-Overlee Knolls. No examples are known to have been relocated. If a California-type house is relocated, it must be set within a contemporaneous residential subdivision of Arlington County. The building must maintain a setting and setback typical of its original subdivision but consistent with its new neighborhood.

Design and Workmanship: A California-type house should possess the following character-defining elements of the Modern Movement and ranch house as typified in Arlington County, Virginia, from

1946 to 1952:

a. Rectangular form;
b. Smooth exterior finishes;
c. Hipped or pyramidal roof;
d. Exterior-façade chimney;
e. Planter boxes, if applicable;
f. Recessed entry, if applicable;
g. Projecting bay, if applicable;
h. Corner windows and/or openings set at the outer edge of the end bays; and
i. Lack of stylized ornamentation in favor of economical, simplistic design created merely by building forms and construction materials.

Materials: A California-type house should utilize popular and innovative building materials from the post-World War II period that reflect the Modern Movement. These original building materials include the following:

a. The structures are concrete block veneered in brick with stretcher-course bonding or a smooth stucco finish. Often the dwelling is painted. Formed stone is acceptable if it was an original exterior cladding material.
b. The roofs are hipped, covered in asphalt shingles.
c. Entry surrounds are original to the building. Stoops are masonry, typically concrete faced in brick or stucco.
d. Casement windows of steel are original and a hallmark of the Modern Movement and this particular housing form.
e. Brick exterior-façade chimneys are the norm, some covered in stucco or constructed of stone.

Setting: A California-type house should be sited within a residential, single-family neighborhood. Often, these dwellings are located on standardized lots that are typically 40 feet by 110 feet. The houses have a typical common setback of 40 feet from the street with sidewalks along the perimeter. Several, but not all, examples have driveways. Paved walkways from the sidewalk and driveway are common.

Feeling: A California-type house should maintain the necessary physical features, taken together, to convey its historic character, specifically the period during which it was constructed. By retaining the original design, majority of the construction materials, workmanship, and setting, these single-family dwellings can express an aesthetic and historic sense of residential construction in Arlington County in the post-World War II period. Individual elements that should be retained or replaced in-kind are the following:

a. Rectangular form;
b. Smooth exterior finishes;

c. Hipped roof with overhang;
d. Exterior-façade chimney;
e. Corner windows and/or openings set at the outer edge of the end bays;
f. Planter boxes, if applicable;
g. Recessed entry, if applicable;
h. Projecting bays, if applicable; and
i. Lack of stylized ornamentation in favor of economical, simplistic design created merely by building forms and construction materials.

Association: A California-type house should maintain a link between its historic origin and the events that led up to its creation. The resources can reflect this association by remaining a largely unaltered single-family dwelling and resembling mid-twentieth-century Modern Movement small house trends (ranch house) from the post-World War II period, specifically 1946 to 1952.

A California-type house in Arlington County dating from 1946 to 1952 will meet registration eligibility requirements if:

1. **Wall Materials:** Original wall materials should be intact and non-historic cladding must not be introduced on the façade and secondary elevations. Replacing portions of original damaged masonry or of replacement veneer/cladding with in-kind masonry or veneer/cladding to match the original or of comparable appearance to the original shall not compromise the building's ability to meet eligibility requirements. Replacing portions of original damaged stucco with in-kind stucco to match shall not cause the building to fail to meet eligibility requirements. The application of vinyl or aluminum siding, thereby creating a horizontal emphasis from the siding that was not consistent with the building's historic appearance, shall affect the building's integrity of design, workmanship, materials, and feeling, thus compromising its eligibility. Original exposed brick veneer, painted brick, or a stucco finish should not be altered with the application of non-historic exterior finish.

2. **Windows:** Replacement of the original sash or casement windows is common and has been determined to be acceptable for this particular housing form if certain requirements are met: the original fenestration pattern, sill, and opening size must remain intact; and the original openings must not be ornamented by non-historic surrounds, lintels, or arches. The creation of new window openings will compromise the eligibility of the resource if visible from the public right-of-way. Original window sash must be present or replaced in-kind.

