

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

RECEIVED
JUL 27 1994

National Register of Historic Places
Multiple Property Documentation Form

NATIONAL
REGISTER

This form is used for documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form (National Register Bulletin 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-9000-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items.

New Submission Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Apartment Buildings in Washington, D.C. 1880-1945

B. Associated Historic Contexts

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

- Apartment Buildings (1880-1945)
- Working Class Housing, Alley Dwellings, and Public Housing (1865-1950)

C. Form Prepared by

name/title Emily Hotaling Eig and Laura Harris Hughes Architectural Historians
organization Traceries date July, 1993
street & number 5420 Western Avenue telephone (301)656-5283
city or town Chevy Chase state Maryland zip code 20815

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 Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Robert L. Mallett
Signature and title of certifying official

7/22/94
Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

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.

Pattie Adams
Signature of the Keeper of the National Register

9/7/94
Date of Action

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and the title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets in How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form (National Register Bulletin 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.)	1-66
F. Associated Property Types (Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)	1-37
G. Geographical Data	1
H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods (Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)	1-21
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.)	1-15

Primary location of additional data:

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

Name of repository:

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. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 120 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 1

E. Statement of Historic Contexts

(If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)

THE HISTORIC CONTEXTS

SUB-THEMES

- I. The Introduction of Multi-Family Buildings in the District of Columbia**
- II. The Earliest Purpose-Built Apartment Buildings**
- III. The Luxury Apartment House: Hotel as Home**
- IV. The Popularization of the Apartment Building**
- V. The Evolution of the Master Apartment Building Architect**
- VI. The Apartment Building as a Washington Institution**
- VII. Modernism and the Apartment Building: Times, Style, and Technology**
- VIII. Public Housing Comes to the Nation's Capital**

INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on the "purpose-built" apartment building, the building designed and constructed to serve as a multiple dwelling.¹ Nearly 4,000 "purpose-built" apartment buildings were built in Washington, D.C., dating between 1880 and 1945. Of these, approximately 3,000 are standing today. The history of the development of the Washington apartment building is both important and engaging as the account of how a new building type is introduced, cultivated, and permanently established within an urban center, and its effect on the city.

The clustering of several families under one roof is often the result of economic or political necessity. Under many circumstances the question of how to house these families is moot: the families make do, working together as an extended family, or perhaps accommodating each family unit on separate floors. But to plan for the housing of separate families as independent units who choose to be lodged within the confines of a single building is a different issue, and one that has resulted in the formation of a specific building type-- the "purpose-built" apartment building.

¹ Those buildings that were designed to serve other purposes are significant here only in how they affected the appearance and utilization of the purpose-built building, either as a part of its evolution or as a source for inspiration.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 2

Apartment living was introduced to Washington, D.C. in the 1870s with the make-shift conversion of large buildings, including institutions and single-family residences, into small self-sufficient living units. Some of these conversions included kitchens and baths, others did not. However, unlike their predecessor, the boarding house, or their corresponding form, the hotel, these revised buildings were intended to be permanent residences capable of accommodating numerous family units.

Early Precedents

The concept of multi-family living is recorded as early as ancient Rome, where apartment "houses" were a popular solution to urban living in the fourth century B.C. In keeping with economic principles still in force today, these multiple-family dwellings allowed lower and middle class people to live near urban centers by fitting many families into buildings that did not require much land. Over the centuries, the increase in construction of the apartment building resulted in the evolution of specific forms and floor plans as well as the establishment of relevant building codes concerning setbacks, fire-proofing, and height limits. The need for the building type was constant until the fifth century A. D. when the fall of the Roman Empire and the resulting severe decline of the city rendered their function moot.

The Renaissance saw a resurgence in the type's popularity, once again spurred by the growth of cities. As trade, wealth, and population made urban life attractive again, so was there an increase in interest in providing multi-family living arrangements. Venice, Europe's most populated sixteenth century city, boasted numerous apartment buildings, several of which still stand today. Other cities, such as Vienna and Edinburgh, also retain examples of apartment buildings from the period.

In more modern times, most cities exhibited variations of the apartment building. Notably, London and Edinburgh developed individualized forms. It was the French example, however, which emerged as the most influential model of the building type for the United States. Paris, which still houses over 95 percent of its residential population in apartment buildings, has been regarded as a major center of apartment building design since the 1600s, although few of the earliest buildings remain. In the late nineteenth century, the Ecole des Beaux Arts brought new life and beauty to the form of the traditional multi-family dwelling. With Paris' development into one of Europe's premier cities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the apartment building continued to solve the need for abundant and economically viable housing for its burgeoning population. It was the late nineteenth-century, French apartment buildings that served as the archetype for the building type in American cities. The French style of exterior massing and

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 3

architectural treatment as well as the floor plans were transported by American architects to Boston, Chicago, and New York City in the 1870s.

Boston, Chicago and New York

According to James Goode in Best Addresses (1988), an authoritative study of the luxury apartment buildings of Washington, D.C., the Hotel Pelham in Boston was "the first authentic apartment house in the United States."² Dating to 1857, the Pelham was designed following the Parisian apartment model with one apartment unit per floor. It was the work of architect Alfred Stone completed for Dr. John H. Dix. Called a "hotel" from the French for private mansion, the building's apartments did not have private kitchens or bathrooms. This may account for the immediate demise of the sub-type as a location of permanent residence.³

The Hotel St. Cloud, following the Pelham by twelve years, was the next apartment building to be constructed in Boston and more closely adheres to the modern-day definition of an apartment building. In fact, Hotel St. Cloud (with New York's Hotel Stuyvesant) may be the first true American apartment building.⁴ Designed by the architect Nathaniel J. Bradlee, the 1869 building included kitchens and bathrooms in each apartment, a major step towards meeting the needs of permanent residents. Over the ensuing years, Boston's apartment house design took on its own distinct character. Large buildings featured commercial space on the ground floor, kitchens on the top, and servants' quarters reserved for the basement. The more modest "triple-deckers" are comprised of three units, one per floor, while the "double triple-decker" type consists of six units, two per floor, three per side connected by a stairhall-- both appearing as a detached house.

The first true apartment building constructed in New York City was Richard Morris Hunt's Stuyvesant Flats (1869). Hunt was the first American to be educated in architecture at the Ecole des Beaux Arts and his French experience can be seen throughout his career. Stuyvesant Flats

² James Goode, Best Addresses, p. 536.

³ For this study, this type of apartment building is labeled as an "Apartment-Hotel" sub-type and is not included in this historic context.

⁴ The fact that the Hotel Pelham more closely resembled a suite hotel than an apartment building leads one to speculate that the Hotel St. Cloud in Boston and the Hotel Stuyvesant in New York City, both dating to 1869, may be more likely contenders for the position of America's first authentic apartment building.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 4

was designed to fit into the New York residential streetscape; its four-story, low scale, rhythmic facade composition, and double entrances reduced its visual impact as a new building type. Unlike Boston's Pelham, each apartment of the Stuyvesant Flats was equipped with a kitchen and a bath.

The French flat, with one apartment unit per floor, was introduced to the city in the mid-1870s. This form seemed to be particularly appropriate to New York's long, narrow lots that had accommodated rowhouses for so long, and immediately caught on. Architects familiar with French design led the way in New York, skillfully handling the new forms and their companion interior plans. In the 1880s, larger apartment buildings were developed, often filling entire city blocks. Developer Juan de Navarro was responsible for the first of these massive buildings when he built the Central Park in 1883. Its spacious floor plan allowed for correspondingly spacious plans for the apartments. It, too, used French design of one apartment per floor as its model, offering large seven-room units complete with kitchens, baths and servants' quarters.

The apartment building did not reach Chicago until the 1880s. C. W. Westfall, in his study of the building type in that city, found that "From the beginning Chicago had resisted multifamily residences of any kind."⁵ Chicago's first apartment building was the obscure Waltone built in 1879. This was followed in 1880 by the seven-story Ontario Flats, designed by the architectural firm of Treat and Foltz. Utilizing the popular French form and architectural treatment, the floor plans were based on the prevailing style of Chicago's better residences. The apartments featured public parlors and dining rooms, obviating the need for private kitchens, clearly associating them with hotels; however, the individual apartment suites, as well as their location in residential sections of the city established their residential quality.⁶ Chicago's resistance to apartment buildings was manifested not in a rejection of their use, but rather in their packaging: "One of the growing tendencies of the present time in the large cities is the constantly increasing number of families making their permanent homes in hotels," pronounced the promotional brochure for the newly completed Virginia in 1890.⁷ This consistent ambiguity of the apartment/hotel became a defining characteristic of the city's interpretation of the building type continuing far into the twentieth century.

⁵ C.W. Westfall, "From Homes to Towers: A Century of Chicago's Best Hotels and Tall Apartment Buildings" in Chicago Architecture:1872-1922, p. 269.

⁶ Westfall, "From Homes to Towers," p.269.

⁷ Westfall, "From Homes to Towers," p. 276.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 5

Washington's Apartment Buildings

In Washington, large numbers of short-term residents, an inhibiting height limitation, and the development of zoning regulations and building codes combined with the economic and aesthetic requirements to give the city's apartment buildings their own distinct expression. Goode writes:

The development of the apartment house in Washington over the past century makes a complex story. Architecturally, the apartment has been affected constantly by changes in style and social patterns, war, depression and inflation, building codes, zoning laws, rent control, public transportation systems, demographic shifts, and technological developments. Architecture always reflects the forces that surround its inception; this maxim is magnified with the apartment.⁸

It was the New York apartment building that proved to be the most powerful inspiration for Washington's apartment building architecture, both in the early years and throughout the development of the building type. Although not every idea formulated in New York was appropriate for transference to Washington, many were. Massing, exterior decorative treatment, floor plans, even control of building height illustrate the influence of New York on Washington's early apartment building design. Washington, however, was not to be without its own unique variation of the type. This city, like the others, saw the apartment building evolve to respond to the specific conditions of local needs, tastes, and restrictions.

DEFINITIONS

The methodology used to prepare the Historic Context is defined by the following framework:

1) study of the building type resulted in the identification of a "purpose-built" apartment building. This property type was found to have eleven significant sub-types. These include: Conventional Low-Rise; Conventional Mid-Rise; Conventional High-Rise; Rowhouse-Type; Mansion-Type; Garden; Grand Garden; House-Type; Commercial-Residential; Stacked Flats; and Luxury Apartment House. Definitions of these sub-types are included in Section F: Associated Property Types;

⁸ Goode, Best Addresses, p. 3.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 6

-
- 2) due to the sheer volume of data on this topic, mention of a specific apartment building does not necessarily mean that the building holds sufficient significance to merit individual listing on the National Register of Historic Places, nor does the omission of a specific building indicate that it lacks merit for listing;
- 3) to facilitate an understanding of the breadth of this study, a complete chronological listing of all purpose-built apartment building identified during the 1985-87 survey of Washington apartment buildings, as well as frequency reports on names of architects, owners, and builders is attached at the end of the Section E: Statement of Historic Contexts.

THE SUB-THEMES

I. The Introduction of Multi-Family Buildings in the District of Columbia

From 1860 to 1865, during the Civil War, the population of the District of Columbia increased from 75,000 to 125,000. The city, never having enjoyed the full implementation of L'Enfant's grand plan, was under visual siege; military encampments and their accessory facilities, hotels, bordellos and the people who used them filled the parks and streets. The conclusion of the Civil War found the District tattered and torn, even less dignified a capital city than before: a city suffering from a shortage of money, supplies and a declining population. The throngs of people, both military and civilian who were attracted to the city during the war, quickly dispersed in peacetime. Simultaneously, political pressures to move the capital to a more central location were stronger than ever. This combination of forces resulted in an extraordinary effort to lift the city from the trenches and outfit it in a manner befitting a nation's capital. As Reconstruction was implemented around the country, the local power of Alexander "Boss" Shepherd, Territorial Governor of the District of Columbia, dramatically changed the physical character of Washington; streets were re-graded, parking areas and sidewalks introduced into the wide streets, gaslights installed, trees planted, and the Washington Canal was replaced by a sewer line. All of this effort, though highly controversial financially, played a major role in re-inspiring the belief that Washington could serve its country as the Nation's Capital, and once again draw and maintain a great residential population. These mid-nineteenth century conditions provide the setting for the story of the development of apartment buildings in Washington.

Although excellent examples of a new building type known as the "apartment house" were being introduced in other cities as early as 1857, in Washington there was a strong prejudice against the idea of permanent multi-family residences. The transient character of the Federal City would seem to have given the idea a sound basis. Most likely, two key factors diminished its popularity: first, the association of apartments with the poverty stricken tenement housing of nearby New York played a role in reducing the attraction of the idea, and second, the large amount of

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 7

undeveloped land already delineated as "city" and located close to the developed portion of the city.

Pressures for housing began to overcome this reluctance, at least on some social levels. In Washington, the first apartment buildings were not new buildings, but conversions of large multi-room buildings designed and constructed for other purposes. These early "apartment buildings" did not have notable lobbies, elevators or support staff, but they provided independent living units within a single building.

In 1870, Miss Lydia English's **Georgetown Female Seminary** (now the Colonial), located at 1305-15 30th Street, N.W., was one of the first, if not the first, building to be converted into true apartments.⁹ Another early example is **507 6th Street, N.W.** Built in the 1860s, in 1881 it was converted from a single family residence into a boarding house, and then, in 1909 into an apartment building. Long thought to be the city's earliest example of a purpose-built apartment building, it is now recognized as one of the many transformations that occurred as apartment life gained acceptance, particularly as an alternative to the boarding house or hotel.

The **Everett** at 1730 H Street, N.W. (1882, demolished), was converted from a single family residence by Edward Everett's grandchildren to the designs of the architects Hornblower and Marshall.¹⁰ The architects Gray and Page were responsible for remodeling three houses in the **1700 block of H Street, N.W.** into an eight-unit apartment building for Charles Hill in 1883. As an indication of the sweeping changes effected by the sudden popularity of apartment living, that same year Gray and Page designed two houses on 16th and K streets, N.W. for New Yorker William Prail, who then retained the firm to convert the almost completed dwellings into a single apartment house with two apartment suites per floor.¹¹

Another significant conversion is architect Nicholas Haller's reconstruction of the **Cambridge**, (1894), 510 I Street, N.W. Built in 1869 for Peter Dubant, Dubant retained Haller to alter his personal residence into a four-story apartment building in the Romanesque Revival style. In 1873, a purpose-built apartment building was planned for the 200 block of East Capitol Street,

⁹ Extensively renovated again in 1899 to a design of architect Appleton P. Clark, this apartment building has been known as the Colonial Apartments since that time. The building is significant for its employment of the Colonial Revival style.

¹⁰ The Washington Post, October 28, 1888, p. 7.

¹¹ The Evening Star, July 21, 1883, p. 5.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 8

N.E. The building was not constructed when the Panic of 1873 forced the owner into bankruptcy. It was only with the 1880's that Washington would see the construction of a true apartment building.

II. The Earliest Purpose-Built Apartment Buildings

In 1880, the first "purpose-built" apartments were constructed in Washington. These large, Victorian buildings were elegantly designed to serve an upper class clientele, providing full service staffs within the buildings, not unlike hotels. The exception was that the rooms were set up as suites with parlors, dining rooms, and bedrooms. Kitchens were only rarely included. Based on the New York "apartment house" model, these early buildings were the initial step toward a major change in Washington's attitude toward multi-family living.

Washington's first structure "purpose-built" to be an apartment building was the four-story **Fernando Wood Flats** (demolished) begun in May 1880. The building, named for its developer, a New York Congressman and former mayor of New York City with obvious Washington connections, was located at 1418 I Street, N.W. It was designed by John Brady and constructed by Robert Fleming of Washington.

In 1888, The Washington Post related a belated description of this seminal event:

The first attempt at a regular flat in this city was made about 1875 [sic], when Fernando Wood built a three-story house on I Street, between Fourteenth and Fifteenth streets, in the rear of what is now John Chamberlain's restaurant. In this house he made four suites of apartments, which rented very readily.¹²

The ground floor held commercial shops, while the three floors above housed the twelve apartments. Little else is known of the character of Washington's first "purpose-built" apartment building, but its importance cannot be underestimated.