3. **Doors:** Replacement of the original main entry doors is permissible and overwhelmingly common. Original doors, however, should be replaced in-kind. The exterior, taken as a whole system, is composed of relatively few elements due to the smooth exterior presented by the dwelling. Any interruption of this, albeit as minimal as a door, will alter the design and character

of the dwelling. Further, many of the original openings are recessed or sheltered by the overhang of the main roof. These recessed openings and overhangs must be retained in-kind.

4. **Roofs:** Original roof form and its overhanging eaves with shallow soffit must remain unchanged. A character-defining feature of the California-type house is its shallow hipped roof. Many of the roofs have replacement asphalt shingles due to maintenance requirements; this replacement, however, does not compromise the integrity of the building. Gutters are commonly adhered to the edges of the overhanging eaves and shall not affect the eligibility of the resource. Dormers and rooftop additions (including the construction of an upper story or addition that intersects the main roof) will compromise the integrity of the resource and possibly render it not eligible.

5. **Chimneys:** The original form, height, and exterior treatment of a chimney should not be altered. Another character-defining feature of the California-type house is the exterior chimney on the façade, set to the side of the main entry. The original chimney stack may be repaired or replaced in-kind. The stack can either interrupt the overhanging eaves or project through the soffit. It typically has stepped shoulders. Chimneys should not be added to the dwelling that can be viewed from the public right-of-way.

6. **Additions**: Modest additions are not common, but have occurred in a few instances. The modest size of the California-type house is a character-defining feature of this particular post-World War II domestic form and should not be compromised by additions. Additions standing one story in height that are applied to the rear of the structure, and thus not fully visible from the public right-of-way, will not cause the building to fail to meet eligibility requirements. Side or front additions, as well as upper-story and multi-height rear additions, will render the resource not eligible. Enlargement of the projecting bays and addition of a front porch will also affect eligibility.

7. **Garages/Carports**: California-type houses may have original garages or carports. Garages are always freestanding and never integrated. Carports are sometimes attached to the side elevations but do not interfere with the building's plan, form, and/or massing. The majority of the examples do not have associated garages. Construction or removal of an historic garage or carport on the property will not compromise the resource's eligibility. The addition of an attached garage, however, will affect the dwelling's integrity of design and, thus, render the resource not eligible.

8. **Secondary Resources:** Original secondary resources are not common, but do exist. These resources must remain in their original locations and display their original forms. The introduction of a non-original secondary structure to the property is permissible if it does not negatively affect the dwelling's form and setting.

9. **Landscape:** Landscaping should not deter from the architectural characteristics of the California-type house. Window and door openings should not be obscured by plantings. Importantly, the horizontal emphasis and sense of movement of the structure must be preserved and not interrupted by natural elements or hardscaping introduced by the homeowner. Main entry openings are often accessible by porches or stoops that are ornamented with plantings and paved walkways leading to the sidewalk and driveways. A single planter is an integral and original part of the structure, projecting from just below one of the window openings on the façade (typically abutting the chimney stack). The examples with a projecting bay do not have planters.

10. **Interiors**: The original first-floor plans of the California-type house should be substantially unaltered, although upgrades relating to HVAC, mechanical equipment, bathrooms, and kitchens may occur as necessary. These alterations are normal and expected, though the high degree to which the owners have taken steps to retain the original interior design and characteristics of the design is notable. The interiors consist of a living room, kitchen with dining area, two bedrooms, and one full bath. The full-size basement originally provided additional living and laundry space, and, in most cases, has been finished to provide bedrooms, office space, bathrooms, and family rooms. The original floors are typically parquet with six-inch-high base boards with an ogee-molded cap. The original entry openings in the more public spaces are segmentally arched, lacking casings. The houses contain approximately 1,141 square feet.

G. GEOGRAPHIC DATA

Organized by building form (e.g.: Apartment Bungalow and California-type House), then by neighborhood and subdivision.