Construction of a second apartment building began one month after the Fernando Wood Flats broke ground. A large, luxury building, the **Portland** (1880, demolished), 1125-1133 Vermont Avenue, N.W., was designed in the manner of "French Flats," but not limited to one apartment per floor. It was intended to match the splendor already associated with New York City's finest

¹² The Washington Post, October 28, 1888, p. 7.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 9

new examples of the building type. Designed by Washington architects Cluss and Schulze, it stood on Thomas Circle as a handsome addition to the Victorian city. The six-story, 39-unit Victorian edifice was constructed in 1880-81; with a major addition completing the V-shape form in 1883-84. Its owner-developer was Edward Weston, a successful apartment building developer from Yonkers, New York. The Washington Star waxed poetic as it related the many superior features of the completed Renaissance Revival style building where "sweet, fresh air and plenty of light throughout, convenient communications and fireproof constructions in all essential parts" set the stage for the elaborate service facilities in the basement including "a kitchen with six French cooking ranges, steam tables, oven, pastry and store-rooms, scullery, china-rooms, wine cellar, laundry, steam drying and ironing rooms" and the most modern gas and steam utilities. "...Suites of rooms, each consisting of parlor, dining-room, three chambers, kitchen, pantry, servants' room and bath-room, which are grouped around a private hall" was just one example of the various arrangements possible.¹³ The report detailed the sophisticated communications systems in place, the three sets of stairs and two elevators, and heralded the structural system and architectural treatment. The apartment interior detailing was described:

The exposed wood work of the interior is framed of combinations of cherry, oak, ash and white pine, with an occasional frieze ornamentations in color, all oiled and rubbed to dull faces. Most of the rooms have cheerful open fireplaces, fitted with iron facings, andirons, and movable half low-down grates. Those in the parlors have rich ebony mantles, ornamental tile borders and hearths and are surmounted by beveled mirrors. Where suitable, modern Turkish portieres are hung in place of doors. The architecture is fitly supplemented by the art of the decorator in the elegant furnishing of the building, done mostly by and at the expense of the owner.¹⁴

An exquisite description records the building's exterior design:

The external architecture of the Portland is kept in modern renaissance based upon the traditions of Italian art during the cinquecento. The walls are about 82 feet high, and are pleasantly relieved by a rich attica above the fifth story. The extreme height of the tower above the green sward surrounding the building is 130 feet. This tower is octagonal; it starts with a story in cut stone work in modern

¹³ The Evening Star, January 12, 1884, p. 5.

¹⁴ The Evening Star, January 12, 1884, p. 5.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 10

Doric, which is gradually transformed until a graceful cupola in kindred forms with an Oriental feeling is reached, and this is surmounted by a huge finial. The silhouette of the tower is enlivened by numbers of balconies of various sizes and shapes, jutting out towards all points of the compass on the different stories, and the dead surfaces of the walls are broken by ornamental panels of terra cotta blocks and of encaustic tile in chaste contrast of color with the red ground tone of pressed bricks.¹⁵

Weston, who wintered in Washington in his house on K Street, observed that the time was right for Washington's first luxury apartment house. However, few shared his enthusiasm for the idea and failure was predicted.

...Weston, a wealthy New Yorker, saw an opportunity for a good investment here. He saw that there was a floating element of Washington society that would patronize a first-class apartment house and he put up the "Portland." As the big house went up he heard many predictions that the plan would end in dismal failure. It did not, however. It paid right from the start, and two years later he had to put an addition to his house, and the Portland is now a regular gold mine to its owner.¹⁶

Other notable examples include the mansion-type **Maltby House** (1887, demolished), 200 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., designed by Robert Stead; the rowhouse-type **Canterbury** (1888), 704 3rd Street, N.W., designed by Johnson & Co. for J. Harvey Spalding and the Queen Anne style **Story Flats** (1889, demolished) at 715 13th Street, N.W., designed by T. F. Schneider for M. A. Story. The architects associated with these buildings were among the city's most accomplished, and almost all attempted to capitalize on their experience with the new building type. Although there are hardly any survivors from Washington's first decade of purpose-built apartment buildings, it is known that these first buildings were four to six stories high, had elevators, and their public and commercial spaces were placed on the ground floor. Located downtown, these moderate to large size structures were usually U-shaped. In most cases the apartments were sited at street intersections to maximize light and air. Although several styles were employed, as is typical of Victorian range of tastes, their stylistic treatment was compatible with the city's residential architecture. Facade composition was traditional and facades were ornamented with projecting bays, cornices, turrets, occasional porches and gabled roofs. The interior plans also followed that

¹⁵ The Evening Star, January 12, 1884, p. 5.

¹⁶ The Washington Post, October 28, 1888, p. 7.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 11

of traditional Victorian brick rowhouses.

III. The Luxury Apartment House: Hotel as Home

Although early apartment houses were built for a variety of social levels, it was only the luxury apartment houses that captured the attention of the city. The majority of these early buildings offered many amenities to their tenants, and most of these amenities were of the type that were associated with hotels. Large lobbies, suitable for public gatherings and reception services were expected. Public dining rooms were common. Commercial service facilities such as barber shops and drug stores were usually located on the ground floor. Kitchens, laundries and service facilities were placed in the basements. The individual apartments were spacious, and included parlors, dining rooms, bedrooms, and baths; kitchens were not included in the individual units, as most residents must have preferred to take their meals in the public dining rooms or perhaps the technicalities of numerous kitchens on numerous levels was too new to handle efficiently.

The Portland's financial success was critical to the furtherance of the building type in Washington. A number of new "apartment houses" were built during the 1880s, several of which featured lobbies, elevators, a public dining room, small shops, and a staff to serve the tenants. The **Richmond Flats** (1883, demolished) at 1701 H Street, N.W., was designed by architects Gray and Page, with an addition in 1887 designed by Henry T. E. Wendell. Owned by Lieutenant F. H. Paine, this building was designed and operated in keeping with the luxury character of the Portland. The Evening Star reported about the building while it was under construction:

The building is to be seven stories in height, with a fine round tower at the corner of 17th and H streets, 112 feet high above the basement floor, with spiral top and galvanized iron and Hummelstone brown stone all the way up...the plan of the building shows it to be 109 feet on 17th street by 130 feet on H street. It will contain ten apartments, with seven rooms in each apartment, all complete, making a distinct and separate dwelling of each.¹⁷

Like the Portland, a hydraulic elevator served each floor, while dumbwaiters provided meals directly from the basement kitchen into each apartment. Interior finishes were of hand-rubbed

¹⁷ The Evening Star, May 19, 1883, p. 2.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 12

natural poplar and cherry: "No paint will be used at all."¹⁸ Parlors featured fireplace mantels, and dining rooms were embellished with built-in cabinets. Kitchens were included for each apartment, but their location was outside the confines of the apartments (either in the basement, the attic or set away from the apartments on the intermediary floors) and possibly designed for communal use. This proved an unpopular arrangement, requiring additional servants, and is not seen in any later apartment building designs.

Years passed before new large luxury buildings were constructed. However, once construction began it continued at a steady pace. A few of the outstanding examples include: the **Cairo** (T. Franklin Schneider; 1894; 1615 Q Street, N.W.); the **Iowa** (T. Franklin Schneider; 1900; 1325 13th Street, N.W.); **Stoneleigh Court** (James G. Hill; 1902; 1013-1033 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.); the **Kenesaw** (now La Renaissance) (George W. Stone; 1905; 3060 16th Street, N.W.); the **Champlain** (Clinton Smith; 1904; 1424 K Street, N.W.); the **Ontario** (James G. Hill; 1903 and 1905; 2853 Ontario Road, N.W.); **Florence Court** (now California Court and California House) (T. Franklin Schneider; 1905; 2205 and 2153 California Street, N.W.); the **Westmoreland** (Edgar S. Kennedy and Harry Blake; 1905; 2122 California Street, N.W.); the **Wyoming** (B. Stanley Simmons; 1905, 1909 and 1911; 2022 Columbia Road, N.W.); the **Dresden** (Albert Beers; 1909; 2126 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.); the **Northumberland** (Albert Beers; 1909; 2039 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.); the **Woodward** (Harding and Upman; 1909; 2311 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.); the **Brittany** (A. M. Schneider; 1916; 2001 16th Street, N.W.); the **Altamont** (Arthur Heaton; 1915; 1901 Wyoming Avenue, N.W.); the **McCormick** (Jules H. deSibour; 1915; **2029 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.** (Hunter and Bell; 1915); **Meridian Mansions** (now the Envoy) (A. H. Sonneman; 1916; 2400 16th Street, N.W.); **Northbrook Court** (Frank Russell White; 1917; 3420-26 16th Street, N.W.); the **Whitelaw** (Isaiah T. Hatton; 1918; 1839 13th Street N.W.).

Probably the most famous of these, the twelve-story Cairo, was designed and constructed in 1894 by architect/entrepreneur T. Franklin Schneider. Of the more than one thousand buildings that he designed during his thirty-year career as an architect, the Cairo stands out as a unique achievement. Influenced heavily by his visit to the 1893 World Columbian Exposition, Schneider relied on Louis Sullivan's two-story Transportation Building as his inspiration for the Cairo's ornate entrance, cornice and balconies. He appears to have based the massing and organization on New York's Osbourne (57th Street) which was built in 1885 and recognized as "the second [after the Dakota] successful luxury apartment house in the city."¹⁹ Designed by the New York

¹⁸The Evening Star, May 19, 1883, p. 2.

¹⁹ Elizabeth Hawes, New York. New York: How the Apartment House Transformed the Life of the City, p. 104.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 13

architect James E. Ware, the Osbourne bears dramatic similarity to the Cairo both in its appearance and its saga. The Cairo, like the Osbourne, was constructed of iron and steel frame, a necessity to reach the height of these buildings. Both designed in a high-style of the day, the Renaissance Revival-style Osbourne, developed by the owner of a major stone quarry, was clad in rough-cut, deep-red stone, while the Cairo utilized light-colored brick to effect the look of limestone associated with the newly fashionable Beaux Arts style. The eleven-story Osbourne was designed to work as a complete living environment serving 40 families (four apartments per floor) with more amenities than might be imagined.

...the Osbourne seemed more eastern [than the open and adventuresome Dakota apartment house]--more ponderous, more cultured more centered. It felt like a sanctuary. The richness of its decoration created a sense of well-being of a beautiful Byzantine world closed in upon itself. The solidity of its construction...guaranteed peace and quiet... It had its own florist shop, fancy dining room, and private billiard room, its own doctor and pharmacy; a year-around croquet court was planned for the roof, and it felt complete, like a small city.²⁰

Although organized to house up to 110 families in small, two-room apartments, the Cairo, too, sought to provide every amenity to its residents.²¹

Upon entering the original Cairo, the visitor found a large lobby, with an ornate public desk to the left and classical pillars surrounding a marble fountain in the center. The lobby extended into the rear courtyard, where it was lighted by an arched skylight. Adjacent to the lobby was a public parlor, called the Oriental Room, with Moorish and [British] Indian furnishings and detail. Other public spaces on the first floor included the office, reading room, ballroom, and drugstore. In the basement an artesian well supplied the Cairo with fresh water. Although most of the apartments contained decorative fireplace mantels with gas logs, only electricity was used for lighting, a unique feature for an apartment house of this period.

²⁰ Elizabeth Hawes, New York, New York, p. 108.

²¹The Cairo's floor plan was flexible in character. Connecting doors allowed an individual apartment to be of any number of rooms.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 14

Most of the 110 apartments on the floors above contained two rooms and a bath. Only a few units had kitchens, since most of the residents took meals in the spacious dining room that originally occupied more than half of the twelfth floor. Almost all of the rooms on each floor connected so that an apartment could be expanded to any size by unlocking adjacent doors. A bowling alley, billiard room, and numerous service rooms were located in the high English basement.²²

This was all topped off by a roof garden and restaurant, one of Washington's first. Set twelve stories above the street, the Cairo was the tallest building in Washington when it was completed in 1894.

The Beaux Arts was initially introduced into Washington's apartment building vocabulary through the Cairo. Although its Moorish style exterior did not present the Beaux Arts style, its light stone coloration and reference to Louis Sullivan's Transportation Building from the 1893 World Columbian Exposition seemed to promise that change was in the air. Soon the public's penchant for exuberant Victorian ornament and deep tones of the city's ubiquitous red brick would change into a clamor for the lyrical embellishment and light coloration associated with the French style presented at the Chicago fair. Equally significant, if not more so, is the building's role in establishing limitations on the heights of Washington's buildings. Concern over the impact of these new large residential buildings was mounting: adjacent residents worried that their properties would be overshadowed; public officials feared that the District's fire fighting equipment was inadequate; and public-spirited aesthetes were threatened by the potential for violating the city's low scale with new structural and elevator technology. The Cairo was the final straw. Although thrilling to the public, the official response to the extreme height of this building was strong criticism. Three stories taller than the city's next tallest building, the Baltimore Sun Building on F Street, the Cairo's height sent a warning to the District's Board of Commissioners of the problems inherent to tall buildings. The result was their action passing the 1894 height limit regulations as part of the District's building code, limiting privately owned residential buildings to 90 feet (considered to be seven stories at the time) and commercial buildings to 110 feet.²³

²² Goode, Best Addresses, p. 18-19.

²³ Ironically, the eleven-story Osbourne was the last apartment building erected in New York City before the June 1885 passage of the New York State Daly Law, limiting for many years multiple dwellings to five or six stories.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 15

It was the erection of the Cairo Flats that directed the attention of the Commissioners to this matter. When the permit [to build] was granted several protests were filed with the Commissioners by the neighbors in the vicinity who claimed that the building would not only be a menace to the surrounding dwellings in case of fire or other catastrophe, but would depreciate their property by shutting off light and air. When the Board of Commissioners met several days after receipt of the protests, Commissioner Truesdell called the matter up for consideration. He agreed with the protestors and argued at length against such a building. Should a fire break out in any of the upper stories, there was not an engine in the city that could throw a stream high enough to extinguish it, and there were no ladders in the fire department long enough to reach a roof 160 feet above the sidewalk. Then, again, there was the argument advanced by the surrounding property owners that such a high building was a constant menace and depreciated adjacent property.²⁴

He believed it did, and while nothing could be done to stop the erection of the present building, he thought the Commissioners should pass an amendment to the building regulations forbidding such high buildings in the future. Further, there was necessity for such high buildings in the commercial cities where there was little room, but here in Washington, where there was ample space, he did not see the necessity for such high structures.

The significance of this legislation was not limited to the simple issue of height for future apartment buildings; it resulted in a shift in design, increasing the importance of lobby and facade treatment and diminishing interest in height and views that became critical to the design of apartment buildings in other cities.

Another early luxury apartment building, the **Portner Flats** (1896, demolished) immediately became one of Washington's most fashionable buildings when it opened. Sited at 2015 15th Street, N.W., it was remote from the other large apartment buildings; its success resulted from a location one-block from the 14th Street Streetcar Line that had been electrified for cable cars and extended to Park Road in 1892. Built in two sections, like so many of the very largest early buildings, the Portner possessed myriad amenities: tennis courts, a pool, and later when construction of the second portion took over the site of the pool, a large public dining room suitable for balls. The building illustrated the stylistic transition of the Washington apartment

²⁴Quoted in Goode, Best Addresses, p. 18.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 16

building aesthetic as the Beaux Arts slowly overtook the Victorian styles in popularity. Its rudimentary tripartite facade, Roman brick walls, and classical sculptural ornament associated its design with the Beaux Arts style while its corner turrets and massing were pure Victoriana.

Among the finest luxury apartments was the **Altamont** (1915) at 1901 Wyoming Avenue, N.W. Designed by Arthur Heaton for District Commissioner George Truesdell, this building seems to close the circle on T. F. Schneider's efforts with the Cairo to push the envelope of Washington luxury apartment houses. Truesdell dabbled in several apartment projects, testing three architects in 1901. In 1901 he worked with Autenreich & Goenner on the **Owasco**, 11 R Street, N.E.; George Cooper on the **Oneida**, 147 R Street, N.E. and the **Ononadaga**, 149 R Street, N.W.; and James Green Hill on **1711-19 Lincoln Avenue, N.E.** Fourteen years later, he chose Arthur Heaton to design the Altamont on the site of his estate Managasett. Heaton approached this design just as he had his other large commissions--the building was to read as a mansion, this time derived directly from Italian Renaissance design. Six generous stories (where seven were allowed) held variously sized apartments with the largest suites on the upper three floors. A richly ornamented lobby and great public parlors, summer pavilions, a public dining room on the top floor, beauty parlor, barber shop, billiard room, laundry, storage rooms--the design of this building embodied years of refining the concept of a luxury apartment house.

The **Whitelaw Hotel** (1918-1921) opened as the first grand apartment-hotel for "colored people" in the Nation's Capital. This fine Beaux Arts style building, located at 1839 13th Street, N.W. (near U Street, the center of Washington's African-American community) was designed, financed and built entirely by African-Americans. John Whitelaw Lewis, the man behind the Whitelaw, developed the project at a time of intense racial segregation. Isiah T. Hatton served as its architect. The Whitelaw helped fill the need for elegant hotel and permanent housing accommodations for African-Americans. The Whitelaw Hotel succeeded as a sophisticated and dignified gathering place for Washington's black intellectual, cultural and social elite.