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
3900	South	7th Street	Apartment Bungalow	Alcova Heights	Alcova Heights	1938	American Homes, Inc.	A.E. Casgrain	Stucco	Interior center
3904	South	7th Street	Apartment Bungalow	Alcova Heights	Alcova Heights	1939	E.M. Parks	American Homes, Inc.	Stucco	Interior center
3908	South	7th Street	Apartment Bungalow	Alcova Heights	Alcova Heights	1938	American Homes, Inc.	V. Lewis Bassie	Stucco	Interior center
3919	South	7th Street	Apartment Bungalow	Alcova Heights	Alcova Heights	1939	Miller Brothers	Nicholas C. Miller	Stucco	Exterior Side
3923	South	7th Street	Apartment Bungalow	Alcova Heights	Alcova Heights	1939	Miller Brothers	Nicholas C. Miller	Brick Veneer	Exterior Side
1031	South	21st Street	Apartment Bungalow	Arlington Ridge	Addison Heights	1939	Harold P. Hallock	George C. Stoodt	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1210	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	Berse & Sale	Lois J. Weldon	Permastone and Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1216	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	Berse & Sale	Henry and Barbara Mustin	Brick Veneer	Interior center
1223	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	Berse & Sale	Kermit and Louise Aleshire	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1229	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	L. and T.C. Melmer	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1243	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Samuel and Celia Bryan	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Side

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
1247	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Walter and N.A. Dean	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1248	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	V.F. Bond	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1301	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	W.E. Aoy	Brick Veneer	Interior center
1304	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	Berse & Sale	Howard and Vera Long	Brick Veneer	Interior center
1316	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	William Sick	Permastone and Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1317	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Oliver E. Oversoth	Permastone	Interior center
1321	North	Stuart Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Abraham Pollock	Vinyl Siding	Interior center
1207	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Horace St. Germaine	Stucco Exterior	interior center
1210	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1938	American Homes, Inc.	E.F. Ligen	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1212	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	A. Sowers	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1215	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	L. Lester Randall	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1219	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	William and Leala Clever	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1226	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Allease R. Sowers	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1244	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1938	American Homes, Inc.	David Frye	Stucco Exterior	Interior center

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
1301	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	V.D. Young	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1308	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Fairview Realty Company	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1313	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Sara L. Hunt	Permastone and Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1316	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1938	R.D. Burton	E.R. and M.A. Hamilton	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1317	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	James Simms	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1321	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Robert S. Loney	Vinyl Siding	Interior center
1227	North	Vermont Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1938	R.D. Burton	Harry and Daisey Deering	Brick Veneer and Aluminum Siding	Interior center
1235	North	Vermont Street	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	T.D. Sowers	Fern Wray Klainberger	Stucco Exterior with Permastone	Interior center
1124	North	Stuart Street**	Apartment Bungalow	Ballston/Virginia Square	Resubdivision of Clarenford	1938	Ricker	John P. Brock	Stucco	Interior center
600	North	Jefferson Street	Apartment Bungalow	Bluemont	Bon Air	1939	William E. Eddy	L.G. Richardson	Stucco Exterior	removed
851	North	Jefferson Street	Apartment Bungalow	Bluemont	Veitch	1939	R.F. Riley	Not Listed	Stucco	Interior center
1729	North	Cameron Street**	Apartment Bungalow	Langston Brown	Highview Park	1939	T.D. Sowers	Harry I. Tinneirs	Stucco	Interior center
1803	North	Cameron Street**	Apartment Bungalow	Langston Brown	Highview Park	1941	Unknown	Unknown	Formed Stone	Interior center
1917	North	Edison Street**	Apartment Bungalow	Langston Brown	Highview Park	1939	T.D. Sowers	Stanley F. Rollings	Alumium Siding	Interior center