Isiah T. Hatton was responsible for three other of the area's most important buildings: the Industrial Bank Building, the Southern Aid Society Building and the Murray Brothers Printing Company. Born in Maryland in 1888, Hatton is believed to have apprenticed with John Lankford, a prominent black architect. Records show that Hatton worked first as an engineer and draftsman and later as an architect, from 1905 until his death in 1922 at the age of 33.

Hatton's design for the elegant Whitelaw Hotel resulted in a stately lobby, elevators, a splendid ballroom suitable for banquets and conventions, luxurious hotel rooms, and two-, three- and four-room apartments equipped with modern amenities including private baths, steam heat, gas for cooking, and electric lights.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 17

IV. The Popularization of the Apartment Building

The Transformation of the Luxury Apartment House

In the nineteenth century, Washington's apartment building design was marked by one characteristic: it was perceived as being reserved for Washington's wealthiest citizens. This was partially a product of the strong visual presence of the luxury buildings which drew attention to their purpose, and partially reality. Until this time, the larger apartment houses provided housing for the elite; buildings for the working-classes were limited to small buildings, and most of these were converted dwellings. Regardless, soon the Washington example of the building type was almost universally identified with wealthy society. There is no question that, seeking to draw the politician away from the hotel, the apartment "house" developer offered the opportunity to lodge an entire family in an autonomous unit that still provided hotel amenities -- at a price. It was only in the 1890s, when apartment buildings were re-conceived to meet the demands of truly self-sufficient living and the buildings began to take on more familiar images that the middle class recognized that the apartment building could be a viable alternative to the single family house.

Neither pundits nor dilettantes were in a position to prognosticate the future, and there was much speculation as to the impact of the building type and its potential for modification to Washington's needs. In 1891, The Evening Star discussed the potential impact of the new residential buildings that were being erected in Washington over the last decade:

An apartment house is being erected in the extreme northwestern portion of the city. The projectors of this enterprising design to supply accommodations equal to those afforded by a small house at a rental which will not be more than such a house would command in a similar locality. To a certain extent the apartment house is still in an experimental stage in this city. The oldest and most successful building of this kind is more of a private or family hotel than an apartment house. The suites have no kitchens in use, and the occupants get their meals in the general dining room. There are practically only two buildings in this city which are apartment houses in the real meaning of the term. In these buildings each suite has a kitchen attached and is a separate and distinct house. The rentals range from \$35 to \$50 per month. The experiment will be made in this new building, as well as in several others which are now projected, of supplying accommodations of a complete house at a rental which will not exceed for the best suite \$75 per month. It is believed that such buildings will supply a need and will yield a good revenue upon the money invested, but so far this is mere theory. The results

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 18

of the experiments to be made will be watched with considerable interest by men who have money to invest in such undertakings.

The likelihood of success of apartment buildings in Washington became a common topic of discussion in real estate circles. The middle class had not shown interest in the apartment building, recognizing that the luxury apartment house was out of reach, and uninterested in abandoning the possibility of a single-family dwelling for a lifestyle distinctly associated with the poverty of tenement housing. But the swelling ranks of the Federal government (elected, appointed and employed) would escalate the apartment building as a real alternative when there was insufficient housing available around the city.

An example of the early middle-class buildings is the **Frederick** (1888, demolished), designed for John McLean by James Green Hill. Located at 816 K Street, N.W., a contemporary description records:

...a four-story pressed brick building, with three floors divided into small suites of apartments. The house is prettily finished in natural woods, and has all the modern conveniences. It is Mr. McLean's intention to rent these flats at a reasonable price, thus opening them to people who are crowded out of the larger apartment houses by high rents. The house has only nine suites of apartments and there are already over twenty applications for them.²⁵

Typical of moderately priced apartment buildings were the small buildings designed by architect Julius Wenig. Some of his early buildings include the two small apartment buildings designed next to one another at **701 and 703 C Street, S.W.** (1899, both demolished). This was followed by a four-story, eight-unit building at **115 New York Avenue, N.W.** (1902), and a three-story, four-unit building with commercial space at the ground level, at **1118 7th Street, N.W.** (1902, demolished). These patterns of design (clustering; use of ground floor for commercial space and, simple, small buildings) were repeated for a variety of modest investors, satisfied that small buildings were the only way to handle the moderate and lower cost rental units.

In early 1890, The Evening Star presented a commentary espousing the idea that moderately

²⁵ The Washington Post, October 28, 1888, p. 7. The term "flats" is synonymous with apartment and does not refer to only a single unit per floor.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 19

priced apartment houses did not have to be limited in size to be financially successful. Larger scale buildings with moderate rent, the Star forecasted, could serve the middle-class and support investors' financial requirements:

It is likely that in the near future several large apartment houses will be erected in this city. These enterprises will be designed to meet a want which is believed to exist for residences at moderate rentals in the central portion of the city. It is difficult to find small houses renting from \$30 to \$40 per month within easy reach of those who find it necessary to have their residences near their places of business. While there are a limited number of apartment houses already in successful operation in this city yet the scale of rentals is, as a rule, rather beyond the means of people having moderate incomes. Several capitalists are now considering plans for apartment houses and it is probable that definite plans will be decided upon so as to begin building operations in the spring. The representative of a man of large means who has already made extensive investments in property in this city has recently returned from New York, where he inspected the various classes of apartment houses in that city. He is of the opinion that buildings of this character will prove to be a profitable investment in this city and he thinks that owing to the better style of building, here, as well as what seems to be a more intelligent method of arranging interior plans, the New York apartment house can be improved upon. Cheap apartment houses, or rather those containing suites of rooms rented at moderate prices have been built here on a small scale and they have proved to be good investments. It is believed that the same style of house on a much larger scale will be equally successful.²⁶

In November, The Evening Star elaborated on the earlier comments by reporting on profits accumulated through investment in apartment buildings. An interview with George Swartzell, an executive with the real estate firm of B. H. Warner, addressed whether Swartzell believed that "apartment buildings would prove to be a paying investment in this city?" Swartzell responded in the affirmative, "I am certain, especially when they are built in locations where the first floor can be rented for business purposes."²⁷ The paper went on to venture: "There seems to be an opinion that the building of apartment houses will be one of the features of the development of this city." The discussion of the potential for apartment buildings in Washington held the Star's

²⁶ The Evening Star, February 1, 1890, p. 6.

²⁷ The Evening Star, November 1, 1890, p. 14.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 20

interest into December. Commenting on the penchant to use the winter months to plan for the future, the writer mused about the rampant exchanges regarding proposed building projects, "What is particularly interesting in this preliminary discussion is the fact that investors are considering the advisability of erecting flat or apartment buildings."²⁸ He explains:

Generally speaking, it seems to be conceded that there is a demand for buildings of this character. This demand is believed to come from two sources, namely, the people who spend their winters here and those who live here the year around. It is a phase of modern city life which has never been developed in this city to any extent. The experiments that have been made are mainly in the line of providing apartment buildings for people of liberal incomes. It is thought that the near future will witness a change in this particular and that apartment buildings will be erected where suites of rooms can be leased at moderate rates. The growth of the population and the increasing value of land are the conditions which have favored the erection of buildings of this character in other cities and there is no reason to suppose that the same conditions here will not produce the same results. The experiments already made in this direction have proved to be successful and this fact is encouraging to those who have under consideration plans for building apartment houses.

That November's conversation with Swartzell was reiterated as "a Star man was told that apartment buildings in this city are profitable and can be made profitable if they are well located and conveniently arranged." The knowledgeable Swartzell was again extensively queried as to the desirable type of arrangement for apartment suites ("... those with three or four rooms each, with bathroom and necessary kitchen accommodations, are the most sought after."), the cause of this new interest in the building type ("...the expansion of the business center, which absorbs residence property and drives residents farther out, and by the fact that persons are constantly coming here who have been used to apartments in other cities and desire the same accommodations here."), and the benefits of a flat over a house ("The advantage of a flat is that its location is more central, with substantially the same convenience as a small house, with an increase in rent, perhaps, but the increase is covered by a saving in time and carfare.") "Yes," he concluded, "I think apartment buildings are profitable and I will not be surprised if their number in Washington is not increased during the next few years."²⁹

²⁸ The Evening Star, December 20, 1890, p. 10.

²⁹ The Evening Star, December 20, 1890, p. 10.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 21

Whether the Star's commentary reflected general views in real estate circles, or was championing its own position, the promoted change in approach to apartment living worked to escalate the building type's popularity. The 1890s saw nearly 70 apartment buildings constructed during the decade, seven times as many buildings as were built during the previous ten years. This vast increase in construction was the direct product of increased demand by Washington's middle class. Large numbers of the apartment buildings of the 1890s offered not only a self-sufficient lifestyle and lower prices, but architectural treatments in keeping with the customary forms of single-family dwellings. A significant illustration of this strategy of slow indoctrination to apartment living through the retention of familiar imagery can be seen in the design for the **Roosevelt** (1898) at 1116-1118 F Street, N.E. This brick Victorian, three-story, six-unit building reads as a pair of rowhouses, having two entry doors, two staircases, and a facade composition interchangeable with a set of typical 1890s Washington rowhouses. The critical difference is the fact that the building also bears a stone plaque on which is incised the building's name, Roosevelt, publicly identifying it as an apartment building.

Clearly, housing shortages that resulted from increased federal activities and the organization of new governmental agencies following the Spanish-American War further spurred interest in apartment living, but there can be little doubt that the strong response to middle-class apartment living in the real estate market was due to resourceful developers who sought to satisfy the needs of their audience. By the turn of the century, developers had succeeded in creating a new type of building, one which was offered at moderate rents and yet provided at least some of the desirable amenities formerly associated only with the more elite luxury buildings.

Though not a rule, this new class of apartment buildings often was only three or four stories tall, thereby negating the need for (and expense of) an elevator. Hotel-type personal services were gradually dropped from the design program, also caused by the desire to reduce costs. The truly self-sufficient character of the apartments more than made up for this. The floor plans of the earliest moderate priced apartments were usually composed of rooms set off a long hall, often with the parlor taking the front space followed by bedrooms, and dining room which was adjacent to the kitchen. Although central heating systems were provided in these buildings, a decorative fireplace mantel with mirror above was an essential interior feature. Later designs brought more modern layouts that worked better for the building type. The **Olympia** (1898) at 1368 Euclid Street, N.W., was sited in recognition of the value of a location adjacent to the 14th Street

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 22

Streetcar Line. Well-publicized during its construction, this comfortable, six-story, brick building was designed in a transitional Beaux Arts style by A. B. Morgan for Oscar White and his silent (but steady) investment partner Dr. Zeno B. Babbitt. Aimed at the middle class, its 36 apartments were "equipped for housekeeping, gas ranges, sinks, etc., electric lights, electric bells, and the latest system of house telephones which take the place of speaking tubes."³⁰ The main entrance led to a vestibule, large lobby with elevator and two stairways, as well as a coat room, large public parlor, reading rooms and a cafe. Additional amenities included a billiard room, barber shop, janitor's quarters, storerooms, laundry and bicycle rooms. Interest of the middle-class in apartment living surged as individuals and families competed to rent moderate-priced apartments in buildings like the **Kingman** (now President Monroe, 1902, partially demolished) at 423 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.; **Dumbarton Court** (1902) at 1657 31st Street, N.W., and the **Covington** (1911) at 1848 Columbia Road, N.W. In the 1910s and 1920s, hundreds of these conventional-type apartment buildings would be constructed throughout Washington, D.C.

The Flat as a Modest Alternative for Urban Living

Harry Wardman influenced apartment building development by constructing groups of apartment buildings in Washington, expanding on a concept first seen in the work of the architect George Cooper at the identical **Hawarden** and **Gladstone** (1900) at 1419-1423 R Street, N.W. Wardman built on his success with the rowhouse, intending to accommodate moderate or lower incomes by reducing design and construction costs. In 1905, his chief architect Nicholas Grimm began designing a series of four-story buildings on W Street. During the process, Albert Beers supplanted Grimm, completing the five-building group. Each building held ten apartments with a variety of floor plans which maximized the interior space for maximum income. Wardman repeated this pattern numerous times. Probably his best known example is his seven-building group by Albert Beers along R Street, N.W. known today as **Wardman Row** (1912).

As interest in moderate priced apartment buildings grew, so did the market for new locations. Nicholas Haller introduced the moderately priced apartment building to Washington's Foggy Bottom. He entered the apartment building market in 1892 with modest flats in the West End. In 1896, he developed the **Westover** (now the Luzon) at 1100 25th Street, N.W., (alternate

³⁰ The Evening Star, June 11, 1898, p. 13.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 23

address, 2501 Pennsylvania Avenue) as a personal investment.³¹ This five-story, 16-unit building boasted an elevator and commercial space at the ground floor. The main entrance was raised, as was the custom in Victorian buildings, especially in Washington's West End, and gave the appearance of a large mansion (perhaps similar to the house that Alfred Mullett, Supervising Architect of the Treasury, lived in on that very site). Romanesque Revival in style, the Westover is faced with buff brick and trimmed in Indiana limestone with a Spanish tile roof. The Westover was one of the earliest apartment buildings located in Washington, toward the west end.

Another example of the trend toward apartment buildings away from Washington's downtown is the **Allen Lee**, designed in 1900 by the Sunderland Brothers for Thomas O'Donnell. Located to the west of the White House almost in Georgetown near the Washington Circle stop of the streetcar line, this building held on to the Victorian aesthetic in its corbeled brick facade. Four stories high with 16 units, the building at 2224 F Street, N.W., follows the form of its triangular lot, supplying ample light and air to its each of its units. While not one of the city's grandest apartment houses of the time, it offered amenities and a location that easily attracted families employed by the government.

On the eastern side of the city, the **Stanhope** (demolished) at 735 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., designed by Paul Pelz, opened in 1901. Set near the Government Printing Office at the triangular intersection of H Street and New Jersey Avenue, this building offered a combination of three-room "family" units with kitchens and a one-room "bachelor" unit on each floor. Pelz, whose work on the Library of Congress left him angered by government interference, designed some of the city's most engaging moderate size residences. This work for brewery magnate Christian Heurich is long forgotten.

One of the first apartment houses in Capitol Hill, the **Eastern** (1901) at 314-16 East Capitol Street, was designed by B. Stanley Simmons. The building, however, is five stories tall and was designed with 22 units. Colonel Robert Harper was its owner. Presented in an interpretation of the Italian Renaissance Revival style, its only major feature was a cafe at the ground level. This building played an important role in the spread of the building type, moving the type into another quadrant of the city.

³¹ This building had the name Westover before the same name was used at 2000 16th Street, N.W. The discovery of a previous use resulted in the second building being renamed the Balfour.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 24

The architect Leon Dessez ventured into apartment building design only four times beginning in 1899 with the three-story, 12-unit, Romanesque Revival-style **Stoddert** at 2900 Q Street, N.W. His greatest accomplishment in this genre was the **Chevy Chase** (1909) at 5863 Chevy Chase Parkway, N.W., sited on Chevy Chase Circle. Spanish Colonial in style, it featured eight one-bedroom and 8 two-bedroom apartments and is credited with being "the first true suburban apartment building."³² In fact, a three-story, six unit apartment building, the **Watkins**, was constructed in 1908 at 406 Cedar Street, N.W. The simple Classical Revival design with wooden sleeping porches, was the product of A. S. Baird for Mary J. Watkins.

Another variation on the apartment building theme was the introduction of flats that could accommodate the working classes. Discussions about the permanent value of housing Washingtonians in apartment buildings entered a new stage when the idea that apartment buildings could serve the working classes was entertained. Those who questioned the stability of the building type were soon chastised for failing to understand, ..."in the first place...what is apparently the demand of the market and in the second place, of the variety that is possible in these structures."³³ Indeed, Washington was learning that the generally held notion that an apartment house "is a building of large size, capable of housing a great many families," was only one way of defining the term. "Yet there is another class that is by no means pretentious and that would not be picked out as apartment houses unless as the result of rather close inspection."³⁴ Described as three or four stories, and about the same width and depth as a house, flats were arranged with one apartment unit or "house" per floor. The success of these apartments was credited to the simplification of "modern domestic life," the result of a reduction of time and cost of housekeeping through a decrease in the actual rented space as well as in the number of rooms per suite and the placement of kitchens on the same floor.

The earliest identified middle-class flat building in Washington is the **Myrene** (1897) located at 703 6th Street, N.W. Designed and built by J. H. McIntyre, this four-story, buff brick and limestone Romanesque Revival building looks exactly like a rowhouse on its exterior.³⁵ Soon thereafter, this idea of using the rowhouse form to house apartments spread like wildfire. Builders comfortable with rowhouse construction could easily transfer their knowledge to the

³² Goode, Best Addresses, p. 93.

³³ The Evening Star, March 2, 1901, Part 2, p. 17.

³⁴ The Evening Star, March 2, 1902, Part 2, p.17.

³⁵ "Some New Buildings" in The Evening Star, December 16, 1897.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 25

building of this new type of "house." Developers had only to learn how to manage their properties instead of selling them off, and potentially there was considerably more profit in this continuing money flow. Thousands of "flats" were constructed during the next decade, maintaining the rowhouse appearance of the city while introducing this important change in residential mores.

Developer Harry Wardman was a leader in the construction of these "unpretentious" apartment buildings. His development company built thousands of units. Examples such as 1112-1116 25th Street, N.W., read as three rowhouses; it is, however, a single, three-story building holding nine flats. Designed in 1903 by Nicholas Grimm, each "rowhouse" holds three flats (one per floor) accessed by a single stair. 2209-2219 N Street, N.W., is another example of Wardman's work with flats. Also designed in 1903 by Grimm, Wardman's architect of the time, these were five, two-story buildings, each holding two flats.

The Commercial/Residential Building

Although the combination of commercial and residential use within one building is commonplace to every Main Street in America, and the very first apartment buildings included commercial services within their walls, a true mixed use apartment building is not as common. Several interesting examples appeared in the 1910s and 1920s. A small complex at the corner of the **4200 block of Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.** presents itself as a Tudor Revival village. Inspired by such projects as the Newport Casino and Chicago's Market Square, this three-story building reserves its first floor for commercial use. Harry Wardman constructed a similar row using the Georgian Revival style on **Connecticut Avenue, at Porter Street, N.W.** In 1925, nationally respected movie palace designer John Zink was commissioned by Washington movie mogul Harry Crandall to design a mixed apartment building movie theater at 4921 Georgia Avenue, N.W. Five stories high and accommodating 26 units, the **Colony** apartment building is located above the Colony movie theater. Another fascinating combination is the **Methodist Building** (1923, now the United Methodist Building). Designed to house church offices (charged with lobbying for Prohibition) on the lower floors while earning income from apartments above, the building is located at 100 Maryland Avenue, N.E., convenient to Congress.

V. The Evolution of the Master Apartment Building Architect

As the apartment house became more prevalent, more architects tried their hand at this new class of building, some gaining the expertise necessary to insure their recognition as masters of the form. An architect's success at apartment building design was dependent not only on the ability

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 26

to render an attractive form or facade, but also in providing the developer with the number and types of units that would command the necessary income to support the project. The first designers selected tended to be Washington men who had strong architectural reputations although limited experience with the building type. Why the developers did not seek architects from other cities who might have been able to bring their experience to these speculative undertakings is not known.

Edward Weston's choice of Cluss and Schulze is said to have been based on a "competition" between the firm and Weston's New York architects.³⁶ Cluss and Schulze, considered among the foremost architectural firms in the Nation's Capital, did not complete even one other apartment building after their significant initial venture. As new projects were initiated and architects became aware of the problems inherent to the building type, a small group of men developed significant skills, qualifying them as masters of the form.

James G. Hill

The nationally respected Washington architect James G. Hill (1841-1913) designed three major free-standing buildings in the earliest years of Washington's apartment buildings: Stoneleigh Courts, the Ontario and the Mendota. Hill served as Supervising Architect of the Treasury from 1879 to 1884 before retiring to launch an important private career. His accomplishments were many, including the Bureau of Printing and Engraving (1879), the Government Printing Office (1894-1904), federal courthouses, and a significant number of Washington's most successful commercial banks and office buildings. His practice included mansions and large residences for Washington's prominent families. He did not, however, have any experience with multi-family dwellings when John McLean, newspaper magnate, real estate entrepreneur and owner of a streetcar line, commissioned him to design the modestly scaled **Frederick** at 8th and K streets in Washington's downtown. He designed a two-story apartment building with ten suites at **1775 Lincoln Avenue, N.E.** (1901) for District Commissioner George Truesdell. His elegant design for the luxurious **Mendota** (1901) at 2220 20th Street, N.W., was constructed almost simultaneously. A distinguished building, it was presented in a transitional, turn-of-the-century style, utilizing both Beaux Arts and Victorian design motifs. Upon its completion in 1901, the seven-story, 49-unit apartment building composed of undulating bays faced with buff Roman brick dominated the adjacent contemporary deep-toned brick of the refined, three-story, single-family residences and rowhouses. Local banker Archibald McLachlen was the building's owner.

³⁶ The Evening Star, January 12, 1884, p. 5.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 27

In 1902, Hill designed Washington's largest apartment building to date, **Stoneleigh Courts**. The Italian Renaissance Revival style building was a project of millionaire diplomat John Hay.³⁷ Capitalizing on the success of the Mendota, McLachlen commissioned Hill to undertake another huge project. The **Ontario**, completed with Hill's new partner Kendall in 1905, is an outstanding presentation of a very large apartment building set on spacious grounds outside the center of the city. Six stories high with 120 units sited on three acres, it was meant to be seen from all sides. The second project for banker McLachlen, Hill's design for the Ontario reveals progress in his handling of the new Beaux Arts style. The restraint exhibited in the facade composition provides a Classical Revival tone to the completed design, while the Victorian octagonal tower maintains an association with the familiar. Utilizing brick instead of stone for the base, pebbledash instead of brick for the upper stories, here Hill focused on the massing and site plan, employing large projecting wings to unite the building with its semi-rural landscape, successfully evolving a resort-like atmosphere.

T. Franklin Schneider

Thomas Franklin Schneider (1858-1938) was born in Washington and educated in D.C. public schools. Schneider went to work at the age of 16 in the local architectural office of Cluss and Schulze. At the time, Cluss and Schulze was a successful enterprise responsible for the Franklin School (1865-69), the Smithsonian Arts and Industries Building (1876) and the Department of Agriculture Building (1867, demolished). In 1883, after eight years with Cluss and Schulze, Schneider left the firm. He was only 23 years old when he set up an independent practice at 929 F Street, N.W., with \$500 in borrowed capital. Soon after, he became a member of the American Institute of Architects.

The Evening Star ran a profile of Schneider in its November 5, 1889 edition. It offers an interesting look at this important architect at an early point in his career:

"The Young Napoleon of F Street." That is the term applied to a certain young architect of this city by his friends. "Why, it's just a few years ago that I was going to school with him playing 'Old Man' and buying a cent's worth of taffy, which we divided at recess," said an acquaintance. And it was just last Saturday that the young Napoleon paid \$175,000 for a row of lots on Q Street, occupying the whole

³⁷ "The Stoneleigh Court Apartments" in American Architect and Building News, Volume 96, December 12, 1909, plate.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 28

front of the square between Seventeenth and Eighteenth streets. Upon this square he will erect a row of residences. Just across the street is another row of some thirty pressed-brick houses which he completed last year. His operations in building for the past four years have been upon the most extensive scale.

When the young man came out of school he put out his shingle as an architect over a modest little office in the third story of a building on F Street, where he still holds forth. He got a start and put his first money into a house, devising the plans himself. When it was built he sold it at a profit. This was the beginning. He has kept on building and selling, putting his profits into other buildings. Many of his houses were sold before completed and payments made, which he would immediately resolve into bricks and mortar for another venture. Good judgment in buying lots, taste and ingenuity in planning, the architectural features of the residences and business ability to keep his money moving, gathering profit as it rolled, have made him one of the solid men of the city. He is a young looking man, with a slight mustache, and a modest, retiring air, but he certainly is what the Westerners call "a hustler."³⁸

In 1893, after ten years of practice, Schneider published a book of photographs and 15 renderings depicting his work to date. Selections from Work of T.F. Schneider, Architect, Washington, D.C. was supported by advertisements purchased by his subcontractors. It included such buildings as rowhouses on both sides of Q Street, N.W. from 17th to 18th Street, the Forest Inn at Forest Glen, Maryland, and his own 50-room house at 18th and Q Streets, and the soon to be constructed Cairo. Schneider's career was to take him into real estate speculation as well as architecture. Most of his design work was done with his own financial investment. Schneider's designing came to an end by the 1920s.

George Cooper

George Cooper (1864-1929) quickly made his mark as an apartment building designer in Washington. He is known to have designed 24 apartment buildings, as well as numerous single-family residences, rowhouses, and some of the turn of the century's most prominent commercial buildings. His Beaux Arts style Bond Building from 1901 is one of the earliest commercial uses of the style in the Nation's Capital.

³⁸ The Evening Star, November 5, 1889.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 29

Cooper's first apartment house was the **Montrose Flats** (1892, demolished), a six-story, 36-unit building for the Davidson brothers. Located at 1115 9th Street, N.W., it was convenient to downtown and read as an infill building amidst the established block of nineteenth-century rowhouses. The Queen Anne was a comfortable style associated with domestic life, and was commonly employed in Washington for single-family residences of all sizes in the 1880s and 1890s. In 1893, the Davidsons commissioned Cooper to design the **Analostan** at 1718 Corcoran Street, N.W. This building, designed in the Queen Anne style, contained 21 units in five stories, but assumed the outward appearance of a large, single family residence -- a mansion befitting the newly developing Dupont Circle area. The success of the Analostan soon resulted in another commission, the **Lafayette** (1898) at 1605 7th Street, N.W. Once again relying on the familiar aesthetic of the Queen Anne, Cooper designed an apartment building that belied its purpose. Cooper's use of the Queen Anne may have played an important role in the building's success at attracting the middle-class residents that both the Davidsons and Cooper's other clients generally sought. Cooper was knowledgeable and skilled in other styles, as evidenced by his contemporaneous use of the Beaux Arts at the Bond Building. The next apartment building of Cooper's design was developed by Cooper himself. Cooper, seeing the success of his clients, undertook the development of the **Jefferson** (1922) at 315 H Street, N.W. This four-story, eight-unit Romanesque Revival style building fits into the streetscape as if it were a large single-family townhouse. The facade treatment expressed a restrained, twentieth-century interpretation of the Romanesque using orange Roman brick with contrasting limestone trim; the bulk of the building was drawn back into the deep lot.

In 1900, already an accomplished apartment building designer with five buildings to his credit, Cooper was commissioned by the builder/developer John H. Nolan to design a new apartment house at 2000 16th Street, N.W. to be known as the **Westover**. Sixteenth Street was barely populated, but plans were at hand to make it one of the most important boulevards in the Nation's Capital. Mrs. John Henderson, whose massive stone Boundary Castle was a few blocks to the north, was doing everything possible to transform the street into the city's Embassy Row. Cooper met the challenge with his Beaux Arts composition. Six stories with four large, five-room apartments and two small suites per floor, it was designed to respond to its site at the corner of U and 16th Streets with elaborate treatments on each elevation. Although one of the first successful examples of the Beaux Arts style, its apartment arrangement followed traditional lines.

At the same time as his work on the Westover, Cooper was engaged in another innovative commission, one that plays an important role in the history of apartment building development-- the use of a single design to construct more than one building. The **Gladstone** (1900) and the

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 30

Hawarden (1901) are sited next to one another at 1417-23 R Street, N.W., just a half block from the 14th Street Streetcar Line. Cooper's re-use of the original design for the second, adjacent building marks the first use of a technique that became standard procedure in apartment building development, especially as it began to serve the middle and lower classes. Cooper introduced the idea to several developers with a variety of results. Interestingly, this method of repetition was used by developer Harry Wardman in 1912 when he built the seven-building **W-A-R-D-M-A-N** Row across the street from the Gladstone and the Hawarden, and again in 1922-23 when Cafritz built his seven-building **C-A-F-R-I-T-Z** Row on Spring Road, N.W.³⁹

The majority of Cooper's work was for the middle class market. His buildings were of the type identified as conventional, three to four stories high, rarely employing elevators or providing luxury amenities. Rather than expensive appointments, his buildings were characterized by good design. Cooper went on to complete the Colonial Revival style **Decatur** (1903), a mid-block building with facades fronting two streets; several rowhouse-type buildings on Swann Street, including the **Baltimore** (1903; 1615 Swann Street) and the **Howard** (1903, 1617 Swann Street, N.W.); the Italianate **Ashburn** (1905) at 1300 Harvard Street, N.W.; his own development of the Mediterranean style **Dumbarton Court** (1909, 1657 31st Street, N.W.); and the **Westchester** (now Barclay North, 1909) at 1332 15th Street, N.W., near the 14th Street Streetcar Line. Cooper's influence on apartment building design was manifold, but his use of style as a tool to conjure sympathetic associations with a building type did much to move Washington's middle class toward apartment life.

Albert Beers

The premature death of Albert Beers (1859-1911) seems to be the only thing that stopped him from becoming Washington's most prolific apartment building architect. Coming from Bridgeport, Connecticut, most likely, to follow up on an opportunity with developer Harry Wardman, Beers designed 71 apartment buildings from 1905 until his death. In Washington, he served as Harry Wardman's chief architect, carrying out Wardman's development plans as fast as Wardman could devise them, while also working for other developers. One of the two most innovative designers to be associated with Wardman, the men worked together to create a number of Washington's most distinguished apartment buildings. A few highlights of Beers' work include the **Toronto** (1908) 2000 P Street, N.W.; the **Northumberland** (1909) 2039 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.;

³⁹ The first letters of the names of the seven buildings, the Walton, the Arden, the Ripley, the Dudley, the Morton, the Ashton, and the Newlon spell out WARDMAN. Cafritz's buildings were named the Carlo, the Aberdeen, the Fernbrook, the Rosedale, the Isleworth, the Traymore, and the Zellwood.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 31

The **Brighton** (1909), 2123 California Street N.W.; the **Carlton** (1908, now the Alexandra), 2101 N Street, N.W.; and **2131 California Street, N.W.** His superb design for the **Dresden** (1909) at 2126 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. introduced a curved facade for an apartment building, something that would not be seen again until the last quarter of the twentieth century. A master designer, he approached each building as unique, creating a profound effect on Washington through his exceptional composition skill and masterful massing techniques.

Hunter and Bell

The firm of Hunter and Bell worked primarily for John L. Warren and his brother Bates. As a result, Ernest Hunter and G. Neal Bell were given the opportunity to design some of Washington's finest apartment houses. Most notable is **2029 Connecticut Avenue** (1915), a robust presentation of white glazed terra cotta in an elaborate Francois XV style. Beginning in 1904 until 1917, the firm designed 53 apartment buildings, ranging from the luxurious "2029" to modest flats. The majority of their work was for the upper end of the market with such buildings as the seven-story, 44-unit **Iroquois** (1905, demolished) at 1410 M Street, N.W., and the **New Berne** (now the New Plaza, 1905) at 1117 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. The firm designed dozens of buildings in the Lanier Heights, Adams-Morgan neighborhood, significantly affecting the appearance of this concentration of apartment buildings.

B. Stanley Simmons

B. Stanley Simmons (1871-1931) was a young man when he designed his first apartment building, the four-story, eight-unit **Arno** (1897, demolished) at 1035 20th Street N.W. A graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Simmons' strong design skills established a career almost 40 years in duration. Simmons designed 61 apartment buildings throughout the four quadrants of the city: 53 in Northwest; three in Northeast; three in Southwest; and two in Southeast.

The commission that established Simmons' career with apartment buildings was a five-story, ten-unit building at **1400 M Street** (1900, demolished) which he designed for Lester A. Barr, a young developer, which in turn led to work for Barr's partner Franklin Sanner. Together, the three men built numerous apartment buildings in Washington, D.C. including the outstanding **Wyoming** (1905-1911) at 2022 Columbia Road, N.W. Simmons was given several notable commissions both large and small. A few examples include the adjacent **Leachman** (1900) and **Homeland** (1900) at 1330 and 1336 U Street, N.W. (also with Barr); the Classical Revival-style **Henrietta** (1900) at 933 N Street; the five-story, 60-unit **Dupont** (1902) at 1717 20th Street, N.W. for Franklin Sanner

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 32

(who would later team up with Barr); the **Iona** (1902, demolished), at 709 H Street, S.W. and the **Veronica Flats** (1902, demolished), at 210 13th Street, S.W., two early buildings in Washington's southwest designed for Samuel Phillips; the **Leta** (1905) at 2031 F Street, N.W., for artist Violet Bloomer; the four-story, 16-unit **Carleton** (1910) at 1741 Lanier Place, N.W., for Josephine Williams; Charles Fairfax's Georgian Revival apartment/hotel at **2100 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.**, (1924); the sprawling Gothic Revival **Embassy** (1914) at 1613 Harvard Street, N.W., for the prolific developer H. R. Howenstein; and the eight-story, 103 unit Tudor Revival **Wakefield Hall** (1925), and his final three apartment buildings on 13th Street, N.W.--the twin **Highviews** and **Castle Manor** also dating to 1925.

Arthur B. Heaton

Arthur B. Heaton's (1875-1951) illustrious architectural career lasted 50 years. His very first commission was in 1900 for his brother-in-law, real estate investor John L. Weaver. This project resulted in a superb building that is one of the earliest illustrations of the mansion-type apartment building in Washington, D.C. The **Augusta** at 1151 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., is four-stories tall and holds 20 apartment suites. Medieval in expression, this large, tapestry brick building is dappled with visual metaphors associated with the Gothic Revival and the subsequent Arts and Crafts aesthetic. Like many other young men who had just completed architectural training, Britain's Arts and Crafts Movement was still fresh in his mind. Ten months later an addition, the **Louisa**, was appended to this unique building.