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
1713	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow	Waverly Hills	Waverly Hills	1939	M.A. Cardwell	M.A. Cardwell	Permastone and Stucco Exterior	Interior center
1220	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow with Projection	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	Sol Adelman	John L. Telford	Brick Veneer	Exterior Side
1222	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow with Projection	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	Sol Adelman	Sol Adelman	Brick Veneer	Exterior Side
1228	North	Taylor Street	Apartment Bungalow with Projection	Ballston/Virginia Square	Clarenford	1939	Sol Adelman	Sol Adelman	Brick Veneer	Exterior Side
5212	North	8th Road	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
5216	North	8th Road	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
5220	North	8th Road	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
5300	North	8th Road	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
5304	North	8th Road	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
5308	North	8th Road	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
850	North	Greenbrier Street	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
851	North	Greenbrier Street	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
852	North	Greenbrier Street	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
855	North	Greenbrier Street	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
858	North	Greenbrier Street	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
859	North	Greenbrier Street	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
5301		Wilson Blvd	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
5309		Wilson Blvd	California-type with Projection	Bluemont	Offutt's Addition to Brandon Village	1952	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Southwood Development Corporation	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
6057	North	25th Road	California-type	East Falls Church	Norwood	1947	J.E. Thompson	Hardin B. Arledge	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
6061	North	25th Road	California-type	East Falls Church	Norwood	1947	J.E. Thompson	Hardin B. Arledge	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
110	South	Kensington Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Carlin Springs	1948	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
114	South	Kensington Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Carlin Springs	1948	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	J.W. Farrell	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5528	South	3rd Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1950	Kramer & Carter	Not Listed	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5412	South	4th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	James C. King	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5416	South	4th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Florence Nichol	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5420	South	4th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Mildred J. Williams	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5424	South	4th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5428	South	4th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Margaret H. McKone	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5500	South	4th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5509	South	4th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1952	Vaughn & Usilton	Vaughn & Usilton	Brick Veneer/ Aluminum Siding	Exterior Façade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
5513	South	4th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1952	Vaughn & Usilton	Vaughn & Usilton	Brick Veneer/ Asbestos Shingles	Exterior Façade
5421	South	5th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Alice Molstrom	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5425	South	5th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	B.K. Watkins	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5417	South	5th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Robert Storey	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5613	South	5th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1946	Hamilton Homes, Inc.	Not Listed	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5621	South	5th Street	California-type	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1946	Hamilton Homes, Inc.	Elisa R. Packer	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5717	South	2nd Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1949	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	Serge Obolensky	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5720	South	2nd Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1949	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	A. Palmer	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5721	South	2nd Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1949	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	Howard Capmen	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5705	South	3rd Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1949	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	Not Listed	Brick Veneer with Siding	Exterior Façade
5709	South	3rd Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1949	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	Richard O. Read	Aluminum Siding	Exterior Façade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
5713	South	3rd Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1949	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	Horace B. Daley	Permastone and Aluminum Siding	Exterior Façade
5712	South	3rd Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	Mrs. Hampton	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5716	South	3rd Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	John B. Clemmons	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5404	South	4th Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1950	Glen Realty Company, Inc.	Not Listed	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5408	South	4th Street	California-type with Projection	Glencarlyn	Glencarlyn	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Wood Shingles	Exterior Façade
1602	North	Lexington Street	California-type	Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Highland Park	1952	Diebler, Jr. & Greene	Earl G. Sisson	Stucco	Exterior Façade
6007	North	19th Road	California-type with Projection	Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Overlee Knolls	1950	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Brick Veneer (painted)	Exterior Façade
6011	North	19th Road	California-type with Projection	Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Overlee Knolls	1950	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Not Listed	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
1906	North	Nottingham Street	California-type with Projection	Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Overlee Knolls	1950	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
5817	North	22nd Street	California-type	Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Richmond Hill	1948	C.J. Saxer Construction Company	John H. Gullett	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5825	North	22nd Street	California-type	Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Richmond Hill	1948	John H. Gullett	Lewis J. King, Jr.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5829	North	22nd Street	California-type	Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Richmond Hill	1949	John H. Gullett	John H. Gullett	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5836	North	22nd Street	California-type	Highland Park-Overlee Knolls	Richmond Hill	1949	John H. Gullett	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
6012	North	25th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Norwood	1952	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
6024	North	25th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Norwood	1952	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
2401		John Marshall Drive	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Norwood	1952	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Brick Veneer and Vinyl Siding	Exterior Façade
2405		John Marshall Drive	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Norwood	1952	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
2411		John Marshall Drive	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Norwood	1952	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
2417		John Marshall Drive	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Norwood	1952	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Offutt Building Company, Inc.	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
5615	North	26th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens	1951	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	William B. Parson	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5623	North	26th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens	1951	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	John W. Sheehy	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5627	North	26th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens	1951	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Elbert P. Jenkins	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5631	North	26th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens	1951	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Jack Neam	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5612	North	27th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens	1951	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Dong Lee	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5616	North	27th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens	1951	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Marjorie Moffitt	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5620	North	27th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens	1951	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	R. Watts	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5628	North	27th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens	1951	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	Charles O. Vermillion	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5632	North	27th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Offutt's Leeway Gardens	1951	W.E.O. Construction Corporation	R.E. Maleen	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
5519	North	22nd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1947	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Unknown	Stucco	Exterior Facade
5531	North	22nd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1947	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Lewis G. Smith	Stucco	Exterior Façade
5701	North	22nd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	John E. Lee, Jr.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5705	North	22nd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Glick	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5504	North	23rd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Carol H. Scharff	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5508	North	23rd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	S.C. Tuttle	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5512	North	23rd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Joyce Love	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5516	North	23rd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	William Pryor	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5600	North	23rd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Charles E. Owen	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5601	North	23rd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5608	North	23rd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior and Vinyl Siding	Exterior Façade
5621	North	23rd Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1949	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Jack Linthrune	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
5531	North	24th Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1947	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Aluminum Siding	Exterior Facade
5527	North	24th Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1947	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Facade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
5612	North	24th Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1947	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Facade
2210	North	Kensington Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1950	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2226	North	Kensington Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco	Exterior Facade
2230	North	Kensington Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2304	North	Kensington Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2305	North	Kensington Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1949	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2308	North	Kensington Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	William G. Nix	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2312	North	Kensington Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2209	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2213	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2217	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Robinson	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2221	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Albert Eller	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2225	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2301	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
2304	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2305	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	m. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2308	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2312	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2316	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2320	North	Kentucky Street	California-type	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1948	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5612	North	23rd Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1949	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Flatcher	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
5613	North	23rd Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1949	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	William T. Collins	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5616	North	23rd Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1949	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Peter Xereas	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5617	North	23rd Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1949	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Brick Veneer	Exterior Façade
5620	North	23rd Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1949	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Ira C. Redfern	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade

Street #		Street Address	Form	Neighborhood	Subdivision	Date	Builder	Original Owner	Exterior Finish	Chimney Placement
5624	North	23rd Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1951	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
5630	North	23rd Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1951	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Brick Veneer	Exterior Facade
5604	North	24th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1950	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Mrs. Gilbert	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Facade
5608	North	24th Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1950	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Claude L. Layman	Stucco Exterior	Interior center
2214	North	Kensington Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1950	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	T.J. Montgomery	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2218	North	Kensington Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1950	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Not Listed	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade
2222	North	Kensington Street	California-type with Projection	Leeway Overlee	Tuckahoe Village	1950	M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc.	Gilmore J.P. Lundquist	Stucco Exterior	Exterior Façade

**Moved in 1963-1964 from Clarenford subdivision with the construction of Interstate 66.

H. SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS

The goal of the project was to gather and evaluate information about the apartment bungalow constructed in 1938 and 1939 and California-type houses from 1946 to 1952 in Arlington County, Virginia. These resources were investigated to more fully comprehend and support their contribution to Arlington County's architectural heritage. The project was intended to: 1) complete documentation of these two specific domestic forms that have not been studied within a thematic context during previous surveys conducted by the county; and 2) collect additional information on and survey previously unidentified or unevaluated domestic resources that are distinctly different in form, massing, scale, materials, and/or fenestration to the traditional and widely accepted forms and styles of Arlington County. The purpose of the project was to officially acknowledge the significant resources that have, until now, been largely unrecognized and undocumented. The survey identified a total of 40 extant examples of the apartment bungalow and 110 extant California-type Houses in Arlington County.

To achieve the desired products, EHT Traceries, Inc., organized a team of professional architectural historians with the credentials, skills, and successful experience to do the work. The team was composed of a project director/senior architectural historian and a number of architectural historian/surveyors. The project director/senior architectural historian managed the administration of the survey project, directed the tasks, and was responsible for research and preparation of the multiple property nomination. As part of this project, the senior architectural historian visited the interiors of four apartment bungalows. The architectural historian/surveyors were responsible for conducting the survey/identification of the historic buildings. The research assignments included the investigation of primary and secondary sources, maps, and historic photographs for information on the development of the neighborhoods where these housing forms have been identified. Research into the history of Arlington County was conducted prior to, in conjunction with, and after the completion of the documentation. Unpublished materials on the history of the county, and more importantly, on individual properties and neighborhoods, were found at the Arlington County Historical Society and the Virginia Room of Arlington County Library. Historic maps located at the Library of Congress presented important information on the development and growth of the county. This work evolved from fifteen years of on-site survey conducted by EHT Traceries, Inc., from 1996 to 2011, which has resulted in the documentation of over 20,000 historic properties in Arlington County.