By 1902, after numerous smaller commissions, Heaton was retained to design the **Highlands** at 1914 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. A commission to design for a prestigious location -- the point where Connecticut Avenue overlooked the city and was to become the gateway to the northwest-- and a substantial budget was a remarkable achievement for a young man: Heaton lived up to his promise. Possibly looking to McKim, Mead and White's 1882 Villard Houses for his inspiration, the Renaissance Revival style Highlands represented the foremost in architectural fashion, again presented as a mansion-type building. Almost every amenity was available for the Highlands tenant. When it opened in 1905, it included as a bonus a basement automobile garage, something that would not be seen in a Washington apartment building again until the 1920s. Heaton's next great apartment building commission was in 1915, when he designed the **Altamont** for District Commissioner Truesdell.

A master designer, Heaton's ideas and skills contributed greatly to Washington's rich architectural imagery as well as the quality of apartment life. Turning his attention to other buildings types for most of his career, Heaton did not design another apartment building until the late 1930s when

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 33

he began work on the **Ellen Wilson Dwellings** (located in the vicinity of G, I and 6th Streets, S.E.), one of Washington's most significant public housing efforts.

Appleton P. Clark

Appleton P. Clark, Jr. (1865-1955) had no formal training in architecture beyond a course in high school, yet he developed a successful career which spanned more than 60 years. As he stated in his application for membership into the American Institute of Architects in 1916, Clark neither graduated from an architecture school, held a scholarship in architecture, nor completed qualifying examinations of the Royal Institute of British Architects or the Ecole des Beaux Arts. Clark apprenticed in the office of A. B. Mullett in the mid-1880s and, in 1886, established his own architectural office. He is known to have designed the conversion of a small building into an apartment house as early as 1882. In 1886, he designed his first apartment building, a three-story building for Christian Heurich at **2418 G Street, N.W.** (demolished). Over the span of his career he would complete 27 apartment buildings. He wrote a section on "The History of Architecture in Washington," (published in John Proctor's Washington, Past and Present; a History, 1903). Through his architectural accomplishments and involvements throughout the city, Clark became one of Washington's most influential architects. Among his most important commissions are the Italian Renaissance Revival style **Rockingham** (1903) at 1315-17 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., designed for Levi Woodbury; the Renaissance Revival "house-type" design for the **Carrolton** (1909) at 2852 Ontario Road, N.W.; the **Roosevelt** (1919) at 2120 16th Street, N.W. and the **Presidential** (1922) at 1026 16th Street, N.W. He finished his illustrious career with apartment building designs in southeast Washington for the Sanitary Improvement Company, a social reform organization dedicated to improving housing for poor African-Americans.

George Santmyers, Jr.

George Santmyers, Jr. (1889-1960) practiced architecture in Washington, D.C. for over 40 years. He remains one of the city's most prolific and important architects of the twentieth century. While Santmyers is credited with the design of banks, commercial buildings, public garages and a multitude of private residences, the majority of his work consists of apartment buildings--over 400. Santmyers' architectural training was limited to apprenticeships in the offices of some of the city's leading architects. By his early twenties, he opened his own architectural office. His earliest known commissions in the city date from 1910 for a group of rowhouses. Still designing and heading his office in 1960, he completed his last apartment building design at the age of 72 just six months before his death.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 34

The sheer number of apartment commissions executed by Santmyers is astounding. Santmyers devoted his enormous skills and energy to produce notably designed buildings with an efficient plans. He worked in a variety of styles, using more traditional, classically inspired architecture in his early buildings; entering a transitional phase based on classical precedents with a panache of twentieth century modern architecture; and culminating in the majority of his work designed in full-blown expressions of the Art Deco, Art Moderne, and the International styles.

His early apartment buildings from the 1920s were typically Colonial Revival in style. The Colonial Revival style provided a formal vocabulary based on architectural elements associated with the American Georgian and Federal periods. The apartments were usually symmetric in composition, with ordered fenestration, large multi-light, double-hung windows, a centrally located doorway complete with prominent portico or architrave, and classical detailing. **Meridian Manor** (1927) apartments at 1424 Chapin Street, N.W., is a classic Colonial Revival style Santmyers' apartment building. The flat, symmetric facade is detailed with colonial swags, and an arched rusticated stone entry. The two buff-brick apartment buildings at **3217-21 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.** (1926), are designed to appear as one Colonial Revival style facade. The entrance bays are trimmed with different classical elements and differentiate the symmetric facade compositions. A granite base, four Corinthian pilasters at the entrance, carved rosettes around the arched doorway, and triangular pediments above the second floor windows define the entrance on 3217 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., features eight Ionic pilasters at the entry, with windows on each side of the door and segmentally arched pediments on the second floor windows. **Capitol Mansions** (1926) at 637 3rd Street, N.E., the **Coolidge** (1925) at 3100 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., and the **Lincoln Arms** (1925) at 5433-5435 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., also illustrate Santmyers' Colonial Revival apartments. These buildings are more traditional in plan with two projecting bays flanking the central entrance.

Beall Court (1928) represents a stylistic transition for Santmyers in which he tentatively embraces the modern aesthetic moving away from historic precedents. Santmyers begins to simplify the composition and minimize ornamentation on this transitional apartment building design. The polychrome brick complex of four buildings is located at 1404-10 26th Street and 2603-05 O Street, N.W. In general, the buildings are reminiscent of much of Santmyers' Colonial Revival work in the classical entry details and ornamentation, however the decoration is applied over a stripped box with a stepped parapet setting a modern overtone. Santmyers quickly succumbs to the modernist influence, which is all pervasive in his work by the end of the 1930s and early 1940s.

Today, Santmyers is most celebrated for his Art Deco, Art Moderne, and International Style apartment buildings from the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. During these decades, Santmyers'

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 35

predilection for the Art Deco movement was given free reign on the overwhelming number of apartment buildings he was commissioned to design. Santmyers' buff-brick, linear massed buildings were found throughout the city. Of the Moderne buildings designed by Santmyers, some of the better known are the **Normandie** (1938, 6817 Georgia Avenue, N.W.), the **Parkcrest Gardens** (1941, 4100 block of W Street, N.W.), and the **Yorkshire** (1941, 3355 16th Street, N.W.). The **Delano** (1941, 2745 29th Street, N.W.) apartment building is a superb example of Santmyers' mature apartment building design.

Jules H. deSibour

Jules deSibour's (1872-1938) architectural practice encompassed the cities of New York and Washington, D.C. and lasted for more three decades. Trained at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris, deSibour was a master of the Beaux Arts style. Based initially in New York, deSibour moved to the Nation's capital in 1909 as his commissions in the city steadily increased. DeSibour specialized in town houses for the socially prominent. The residences he designed, such as Stewart House (2200 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.), Moore House (1746 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.), and Wilkes House (1700 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.) hold their own in a neighborhood that boasts works by preeminent practioners of the Beaux Arts such as McKim, Mead and White, and Carrere and Hastings.

If T. Franklin Schneider's Cairo introduced the idea of the Beaux Arts style apartment building to Washington, D.C. deSibour's **McCormick** (1915) epitomized it. A model of Beaux Arts sophistication, this five-story apartment building occupies a site at the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and 18th Street. Instead of being an anomaly amidst its stately, single-family residence neighbors, its French-inspired facade and classical detailing complements the streetscape as the grandest of mansions. Responding to its site, the curved corner bay, with a tripartite division and an iron and glass canopy, executes a smooth transition between 18th Street and Massachusetts Avenue. Its six units occupying 11,000 square feet were luxurious both in dimension and details.

Besides the McCormick, deSibour designed five other apartment buildings. His earliest commission was the **Warder** (1906, demolished) at 1155 16th Street, N.W., designed in the Classical Revival style. The early 1920s saw an increase in deSibour's apartment building commissions: **Hotel Martinique** (1920, demolished), 1209 16th Street, N.W.; **The Jefferson** (1922), 1200 16th Street, N. W; the **Anchorage** (1924), 1523-1529 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. and; **Lee House**, all of which were replete with classical references. Although deSibour's apartment building oeuvre is rather limited, his simultaneous expansion and refinement of the luxury apartment, handling of scale and mastery of the Beaux Arts style assure his position in the cadre

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 36

of master apartment building architects.⁴⁰

Waddy B. Wood

Apartment buildings did not dominate the career work of Waddy B. Wood (1869-1944), but his designs are among some of the city's most handsome and innovative housing projects. Wood's **Bachelor Apartments** (1905, 1737 H Street, N.W.) and **All-States Hotel** (1927, 514 19th Street, N.W.) provided housing reserved for residents of a single sex. His design for the **Cordova** (1905, 1908 Florida Avenue, N.W.) presented a sprawling Spanish Mission Revival design. Three stories, offering 108 units, Wood recognized the potential for integrating multi-family living into a perfectly suited historic form.⁴¹ The **Nolando** (1905) at 1413 T Street, N.W., and the nearby **Granada** (1908) at 1433 T Street designed by Wood, Donn, and Deming, are skilled presentations of the mansion-type building using Mediterranean imagery. Temporary housing for government workers built on the Capital Grounds and the Mall helped relieve the intense housing shortage affecting federal workers during World War I. Wood donated his firm's time to design the buildings thereby assuring their swift completion. Wood's cognizance of the potential of the building type substantially contributed to its evolution.

Frank Russell White

In a career that extended over a quarter century, Frank Russell White (1889-1961) designed 51 apartment buildings, some 5000 single-family residences and numerous commercial buildings including the Sheraton Park Hotel (formerly the Wardman Park Hotel) and Heurich Building. As one of Harry Wardman's master architects he designed several apartment buildings in Washington's northwest which bear witness to White's grasp of the essentials of apartment design and his versatility in a wide range of styles. White designed **Wardman Court** (1914) at 1312 Clifton Street, N.W. in the Colonial Revival Style while the **Lealand**, from the same year, at 1830 16th, Street N.W. was dressed in Mediterranean Revival garb. In his designs for the **Northbrook Courts - North and South** (1917, 3420-26 16th Street, N.W.) White employed the Classical Revival vocabulary.

⁴⁰Goode calls the McCormick "the finest apartment house erected in Washington." Goode, Best Addresses 134.

⁴¹"The Cordova Apartments, Washington, D.C." in American Architect and Building News, Volume 96, December 22, 1909: plate.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 37

Although White received a steady flow of projects from a prominent clientele, he was not content to remain purely a designer and undertook the development of apartment buildings. His successful efforts as an architect/developer include the **Schuyler Arms** (1926, 1954 Columbia Road, N.W.) and **3220 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.** (1927). The Schuyler Arms is an eight-story building with 96 units. Its brick and stone facade is relieved by classical detailing while the entrance is marked by a Classical Revival portico. At the time of his death in 1961 White ranked among the acclaimed designers of apartments in Washington, D.C. This is borne out by the fact that his obituary notice in The Star was titled "Frank R. White Dies; Apartment Architect."⁴²

Albert I. Cassell

Albert Irving Cassell (1895-1969), an African-American born in Towson, Maryland, graduated with a degree in architecture from Cornell University in 1919. Soon after, Cassell taught architecture at Howard University and in 1921 became the chairman of its Department of Architecture. As an academician, Cassell not only helped shape the newly conceived Department of Architecture, but through the years he also planned for the growth and development of Howard University through typographical and property acquisition surveys of the University and its environs.⁴³ Cassell, besides being an academician, was also a respected practitioner. Although Cassell achieved only one major success in housing--The **Mayfair Mansions** Apartments--the nature of the project draws attention to the architect and others associated with it.

Mayfair Mansions was the earliest "deluxe" apartment complex built exclusively for African-Americans in Washington. Furthermore, the project was conceived, designed and developed by African-Americans while being insured by the Federal Housing Authority. Cassell used his personal funds to take an option on the site of the Benning Racetrack in Northeast D.C. Cassell designed the garden apartment complex of seventeen buildings as a self-sustaining community complete with modern amenities and facilities such as a pool and a community house. These buildings, in Colonial Revival Style, housed African-Americans from all walks of life, including lawyers, doctors and teachers. Mayfair Mansion Apartments represents Cassell's vision of and the hope that it provided for appropriate housing for African-Americans.

⁴²Washington Star, October 24, 1961.

⁴³Harrison Mosely Etheridge, "The Black Architects of Washington, D. C., 1900 to Present," p. 54.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 38

Other Significant Architects

Prolific designers who tended to focus on smaller buildings include men such as Speiden & Speiden and Julius Wenig. Each firm designed its first apartment building in 1899. The sons of Alfred B. Mullett (Alfred Mullet was a former Supervising Architect of the Treasury) continued their father's firm after his death and were selected to design one of Washington's earliest apartment buildings. **Lexington Flats** (1898-99, demolished) was a three-story, nine-unit building at 1033 21st Street. They went on to design eight modest apartment buildings through 1916. Though not as prolific or skilled as George Cooper, young Clarence Harding designed buildings in the same frame of mind as the more experienced architect. Harding, who later formed a partnership with Frank Upman, began his career in 1894 with commissions from his father Theodore A. Harding. Beginning in 1895, they collaborated on Harding's first apartment buildings: four-story flats. In 1900, the pair ventured into a larger investment. The **Landmore** (demolished) at 1133 24th Street, N.W., was a four-story building with 16 units designed to look like a large Romanesque Revival house. So, too, was the nearby **Marion** (1900, demolished) at 2000 H Street. The Victorian massing and ornament placed these buildings at home among the residential West End neighborhood. Harding continued with this idea when he used wood and stucco to face the **Meridian** (1901) at 1513 Meridian Place, N.W., an excellent example of the rowhouse-type apartment building.

VI. The Apartment Building as a Washington Institution

In May 1898, as visions of life in the new century grew more prevalent, the debate over the lasting quality of the apartment building continued. The Evening Star reported: "There have been during the past year or so a good many apartment houses, both large and small, erected, and the opinion has been expressed by some people that too many buildings of this character have been put up." This was followed by the annual report by the Inspector of Buildings which stated that 27 new buildings of "the class known as apartment houses or flats" were constructed in the period from June 30, 1896-July 1, 1897, an increase of 21 from the previous year. What would happen to all these buildings? Was the city going to have to manage abandoned structures, built under misguided understanding of Washington sensibilities? The debate as to the future of the apartment building in Washington was far from over. Some argued that the demand was permanent, while others held onto the belief that "conditions in this city are not such as will permit apartments to take the place of independent houses, at least to the extent that has been the case in some other cities." and there were plenty of "not only ample, but unusually attractive and desirable as home sites [that] will, for some years to come induce the majority of people to prefer houses to flats." Others took a middle ground, arguing that the seasonal quality of nineteenth century Washington was hard to ignore: "It is further urged that while the quarters in

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 39

apartment houses may be preferred by those who make this city their winter home, people who expect to live here the year around will continue in the future as in the past to prefer a house as a home for their family." ⁴⁴

These years resulted in testing of the speculative value of the building type by small investors such as Davidson and Davidson, Thomas Pickford, and the Kennedy Brothers; large-scale developers such as Harry Wardman and Franklin Sanner; and architects-turned-developers such as T. Franklin Schneider, George Cooper and B. Stanley Simmons. Those who saw no future for the building type in Washington were found to be wrong. By the first decade of the new century, apartment buildings seemed to be sprouting like weeds through out the District. Between 1900 and 1909, 439 apartment buildings were constructed spread over all four quadrants: 363 in Northwest, 45 in Northeast, 11 in Southwest and 20 in Southeast. This was more than four times the number built in the 1890s. The decade from 1910 through 1919 was almost as high in spite of the building halt caused by the World War. During that decade 316 apartment buildings were constructed; with 287 in Northwest, 17 in Northeast, 3 in Southwest, and 9 in Southeast. The 1920s more than doubled the figure to 705; 594 in Northwest, 66 in Northeast, 8 in Southwest, and 37 in Southeast. By 1930, an estimated 50% of Washingtonians resided in apartment buildings. These buildings began to take identifiable forms in a variety of types. The archetype "luxury" building was transformed into "conventional" types, at first presented in a simple form, then in the 1900s and 1920s expanding to a "mid-rise" and a "high-rise" version. The small "rowhouse-types" associated with the earliest moderate income examples were supplanted by the "house-type," a short-lived phenomenon that was popular in the 1940s. The late 1880s introduced the "mansion-type," popular in the 1910s and 1920s, while "flats," designed for the working classes as well as the luxury versions, came into their own in the 1900s. The 1920s were associated with the "garden" and "grand garden" variations. True mixed use buildings, the "commercial-residential" type, were seen from the late 1880s throughout the 1940s.

World War I dramatically decreased the amount of housing constructed in the city of Washington during the war (while 40 apartment buildings had been constructed in 1917, only six were constructed in 1918, 36 in 1919, 16 in 1920, 29 in 1921). The war effort consumed most of the civilian industrial capacity. As a result, there was a severe shortages of materials, including building materials. Meanwhile, the population in Washington, D.C. continued its dramatic increase, multiplying on top of a federal work force that tripled between 1916 and 1918.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ The Evening Star, July 10, 1898.

⁴⁵ Goode, James. Best Addresses, p. 173.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 40

Consequently, there was a large demand for housing when civilian construction resumed in the early 1920s. Architects, builders, and developers rushed to fill the void and the decade of the 1920s experienced a burgeoning of both apartment buildings and single-family housing. In the decade after the end of World War I, from 1919 to the Stock Market Crash of 1929, 741 apartment buildings were constructed in the city, a growth paralleling the dramatic increase in single-family house construction.

Competition among apartment building developers was fierce. Not only were developers scrambling to provide enough housing for the new federal workers but they also attempted to build more attractive apartment buildings by offering the latest technological advances as well as novel interior designs and other schemes which would appeal and attract residents to their particular apartment development.

Once the idea of an apartment building as a respectable and functional place to live was accepted, several factors further encouraged their development throughout the city: 1) the rapid growth of the street railway system; 2) the new popularity of the automobile; 3) the revision of building codes to ensure safer, more healthy living environments and 4) the passage of zoning regulations requiring the "gathering" of buildings and accessory services.

New Development Accelerates the Impact of Washington's Public Transportation System

Public transportation lines spurred the development of apartment house corridors. In 1862, the first streetcar railway lines were chartered by Congress. Their completion, six months later, changed the way Washington worked, lived, and played. These lines were extended over the years, converted to an electrified cable system in the 1890s, and extended farther into Washington's new suburbs. Although the earliest apartment buildings were located primarily close to lower Connecticut Avenue, extending through the heart of the "downtown" residential area, the opening of the streetcar lines attracted investors eager to capitalize on less expensive land. Fourteenth Street offers a prime illustration of the growth patterns which evolved from the streetcar construction. By the end of the World War I, 150 apartment buildings were on 14th Street or between the 13th-15th Streets corridor.

The expansion of the street railway lines into the outer reaches of the District also had the same effect. When the Columbia Road streetcar line extended from the boundary of the city northerly to Mount Pleasant, the **Woodley** (1903) at 1851 Columbia Road, N.W. and the **Kenesaw** (1903) at 3060 16th Street, N.W. at opposite ends of the route were built simultaneously. From this time, proximity to Downtown was no longer as important as proximity to a transportation route. Soon

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 41

buses replaced or extended traditional routes, heightening the appeal of a location close to public transportation.

The growing popularity of the automobile affected the apartment building almost as much as public transportation. When, by the 1920s, the future of the car was secured, the possibility for apartment locations became almost limitless. The car opened up possibilities for the location of new apartment buildings in far the reaches of the city, and beyond. Public transportation was no longer a requirement for the federal worker. Further, the apartment building forms changed to accommodate the automobile. First, driveways and porte-cocheres were incorporated into the designs of new buildings. Soon garages (attached and not) were seen. Although the Highlands offered a basement garage when it opened in 1905, this was most unusual and it was not until the 1920s when zoning regulations mandated garages in larger buildings that they were regularly instituted into building design.

Cooperative Ownership and Cooperative Apartments

The first building known to have successfully transformed the early apartment building into a "privately-owned home" was **The Concord** (1891, demolished) at 1701 Swann Street, N.W., designed by Oehlman Von Nerta for James Gregory.⁴⁶ Its suites each held their own kitchen; but more significantly, the building opened in 1892 as the city's first co-operative apartment building, where each tenant actually held a share in the building's ownership.⁴⁷ This was followed in 1909 when a group of six friends joined together to build **1852 Ontario Road, N.W.** Designed by Appleton P. Clark, the three-story Renaissance Revival building looks distinctly like a fine residence and offered each of its six owners a spacious unit. It is an excellent example of the "house-type" of apartment building.

In the early 1920s, cooperative ownership was still an almost untried idea in the real estate world in Washington. It was Herbert Hoover (at the time, the Secretary of Commerce) who endorsed a plan to have philanthropists build apartments that could be sold to the Federal employees at low payments after a small cash payment.⁴⁸ The idea was studied for many years by Washington

⁴⁶The Concord which is currently standing is not the original.

⁴⁷ Goode, Best Addresses, p. 6.

⁴⁸ "Plan Project For Housing \$7,500." The Washington Times. May 11, 1929. Real Estate Section.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 42

developers before it was determined that a commercial undertaking of this nature would be successful.

Cooperative ownership in the true sense promises a real improvement in apartment house architecture. Elimination of the usual speculative profit in the financing of an apartment house will enable the cooperators to obtain homes at much lower costs than hitherto and, more important still, it will give them housing of a much finer standard.⁴⁹

Allen E. Walker introduced the idea of cooperative ownership to this city. He originally converted rental apartments to cooperative status with great success. Edmund J. Flynn established the Edmund J. Flynn Company in 1920 expressly to develop and sell cooperative apartments. Flynn, along with Walker, quickly became a leading authority on cooperative ownership. His conservative and sound business sense led to many successful cooperative undertakings. In 1929, Edmund Flynn and Joseph Shapiro joined together to establish the cooperative at the nine-building **Hampshire Gardens** (200 Block of Farragut Street, N.W.) to be owned and operated by one corporation. This arrangement was unusual as most apartment buildings in cooperatives were owned and operated individually. At Hampshire Gardens each building elected a member to the board of directors and acted as chairman of the house committee for his building.

The financial arrangement of the Hampshire Gardens Cooperative was also new to Washington. The arrangement was modified from the earlier cooperative plans of Edmund J. Flynn and Allen E. Walker. Each building was subject to only one deed of trust. A proportion of the trust was charged to each apartment and was included in the total sale price of the stock allocated to an apartment. The purchaser selected an apartment and agreed to buy the stock allocated to the apartment selected. Upon payment in cash of at least 15 percent of the total sale price of stock, the Hampshire Gardens Development Corporation would take the note for the balance of the sale price above the proportion of the trust. The stockholder gave the corporation his personal note along with his stock which he put up as collateral and agreed to payments in monthly installments with interest at 6 percent. The idea of resident ownership had appeal to many people; however, it did not meet the needs of the majority of apartment tenants who either preferred or by economic necessity had to rent, consequently, it never gained dramatic popularity in Washington.

⁴⁹ "The Suburban Apt House." The Evening Star. October, 1921.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 43

The Influence of the Beaux Arts in the Making of Classical Washington

Like other building types, the stylistic treatment of apartment buildings was subject to passing fashion. The dark, muscular brick imagery of the Victorian age introduced the earliest apartment buildings in such fine examples as the Portland Flats, the Richmond Flats, the Maltby Flats, and the **Mount Vernon Flats** (1890, demolished) at 900-906 New York Avenue, N.W. But Schneider's 1894 Cairo turned attention to the newest style of the times, the Beaux Arts. The introduction of Beaux Arts style reflecting interest in the City Beautiful Movement would ultimately transform Washington from red brick to white stone. European precedents introduced the tripartite facade composition, as well as classically inspired sculpture, ironwork, porte cocheres and marquees. The Evening Star's Real Estate Gossip column pronounced "the French style" to be gaining popularity in New York. "It is fair to presume that it will not be long before examples of this style will be given form and shape in this city."⁵⁰

It took Washington architects time to make the transition into this new style and many buildings illustrate the colors and details associated with the Beaux Arts while still presenting the familiar Victorian forms. Buildings such as the Balfour and the Mendota illustrate the transition into the new aesthetic. Complete expressions of the Beaux Arts were not constructed until after the turn of the century with such buildings as Stone and Averill's **Kenesaw** (1905), Clinton Smith's marble **Champlain** (1905) at 1424 K Street, N.W., Bruce Price and Jules deSibour's **Warder** (1906) at 1155 16th Street, N.W. The full-blown presentation of the style is not seen until 1915, in de Sibour's extraordinary, mansion-type luxury flats, the McCormick.

Indeed, despite the high fashion associated with the Beaux Arts, the less grandiose Classical Revival style seemed a more comfortable alternative for many architects and owners. It was the single style used most often for larger apartment buildings. For apartment building design, the twentieth century presented a more ordered and logical arrangement of composition than did the late nineteenth, as much the product of architectural fashion as of the skills of better trained and more experienced apartment building designers. Although the Classical Revival style dominated, related styles were successfully used. The **Highlands** and **Stoneleigh Court** stand out for their expression of the Renaissance Revival made popular by New York's McKim, Mead and White. The Renaissance Revival was used also in such large buildings as the Altamont, and smaller buildings such as the Jules de Sibour's Anchorage. Offshoots of the Classical Revival, the

⁵⁰ The Evening Star, July 20, 1895, p. 9.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 44

Georgian and Colonial Revival styles reflected popular interest in the search for an "American" style. These styles have the longest duration for building type as seen in Hunter and Bell's Lehigh (1909), Claughton West's **Biltmore** (1913, 1940 Biltmore Street, N.W.), Clark's **Roosevelt** (1919), Santmyers' **Lincoln Arms** (1925), and New York architect Kenneth Franzheim's **McLean Gardens** (1942-43, vicinity of Langley Court, Newark, 39th and Porter Streets, N.W.)

During the 1920s, apartment architects began to draw their inspiration from romantic styles, including the English Tudor, Gothic, and Jacobean Revivals, French Vernacular architecture, and Moorish, Islamic and Spanish vocabularies. Throughout suburban America in the 1920s, residential architecture mimicked English, French and Spanish castles, Tudor manors and English and French farmhouses and Italian villas. In apartment architecture, the idea was not only to evoke the European countryside, but to create more romantic and exotic designs, not immediately associated with the strictly classical, Beaux Arts luxury apartments typical of the previous decades. Interest in the Mediterranean grew with the turn of the century resulting in such buildings as Wood, Donn and Deming's **Cordova** and Harding and Upman's **Woodward** (1909). This style echoed the popularity of Pan-American relations and effect of Spanish-American War. The Medieval English revivals, Tudor and Gothic Revival, came into their own in the 1910s and 1920s, notable with Philip Jullien's 1919 robust design for the **Chastleton** and Robert Scholz' more restrained (though decidedly animated) **Alban Towers** (1928-29).

Styles coming out of the Midwest brought Washington the Craftsman and Prairie Renaissance Revival style buildings in the 1910s and 1920s. The Prairie Renaissance Revival **St. Regis** (1912, 2219 California Street, N.W.), designed by Merrill Vaughn, is an excellent example of its style. Frank Russell White's design for the **Avondale** (1913, 1734 P Street, N.W.) is but one example of his personalized interpretation of the Craftsman style.

Exceptional designs, such as the Arts and Crafts style of George Oakley Totten's **Meridian Hill Studios** (1922) on 15th Street and specialty theme presentations (Horace Peaslee's **Moorings**, 1927, and George Ray's **Galleon**, 1927, demolished) brought color to apartment building design of the era. Styles that forecast the 1930s included William Harris' early (for Washington) Art Deco designs for the **Park Tower** (1928); **La Reine** (1929); and the **Ravenel** (1929). Louis Justement, like so many of his colleagues, entered his career in the early 1920s skilled in historical styles. Then his design of the **Valley Vista** (1927) reveals a technical ability using a new vocabulary. This austere, hard-edged building located at 2032 Belmont Road, N.W. is presented in umber-colored brick with noteworthy stone dressing. It possesses all the qualities of buildings from a much later date, yet possesses the balanced massing and elegant proportions that are clearly derived from Classical Revival architecture.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 45

Building Codes, Height Restrictions, Zoning Regulations

In 1905, ever increasing apartment building construction compelled the District Commissioners to pass more regulations affecting the form of the building type. New apartment houses were required to maintain open space around their exteriors to provide sufficient light and air for adjoining or neighboring lots. Buildings on corner lots were required to maintain 10 percent open space, while mid-block infill sites had to keep 35 percent free. Buildings over 50 feet were required to keep twelve feet of open space on all facades.

The continued increase and uncontrolled location of apartment buildings throughout the city was also a major factor in the decision to establish the District's 1920 Zoning Act. Like other cities, the twentieth century brought with it rampant development. Nationally, the city planning movement called for an evaluation of planning efforts, culminating in the increase in regulations on all aspects of urban development. In Washington, opposition grew toward uncontrolled apartment house construction. Mrs. John B. Henderson's strong public opposition in 1914 to Harry Wardman's plan to build apartments adjacent to her Meridian Hill Park (stopped only by her purchase of the land) and then, in 1919, her failure to halt construction of the seven-story Roosevelt, despite Congressional intervention, typified sentiments against the building boom. Zoning was seen as the answer.

When first introduced, zoning promised to fulfill goals at once simple and majestic. Through its *height and setback* controls, zoning would ensure sufficient light and air at street level so cities would not be labyrinths of dark and dreary canyons. Through its *use* controls, zoning would guarantee congestion-free central business districts and the ability of municipal infra-structure to keep pace with growth. In short, zoning would help create the City Beautiful.⁵¹

The City Beautiful movement quickly gained strength and popularity in Washington, a city already famous for its comprehensive plan. The Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City, dedicated to protecting the city's historic plans of 1792 and 1901, proposed the formation of an architectural review board to advise architects and owners as to the "appropriateness" of new buildings. The National Capital Park Commission was organized to oversee the acquisition of parklands that would assure the verdant character of the city. All the ingredients -- the Height Act, comprehensive planning regulating the city's growth, zoning laws, innovative building codes, an architectural review board-- that were supposed to insure a 'City Beautiful' were in place. But

⁵¹ Charles M. Haar and Jerold S. Kayden, Zoning and the American Dream, p. ix.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 46

the zoning ordinances did not immediately create the effect that public officials hoped. Mass demolition of residential properties that were located within the new commercial zones was one immediate and destructive result--significantly affecting the city's earliest apartment buildings.

A significant change in the appearance of the apartment building was directly caused by the Zoning Act in conjunction with the 1910 Height Act. The Height Act of 1910 reconfirmed height limitations for buildings, including apartment buildings. However, the Zoning Law went even further in controlling the form, height and location of buildings. The District of Columbia Zoning Act of 1920 created zones dedicated to certain uses including residential corridors where apartment buildings were allowed. In these areas, buildings could not extend more than 100 feet from an avenue; an increased percentage of open land was required; commercial signs were prohibited. This resulted in new approaches designed to gain as much height as possible. The reductions and constraints on the height of apartment buildings inspired the introduction of step-down lobbies and rear grade construction allowing more floors.

Dissatisfied with the power of the new zoning regulations to stem overdevelopment, the Commissioners looked to revising the building codes in 1923. A major change occurred in 1925 when the Zoning Commission revised the regulations to further confine apartment building construction, at the same time adding the right to construct such buildings along Massachusetts Avenue.

The Master Developers

Unlike the early years, major owner/developers of the early twentieth century enjoyed a high profile. There were too many and their wealth too great not to draw attention to this new source of Washington money. Some of the most prominent developers were Edgar S. Kennedy, Howard Etchison, Monroe and R. Bates Warren, Harry M. Bralove, Morris Cafritz, David L. Stern, Frank Tomlinson, Gustave Ring, Goldsmith and Keller, Baer and Scholz, A. Joseph Howar, William S. Phillips, the Ell and Kay Company, and, of course, Harry Wardman. Men like Kennedy and Wardman began their careers at the turn of the century, while others like Monroe and R. Bates Warren, Harry Bralove, Morris Cafritz were newcomers in the teens and twenties. Taking their cue from architects such as George Cooper, Nicholas Haller, and B. Stanley Simmons who dabbled in development there stemmed a new breed of architect/developers. Frank Russell White, George Ray, David Stern, and Robert Scholz began their careers as architects, but soon realized the potential for developing their own properties.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 47

Harry Wardman

Harry Wardman (1871-1938), who often appears to have built Washington single-handedly, is known to have developed over 200 apartment buildings as well as hundreds of "flat" units. By purchasing land, building, renting, and then selling the property to gain new capital for the next project, Wardman was able to continue his apartment building career from 1903 through 1928. His first buildings were sited along the **2200 block of 14th Street, N.W.**, near the Boundary Street edge of the Federal City. Locating close to the streetcar line was a resourceful location and one that proved a most successful start. His entry into the luxury market came in 1909 when he developed the distinguished **Dresden** and the **Northumberland**. The design of the **Avondale** (1913) by Frank Russell White illustrates the Prairie Renaissance Revival style, while the two teamed to undertake a variety of styles all with White's unique signature. Later work with Eugene Waggaman returned to the Classical Revival, while Mirhan Mesrobian ventured into varied modernistic interpretations of traditional design motifs. By committing to a single architect at a time, Wardman seemed able to keep the designs coming as fast as he planned the projects. Each man brought his own style to Wardman's success formula.