The context of the research assignments ranged from the examination of general histories of Arlington County for an understanding of the county's development, to specific tasks, such as the influence of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and its decision to use Arlington County as a testing ground for its housing programs. Most significantly was the study of the FHA bulletins and publications related to small house planning, modern architecture, community planning, and any documentation related to the evaluation/adaptation of the ranch house.

The study resulted in the following accomplishments: 1) conducted on-site surveys, photography and documentation of the apartment bungalow from 1938 and 1939 and California-type houses from 1946 to 1952 in Arlington County; and 2) developed a historic context of the apartment bungalow and California-type houses and influences affecting their design and lack of limited success in Arlington County. The properties are grouped under two historic context themes: 1) The Apartment Bungalow of Arlington County, Virginia, 1938-1939; and 2) The California-Type House of Arlington County, Virginia, 1946-1952. The influence of the FHA on small house planning, Modern Movement-era architecture, the ranch house form, and pre- and post-World War II housing needs of Arlington County determined the periods of significance for the historic contexts.

I. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHY REFERENCES

Albrecht, Donald, editor. *World War II and the American Dream: How Wartime Building Changed a Nation*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995.

American Experience. "People & Events: Chicago Century of Progress Exposition (World's Fair), 1933-1934." Public Broadcasting Service. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/streamliners/peopleevents/e_fair.html.

Bricker, David. "Ranch House Are Not All the Same." *Preserving the Recent Past 2*. Edited by Deborah Slaton and William G. Foulks. Washington, D.C.: Historic Preservation Education Foundation, National Park Service, and Association for Preservation Technology International, 2000.

Carley, Rachel. *The Visual Dictionary of American Domestic Architecture*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company, 1994.

Federal Housing Administration. *Architectural Planning and Procedure for Rental Housing.* Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office, 1939.

Federal Housing Administration. *The FHA Story in Summary, 1934-1959*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, n.d.

Federal Housing Administration. *Technical Bulletin No. 1, Recent Developments in Dwelling Construction*. Washington, D.C. Federal Housing Administration, September 1, 1936.

Federal Housing Administration. *Technical Bulletin No. 2, Modern Design.* Washington, D.C. Federal Housing Administration, 1 March 1941.

Federal Housing Administration. *Technical Bulletin No. 4, Principles of Planning Small Houses*. Washington, D.C. Federal Housing Administration, 1936, revised July 1, 1940.

"Fenestra Steel Sash." *The Horseless Age*. vol. XXIV, No. 1. New York, NY: 7 July 1909.

Garlinghouse Ranch and Suburban Homes. Topeka, KA: L.F. Garlinghouse Company, Inc., 1948.

Homer Hoyt Associates. *Economic Survey of the Land Uses of Arlington County, VA.* Arlington, VA: Homer Hoyt Associates, September 1951.

Massey, James C. and Shirley Maxwell. *House Styles in America.* New York, NY: Penguin Studio, 1996.

Moor, Abby. "Eclectic Revivals." *The Houses We Live In.* Jeffery Howe, editor. London, England: PRC Publishing Limited, 2002.

National Housing Agency. *Planning the Expansible House: Six Schemes for Houses that Grow*. Washington, D.C., Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the Administrator, 1947.

National Register of Historic Places. Historic Residential Suburbs in the United States, 1830-1960, Multiple Property Document.

Rybczynski, Witold. "The Ranch House Anomaly: How America fell in and out of love with them." *Slate* Magazine. Posted 17 April 2007, http://www.slate.com/id/2163970?nav=ais.

Sunset Magazine, Editorial Staff. *Sunset Western Ranch Houses*. San Francisco, CA: Lane Publishing Company, 1946.

United States Department of Commerce. *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Housing, Volume II, General Characteristics*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943.

United States Department of Commerce. *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Population, Volume II, Characteristics of the Population*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943.

Washington Post, 1925-1960.

Weiss, Marc A. *The Rise of the Community Builders*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1987.