Wardman's later innovations include the **Alcova Heights** apartments (1925), a mixed use, moderate-income co-operative development, a group of moderate-income, featuring five four-story, Georgian Revival style buildings with 152 units and nine stores. In 1925, it was "touted as the largest co-op outside New York City."⁵² This scheme was as close he came to any to realize his dream for a immense project comprised of five towers on five acres at the Taft Bridge. Like so many others, Wardman was seriously overextended when the stock market crashed in 1929, and lost everything he owned, estimated to be worth \$30,000,000. He resumed building several years later, but did not attempt another apartment building.

Monroe and R. Bates Warren, and Edgar S. Kennedy

Monroe Warren, Sr. generally worked in partnership with his brother R. Bates Warren, developing small complexes of apartment buildings. An Evening Star article from August, 1930 calls them one of the "leading operators in the co-operative apartment field". Most of their projects were developed in the 1920s and are in northwest Washington, D.C., specifically in the Cleveland Park and Woodley Park neighborhoods. Shortly before construction began on the **Kennedy-Warren**, they completed the **Tilden Gardens** (1930) at 3900-3930 Connecticut Avenue,

⁵² Goode, Best Addresses p. 177.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 48

N.W.; **Cleveland Park Gardens** (1924) in the 3000 block of Porter Street, N.W.; and the **Army and Navy Apartments** (1925) at 2540 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. (now the Rock Creek Apartments).

Both Edgar S. Kennedy and Monroe Warren, Sr. were experienced apartment building entrepreneurs in Washington, D.C. when they collaborated on the Kennedy-Warren, their only known joint venture. Edgar Sumter Kennedy (1861-1953) came to Washington, D.C. in 1884 and established a building business. Along with his brother, William Munsey Kennedy, he built thousands of single-family residences and many apartment buildings including **2400 16th Street, N.W.**; **3220 17th Street, N.W.**; and a group of four apartment buildings on the **northeast corner of Cathedral and Connecticut Avenues, N.W.** He was responsible for the development of Kenwood, Maryland and the lining of its streets with hundreds of cherry trees and dogwoods. His buildings were the first to use electricity without additionally installing gas lighting fixtures.⁵³ He was president of Kennedy Bros. Co. and Kennedy-Chamberlain Development Co.

Morris Cafritz

Morris Cafritz focused primarily on single family house construction, but was responsible for 27 apartment buildings in Washington from 1922 through the 1940s. He attempted to make his mark with his first group of seven modest, conventional-type apartment buildings on the **1400 block of Spring Road, N.W.** This led to bigger ventures and a mixed success record with co-operative ownership. In 1925, he retained Harvey Warwick to design the Mediterranean Revival **3600 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.** Over the years, Warwick designed many buildings for Cafritz, serving as his chief architect in much the same way that Beers and others had worked for developer Harry Wardman. **Park Central**, a huge nine-story building with 316-units at 1900 F Street, N.W., and the **Parklane** at 2025 I Street, N.W., an eleven-story building with 290-units, were both designed in the Art Deco style in 1928. For the Miramar the team scaled down to eight stories, but still fit 207 apartments into the building. Although most developers scaled back after the Depression, Cafritz seemed to know how to take advantage of the tremendous need for housing close to downtown and the federal work places. Cafritz worked with architects Alvin Aubinoe, Sr. and Harry Edwards to construct the nine-story **Hightowers** (1936), a powerful expression of the Art Moderne style at 2000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. The **Majestic** (1937) at 3200 16th Street, N.W., was also designed by Aubinoe and Edwards. Cafritz ended his apartment building career with a small building, only two stories high and 33 units, designed by Harry Edwards. But like all

⁵³ Washington Star, August 22, 1953.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 49

of Cafritz's work, it held an exceptional character: this garden-type building with its T-shape footprint, is sited to fill the entire triangular Square 3684 known as **1 Hawaii Avenue, N.E.** (1941).

David Stern and Frank Tomlinson

David Stern's **Ponce de Leon** (1928) at 4514 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., captures the essence of the career of an architect/developer in Washington in the 1920s. Stern, whose career lasted over 50 years, is credited with more than 80 apartment buildings, the majority designed in partnership with Frank Tomlinson. Of these, 76 were designed in the 1920s, representing more than 10 percent of all the apartment buildings constructed during that prolific decade of Washington's expansion. Stern is best remembered for his luxury apartment buildings constructed during the late 1920s, and particularly the **Ponce de Leon**. Designed in 1928, it is one of the major buildings that established Stern's reputation as an architect of merit in the city, but it also was a product of his work as a developer. In 1919, Stern collaborated on the first apartment house documented as his work in conjunction with Frank Tomlinson. During their partnership (1919-1926), the firm designed over 60 apartment buildings. Their early design (for example, **3115 Mount Pleasant Street**, 1919) was, in form and style, consistent with apartment building design prevalent before the war and is of the Colonial Revival Style. Between 1919 and 1922, Stern and Tomlinson continued to design modest three-, four-, and five-story apartment buildings, each accommodating fewer than 30 families. These buildings show a change in stylistic direction towards simpler, plainer, flatter facades utilizing the classical vocabulary. Their ornamentation is generally confined to the main entrance, the cornice line, and sometimes incorporates quoining and belt-coursing.

In 1922, Stern and Tomlinson began to design larger apartment buildings. The first was the **Shawmut** (1922) at 2200 19th Street, N.W., accommodating 71 families. In the same year, they designed the **Argonne** (1922) at 1629 Columbia Road, N.W., that housed 242 families. The **Argonne** is the largest apartment building that Stern and Tomlinson designed together. Throughout their partnership, Stern and Tomlinson preferred Classical Revival architectural motifs, although the ornamentation was not limited to that genre. One of the last commissions designed by the partnership, and perhaps the most striking examples of their work together, are the Gothic Revival style twin buildings, the **Windemere** (1925, 1825 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.) and the **Harrowgate** (1925, 1833 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.) designed for developer A. J. Howar.

Each architect continued to design apartment buildings on his own: 21 by Stern and 12 by Tomlinson. In 1926, after Stern opened his own architectural office, his apartment building

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 50

designs for the next two years continued to use the restrained Classical Revival design elements of his earlier buildings. Then, between 1928 and 1930, Stern began to design large luxury apartment buildings using a variety of architectural motifs. These buildings include: **the Lombardy** (1927) at 2019 I Street, N.W.; the **Sedgewick** (1928) at 1722 19th Street, N.W.; the **Frontenac** (1930) at 4550 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.; **Oaklawn Terrace** (1929) at 3620 16th Street, N.W.; and the **Ponce de Leon**. This group of buildings forms the core of Stern's most interesting work and the buildings for which he is most remembered.⁵⁴ Many of these buildings were either designed and built by Stern himself or in collaboration with A. Joseph Howar, another real estate developer in Washington, D.C. who worked closely with Stern during this time period. In 1936, Stern established the David L. Stern Construction Company 1936 and remained its head, even while semi-retired, until his death in 1969.⁵⁵

Of his luxury apartment buildings, the Ponce de Leon is the one that Stern chose for his own residence. The 1929 city directory lists David L. Stern as the resident of Apartment 403. In apartment 402 lived his colleague A. J. Howar. Stern resided in the Ponce de Leon for four years until 1933 when he moved to the **Broadmoor** at 3601 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. In 1932, Howar moved to **1722 19th Street, N.W.**, another apartment building designed by Stern.

Following the stock market crash of 1929 and the subsequent building bust during the early 1930s, few buildings were constructed in Washington, D.C. Stern himself was involved in financial difficulties when the firm of Swartzell, Rheem, Hensey, et al., the original financial backers of the Ponce de Leon (as well as many other apartment buildings), went bankrupt. Apparently these financiers illegally released the building, allowing Stern to sell the building early in 1929. Consequently, when the bankruptcy proceedings started, the legal title to the Ponce de Leon became a contested issue.

In 1936, Stern founded his own construction company and continued to be active in designing and constructing buildings until his death in 1969. However, to date, only a small number of this work has been identified through research of D.C. building permits. The majority of the buildings that have been identified are plain brick structures with little ornamentation typical to the standard of the 1930s and 1940s. One notable exception is **4801 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.** (1938), which is a striking Art Moderne design.

⁵⁴ Washington Star, August 22, 1953.

⁵⁵ David L. Stern, Washington Star, obituary, 9/1/1969.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 51

The Influence of the Garden City Movement

The zoning regulations and revised building codes encouraged an approach to the Washington apartment building that was clearly in touch with contemporary sentiment regarding healthful living. Strong interest in the suburbs was translated into the integration of more green space into urban settings and apartment building designs. Developers hoped that by providing open space and landscaped gardens around apartments, they could dispense with many of the stigmas attached to city apartment buildings. These new "garden" apartments offered superior air circulation, more pleasing views, and enhanced light in each apartment--all at a moderate price. Technological advances and new inventions provided the ground work for new floor plans and interior improvements. Affordable push-button passenger elevators allowed architects to plan more liberal floor arrangements not dictated by the single banks of hand-operated elevators. Consequently, the prevalent U-shape of earlier buildings of the early twentieth century gave way to the radiating wings and irregular shapes such as the X-shape used at Hampshire Gardens and **Tilden Gardens** (1927), 3016-24 Tilden Street, N.W.; the expansive and irregular schemes of **Cathedral Mansions** (1922), 2900 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. and the **Broadmoor** (1928), 3601 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. These plans allowed three exposures in many of the apartment units. Long halls were often no longer required. A balcony or a porch began to be incorporated into the designs of the buildings in the 1910s and 1920s. The first type, almost a "front" porch, was intended for street viewing. Probably a re-interpretation of the suburban porch, it opened up apartments to the outdoors for the first time, examples include the Northbrook and Alban Towers. Sleeping porches were also a new innovation in the 1910s. Set into the backs of buildings, they offered an alternative for hot Washington nights. In the early 1910s, the porches were open, and by the late 1940s, after air-conditioning became more standard, they were typically enclosed with glass and called solariums. Interior improvements included many kitchen and bathroom innovations such as dishwashers, maid entries, and showers in each apartment.

In 1914, The Evening Star published an interview with Richard B. Watrous, the secretary of the American Civic Association on his trip through model towns surrounding a number of Britain's most industrial urban centers. Watrous was convinced that the "garden city" movement was an idea that would suit the United States, and particularly Washington. Washington, he mused, was the "ideal American locale for America's first 'garden city'."⁵⁶ Because of the relatively low--if constant--incomes of government employees, Washington's high cost of living, and the traditional preference for rowhouses, most citizens could not afford detached houses in town. The lower

⁵⁶ The Evening Star, 1914.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 52

priced homes in the garden city would thus be ideal for Washington clerks, the middle and most numerous level of federal workers.⁵⁷

The earliest garden apartments appeared in Washington in the 1920s. James Goode defines garden apartments as "a group of two- or three-story buildings without lobbies or elevators arranged together in a landscaped setting."⁵⁸ The first garden apartment in the city was developed by Allen E. Walker, and constructed in 1921-22. Located adjacent to the Soldier's Home at 124-126-128-130 Webster Street, N.W., **Petworth Gardens** (1921-22, now Webster Gardens) was modeled after the famous Pomander Walk community in London.⁵⁹ The complex was designed by Washington architect Robert Beresford, who used red brick, hipped roofs, decorative dormer windows, glazed sleeping porches, arched doors and eaves to create a residential, small-scale quality for the development. Beresford used the same design for each of the six buildings in the complex. The landscaping of this nascent garden apartment is limited to narrow, rectangular lawns which separate each building. Goode concludes that the city's earliest garden apartments are unsuccessful architecturally because: "...their elements were poorly related to one another. The idea works best when the buildings are grouped together harmoniously around a spacious landscaped courtyard."⁶⁰

The second garden apartment complex built in the city was constructed in 1924-25, and located at 3018-28 Porter Street, N.W. The **Cleveland Park** (1924-25) garden apartments were developed by Monroe and R. Bates Warren, two of the leading apartment developers of the 1920s. Identical in size, each of the six buildings are treated in a slightly different interpretation of the Georgian Revival style. Narrow walkways separate each of the buildings which face directly onto Porter Street. The expansive gardens and garages were situated to the rear of each building, and remain intact today. The director of sales for the Cleveland Park co-ops was Edmund J. Flynn. Flynn had recently left the Allen E. Walker Company and established his own firm specializing in cooperative ownership and cooperative plans. Flynn was instrumental in establishing cooperative apartments as a viable and accepted alternative to rental apartments in Washington. He was one of the first real estate men to take out advertisements for his projects. His full-page notices of

⁵⁷ Goode, Best Addresses, p. 325.

⁵⁸ Goode, Best Addresses, p. 183.

⁵⁹ "Construction of First Unit of Petworth Gardens Begun." The Evening Star. October 8, 1921.

⁶⁰ Goode, Best Addresses, p. 183.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 53

the Cleveland Park Garden Apartments espoused the benefits of living in and owning a Cleveland Park co-operative apartment.

Hampshire Gardens apartments (215, 225, 235, Emerson Street, N.W.; 4915 3rd Street N.W.; 208, 222, 236, 250 Farragut Street, N.W. and 4912 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.), were constructed in 1929. The project's success was directly related to the carefully integrated architecture and landscape plan. This plan provided a unique residential enclave of domestically scaled apartment buildings that was closely associated with and enhanced by a courtyard, garden setting. Although built in an undeveloped area of the city, the co-operative venture was met with enthusiasm and the apartments sold quickly. The Great Depression interrupted progress on the multi-block development, and only one-full city block of the scheme was ever executed.⁶¹ The construction of garden apartments in Washington reached a peak in the mid-1930s and early 1940s. Hundreds of garden apartment complexes were constructed during these years throughout the city. A simultaneous advancement of the building type growing out of the same ethos was the development of the "grand garden" apartment type. Although the Ontario (1903) can be seen as a prototype for the garden apartment with its sprawling massing set onto three acres of a "lofty and rural location free from malaria,"⁶² it was more likely that New York City and Westchester County examples were the models for Washington as the philosophy behind the garden movement took hold in the 1920s. This city seemed perfect for the type as large amounts of inexpensive, relatively close-in land was available. Large, elaborate buildings, such as Philip Jullien's Gothic Revival design for the **Chastleton** (1919) at 1701 16th Street, N.W., and Appleton P. Clark, Jr.'s **Roosevelt** (1919), expanded on the concept of grand, luxury buildings of the apartment building's early history. Although sited on large pieces of land, their huge floor plates occupied the majority of their sites. Robert Scholz' design for partner David A. Baer resulted in the magnificent Gothic Revival style **Alban Towers** (1928-29) at 3700 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Sited tight to the intersection of Wisconsin and Massachusetts Avenue, its street facade belies the grand views of the open space to its rear. Designed to complement the adjacent Washington Cathedral, it possesses a presence formed by the rhythm of its bays, porches and sculptural detailing. **2101 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.** (1927), developed by Harry Bralove reflected the emerging talent of the young designer Joseph Abel.⁶³ Called the "finest apartment house to appear between the two World

⁶¹Many other grandiose apartment plans, including the Kennedy-Warren expansion, were unrealized because of the economic climate in the 1930s.

⁶² Goode, Best Addresses p. 59.

⁶³George Santmyer is listed on the building permit as the "architect", but his employee, Abel, is credited with the design.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 54

Wars,"⁶⁴ the building illustrates an ingenious response to the height limitations imposed in 1910 with its step-down lobby but, like Alban Towers, its rhythmic bays and sculptural rendition of the Gothic Moderne gives a human quality that is easily associated with the buildings that would be sited on large landscaped grounds.

In the early 1920s, the garden apartment aesthetic also influenced the design and siting of luxury apartment buildings. Alexander Sonnemann designed the large, but low-scaled **Kew Gardens** (1922) at 2700 Q Street for developer Harry Kite. Georgian Revival in style, it features a large central garden court, originally landscaped by a New York designer. Harry Wardman's **Wardman Towers** (1928, 2600 Woodley Road, N.W.) designed by Mihran Mesrobian, the developer's favorite designer of the time, also reflects this theme. The X-plan building is presented in a Georgian Revival style. It is set high above Connecticut Avenue, overlooking sumptuous plantings. Other examples such as A. Joseph Howar's Harrowgate development designed by David Stern and Mesrobian's Sedgwick Gardens illustrate this building phenomenon.

In 1915, Harry Wardman was planning a luxury apartment building complex to be called Woodley Courts. The coming war diminished his ability to carry out the ambitious scheme that surely would have resulted in Washington's first "grand garden" apartments. Other projects presented variations on the idea. Wardman's **Northbrook Court** (1917) at 4230-26 16th Street, N.W., illustrates an early "grand garden" apartment complex comprised of two related buildings set onto an open site. Designed by Frank Russell White in 1917, the buildings are Beaux Arts in style. The sophisticated site plan and massing afford light, air and views via large projecting bays set in a staggered design along 16th Street, N.W. Small stone balconies integrate the exterior with the interior. Wardman and Waggaman's design for **Cathedral Mansions** (1922-23), 2900 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. is another early example of a group of luxury apartment buildings sited on grounds sufficiently spacious to introduce a landscaped setting. With careful attention to site plans, landscaping and views, this three-building, Georgian Revival project employed irregular footprints to maximize light and air, while capitalizing on views of the landscaped site. In 1926, Wardman sought to build an even larger complex than Woodley Courts (1915)--five high-rise buildings on five acres accommodating 5,000 tenants, however, the scheme failed to gain financing.

Tilden Gardens (1927-29) remains the grandest of the "grand garden" apartments in Washington. Designed by landscape designers Parks and Baxter, the site plan, landscaping and buildings were conceived as a holistic entity. Architect Harry Edwards served as their "associate architect." Composed of six buildings presented in the English Tudor Revival style, it is a sophisticated

⁶⁴ Goode, Best Addresses, p. 263.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 55

complex sited on a varied grade with extensive gardens, while also incorporating below grade parking. Bralove gave Joseph Abel the opportunity to design a "grand garden" type building with his 1928 Broadmoor at 3601 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Set on five acres, the nine-story Gothic Moderne building uses only 15 percent of its site. Louis T. Rouleau, Jr.'s 1929 Art Deco design for Woodley Park Towers includes a highly irregular floor plan that provided maximum exposure to all apartments.

VII. Modernism and the Apartment Building: Times, Style and Technology

From the end of the World War until 1929, 731 apartment buildings were constructed in Washington, twice the number built during the previous decade. With the stock market crash, and the lack of investment capital, apartment construction slowed in the early 1930s. By the end of the 1930s, 641 apartment buildings had been constructed: 328 in the northwest, 164 in the northeast, 10 in the southwest, and 139 in the southeast. Three major apartment buildings opened the era: the Shoreham, the Westchester, and the Kennedy-Warren, each affected by the Depression. Despite the Depression, Federal programs brought droves of new residents to Washington in the 1930s, effectively inverting the percentage of new construction of houses versus apartment units. By the end of the decade, apartment units outranked houses by 70 percent. The District ranked with New York and Chicago as cities with highest percentage of apartment house residents. This popularity changed the character of Washington's real estate investment industry. Apartment buildings, with their accompanying speculative investment potential, became Washington's prime real estate venture.

The Impact of the Times

The Great Depression did not dramatically affect Washington's building business until 1931, but even that proved to be only an interlude as the federal government's efforts to control the depression resulted in a focus on filling major housing and office needs. Between 1935-41, of the \$102 million expended for residential housing, 60 percent went toward apartment buildings. This increased need for apartments was a result of many new residents whose federal salaries could not keep up with housing prices, placing single family residences out of reach.

Changes to the building type were seen not in the introduction of new forms, but rather in the loss of quality and services due to post-war inflation or interestingly enough, the use of modern technology. Amendments to the 1920 Zoning Act introduced new requirements such as garages

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 56

that would provide adequate parking for tenants was now required for new buildings. Building heights were allowed to reach eight stories, if a large amount of open space was maintained; but lot occupancy was restricted to no greater than 49 percent.

Typical of the early 1930s was the failure of large projects to be completed as planned. The Westchester was intended as a 28-acre project with four, eight-story connecting buildings. Employing the Tudor Revival style, architect Harvey Warwick prepared a design that fully articulated every elevation of the projecting bay designs. Only three of the four buildings were completed as the Depression reduced developer Gustave Ring's financial ability to complete his plans. Most significantly, rising competition for apartments compelled politicians to institute rent control. The response to rising inflation that had placed apartments out of reach of government employees slightly reduced the investment value of apartment buildings.

The Impact of Modernism

The use of modern styles for Washington apartment buildings between the 1920s and the 1930s stands out as the single most significant change in the building type in those years. As visually striking as the impact of the supplanting of Victorian expression by the classically derived styles of the early twentieth century, so was the impact of the styles associated with the Modern Movement. The first phase was associated with the high-style Art Deco. The copious work of architect George Santmyers Jr. offers an excellent illustration of the stylistic transformation of Washington's apartment buildings during this era. Santmyers early work focused on conventional type apartment buildings located in the outer limits of the District. These modest, red brick structures were at first traditional renditions of the historical styles, often not particularly distinguished or detailed. As his work progressed in the 1920s, the proportion of "classical" design was transposed with a more modern stripped aesthetic. First this was seen in doorways, window surrounds, roof cornices; in time the facade composition, color or texture of brick, or the actual massing of the buildings was different, expressed as bold forms or displaying stream-lined ornament. The influence of the Art Deco was often replaced by that of Art Moderne, resulting in low-lying, stream-lined buildings punctuated by glass block and aluminum, clad with tan brick exaggerating the horizontal lines of the design. Finally Santmyers moved to the International Style as the culminating aesthetic force transporting his and Washington's architecture into a new era.

Joseph Abel, Washington's foremost modernist associated with the apartment building movement, worked in Santmyers' office before establishing his own firm in 1928. Continuing his career with

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 57

Harry Bralove, Santmyers' client, Abel went on to an illustrious career. His early work, including 2029 Connecticut and the Broadmoor, relied on a Moderne rendition of the familiar Gothic Revival so popular for residential architecture in the 1920s and 1930s. His design for the Shoreham suggests the struggle that Abel was experiencing as he shed Classical aesthetics for the International Style. The **Governor Shepherd** (1938, demolished), 2121 Virginia Avenue, N.W., was designed by Dillon and Abel in 1938, and was one of city's (and the firm's) earliest International Style buildings. The firm continued its work in the International Style at such buildings as the **Parksquare**, (1927) at 2407 15th Street, N.W.; the **Washington House** (1940) at 2020 16th Street, N.W., and **2100 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.** (1940).

Joseph Younger was a local architect who affiliated himself with several developers during his short career. Younger's work includes the Wardman Park Saddle Club in Rock Creek Park, the Blackstone Hotel, Rizik's P Street store, and the Sixth Presbyterian Church (16th and Kennedy Streets, N.W.), for which he won a Washington Board of Trade award. Apartment buildings known to be designed by Younger are **1372 Randolph Street, N.W.** (1924) for Max Levitan, owner and builder; **3701 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.** (1925) for Baer and Scholz, owners and builders; and the Classical Revival **1661 Crescent Place, N.W.** (1925) for Monroe and R. Bates Warren, owners and builders.

Younger's design for the Kennedy-Warren is far more elaborate and complex than his earlier designs. It is this building which has immortalized the architect. The building should have been the crowning point of his career, instead it was its culmination. Beset by financial difficulties, he committed suicide in his Tilden Gardens apartment in May 1932, only a few months after the Kennedy-Warren was completed.

Harvey Warwick's first apartment building designs were the prosaic compositions in 1922 for the seven-building "CAFTRITZ Row" on Spring Road. The unusual massing seen at the **Randall Mansions** (1923, 1900 Lamont Street, N.W.) begins to reveal a more distinct talent. The **Chalfonte** (1925), 1601 Argonne Place, N.W., presents a Mediterranean facade, distinctly influenced by contemporary Los Angeles apartment building architecture. His skill with the Gothic Revival expressed in the 1930s as Gothic Moderne is seen at the decidedly transitional design for **Hilltop Manor** (1926, now the Cavalier, 3500 14th Street, N.W.), the **Miramar** (1929), and his triumph, the design for the Westchester (1930) for Gustave Ring and Morris Cafritz. After the Westchester, his most significant work is in the 1930s when he worked with Cafritz to create two massive downtown Art Deco apartment buildings: the **Park Central** and the **Park Lane**. The Art Moderne design for Cafritz' family namesake **Marlyn** is credited to Warwick, but it is his associate, Frances Koenig who actually designed this International Style building in 1938.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 58

Frances Koenig worked for Harry Warwick during the late 1930s, fairly fresh from his correspondence school architectural drafting course and first hand design/build experience. He designed two important Art Moderne style apartment buildings in Washington: the immense **Carlyn** (1941) at 2500 Q Street, N.W.; the smaller, 395 unit **Dorchester** (1941) at 2480 16th Street, N.W.

The **Majestic** (1937), with its cylindrical bays, vertical brick pinnacles, and corner windows is an outstanding example of Washington's Art Moderne style. Designed by Alvin L. Aubinoe, Sr. and Harry Edwards for developer Morris Cafritz, its eight stories with 151 units seem to soar amidst a horizontal city. **Park Crescent** (1937) at 2901 18th Street, N.W., **Hightowers** (1936) at 2000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., and a second from 1938 by the same name at 1530 16th Street, N.W., represent several of Aubinoe's Moderne style. The elaborate Art Deco of Mihran Mesrobian's **Sedgwick Gardens** (1931) was a new approach for Harry Wardman's architect of the time. In 1939, for Frank Macklin, Mesrobian again displayed his ability with the Art Deco style. This commercial/residential project, plays with buff brick in a zig-zag pattern set between brick banding, accented by a stream-lined aluminum marquee.

The Impact of Modern Technology

Some of Washington's most fascinating apartment buildings date to the Depression era. The **Kennedy-Warren** (1931) stands among the most significant luxury apartment buildings constructed in the Art Deco style in Washington, D.C. At the time of its construction in 1931, it was considered to be the largest and architecturally most important apartment building in the city. Its exterior, which is intact to its original design, embodies the geometric and jazzy characteristics of the grand architecture of that age. Its majestic siting--set back from Connecticut Avenue, N.W., just north of the National Zoo entrance and abutting Rock Creek Park--sets the building apart from others and adds to the building's distinctive presence on Connecticut Avenue, one of the important apartment building corridors in the city. As the best-known and most significant work of local architect Joseph Younger, its construction brought to a grand end the pre-World War II period of development of the avenue.

On September 13, 1931, a 14-page supplement to the Sunday Washington Post heralded the up-coming opening of the Kennedy-Warren on October 1. Dozens of articles provide in-depth reporting on all aspects of the building's construction, decoration, services, and management. Each participant in the erection of the building, down to the painters and bathtub suppliers, are given coverage. In this respect, the Kennedy-Warren is one of the best documented apartment buildings in the city. The Kennedy-Warren was advertised in its promotional literature as an

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 59

ultra-modern building, the "finest completely air cooled apartment" in the city. It touted reasonable rental rates, a variety of apartment sizes, electricity, refrigerators, gas, and a number of services such as doormen, nightly garbage pick-up from each unit, and telephone secretarial service. The management provided maid service, as well as quarters which residents could rent for their private maids. A ballroom, public dining room, and lounges were provided for large-scale entertainment.

Many builders in the city encountered financial difficulties with the onset of the Depression. Kennedy and Warren experienced such problems soon after construction began on the apartment building. Rather than completing the building as planned, they constructed and fully furnished only half. A large "H" shaped section on the south end of the building was not constructed. Arrangements to finance the rest of the building fell through, and through a series of unfortunate incidents, Kennedy and Warren lost their shares in the building. Their brokers, the B.F. Saul Company, assumed its ownership, and has remained its owner and manager to this day. In 1935, the Kennedy-Warren was enlarged. According to a May 12, 1935 Washington Star article which announced the plans for the addition, construction of apartment buildings had come to a virtual halt soon after the erection of the original section of the Kennedy-Warren. The major addition of 107 units to the Kennedy-Warren brought to an end a two-and-one-half year period during which almost no large-scale apartment building construction took place. Although 120 building permits were issued for apartment buildings between 1931 and 1935, they were generally for small buildings. Only the **Longfellow** (1932), 5521 Colorado Avenue, N.W. with its 202 units was of a size comparable to the Kennedy-Warren.

IX. Public Housing Comes to the Nation's Capital

Between 1940 and 1945, 971 apartment buildings were constructed in Washington, more than a 50 percent increase over the number built in the entire previous decade: 193 in northwest, 222 in northeast, 74 in southwest, and 482 in southeast. The most significant aspect of these statistics is the tremendous growth in the southeast quadrant of the District. Until 1940, only 206 apartment buildings had been constructed in this area. The difference was the product of social reform and the wholesale commitment to public housing.

Following the Depression, many developers who had achieved so much through the 1920s were forced to continue their work with more modest enterprises, directing their efforts to meeting the pressing housing needs of the reduced economic circumstances of the working classes. A major change in focus was inspired by Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Works Project Administration. Initiated in the early 1930s to assist the country's reclamation from the depths of depression, the

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 60

agency developed programs designed to provide employment, housing, and improve societal problems. It met with tremendous success, carrying its director, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, to even greater power. The combined maturation of the government's recovery efforts, and the impact of troubled international politics that led to a second World War significantly affected the character of Washington's apartment housing.

The Public Good

The development of public housing in the United States is a complex story. However, the example of **Langston Terrace** illustrates the way Washington was utilized to demonstrate the possible solutions to this growing problem. Designed and constructed in the mid 1930s, Langston Terrace set the stage for the transition of the concept of the apartment building from one of lodging to omnipotent social reformer. Langston Terrace was designed by Washington architect Hilyard Robinson, with the assistance of associate architect Paul Williams. The garden apartment complex was conceived by the Works Project Administration as a demonstration project providing innovative, well-designed housing for low-income blacks.⁶⁵ Its 273 apartments were arranged on the 14 acres of Parcel 16, an undeveloped site overlooking the Anacostia River. Intended to show how a well-designed environment could affect people's lives positively, the planners of Langston Terrace incorporated many amenities, including playgrounds, public art, and carefully designed units with simple but up-to-date technological features. The 1700 tenants who lived in the 273 units were hand selected for their stable backgrounds--people "worthy" of the opportunity for "reclamation." Phrases like "planned utopia," and "a model community for the reclamation of human lives" were used to describe the project. The complex was not occupied until it was fully completed in 1938. Social programs were incorporated into the daily life of the residents, and distinguished examples of thematic artwork depicting the history and accomplishments of African Americans was integrated into the architecture. The project captured the attention of the social historian Lewis Mumford according to whom "...the P.W.A. apartments [Langston Terrace] in Washington, D.C., by Robinson, Porter and Williams set a high standard of design."⁶⁶

⁶⁵ The plan to pair Langston Terrace with a similar project designed to accommodate poor whites was never realized.

⁶⁶Lewis Mumford, "The Skyline," The New Yorker, April 30, 1938, p. 50, quoted in Mosely, "The Black Architects of Washington, D.C.," p. 69.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 61

As public sentiment recognized the tremendous need for decent housing for the country's poor and under-privileged, the federal government's interest rose as well. The Federal Housing Administration subsidized many private corporations to encourage them to enter the low-income housing market. In Washington, numerous complexes designed as garden apartments were constructed in the late 1930s and 1940s, many of these subsidized to provide low-income tenants a decent place to live. Appleton P. Clark also actively participated in this reform movement. His work with the Washington Sanitary Housing Improvement Corporation focused on designing and building new housing for the working classes. The company organized a program based on need and the ability to pay, to encourage responsible lifestyles and employment. The privately funded program focused on the District's southwest quadrant and resulted in ten buildings by Clark in the late 1930s.

The Alley Dwelling Authority (hereafter "ADA") was a slum clearance agency that came into being in November 1934 as a result of the District of Columbia's Alley Dwelling Act of 1934. The Act provided "for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in alleys and to eliminate the hidden communities in inhabited alleys in the District of Columbia;"⁶⁷ and the re-housing of those displaced. In the late 1930s the ADA undertook the task of designing a major garden apartment complex in the southeast quadrant of the city. Called the **Ellen Wilson Dwellings** as a memorium to President Woodrow Wilson's first wife who worked diligently to alleviate the problems associated with alley dwellings, it consisted of a complex of 46 buildings, bounded by G, I and 6th Streets, N.E. The buildings existing on the site were demolished and new construction was begun in 1940 to the design of the architect Arthur B. Heaton. In 1944, the building was fully occupied. Other alley reclamation projects by the ADA include the **Fort Dupont Dwellings** (1939), designed by Louis Justement, in Southeast, at Squares 5401 and 5402, between C Street and Ridge Road; **Frederick Douglass Dwellings** (1939), designed by Hilyard Robinson at Alabama Avenue and Stanton Terrace, S.E.; and the **Carrollsbury Dwellings** (1939) also in Southeast between 3rd, 5th and I Streets designed by Francis P. Sullivan.

A momentous project for Washington was the effort to construct the mammoth public housing complex, Greenway. **Greenway** (1940) required four complete city blocks to hold the 71 apartment buildings and open space required for this Federal Housing Authority project. Designed by the skilled Harry Edwards, the buildings were delineated in a simple, economical manner alluding to a modern sensibility while maintaining the scale and forms usually associated with the detached house design. Built by the Cafritz Construction Company, this project remains the city's largest public housing complex.

⁶⁷Quoted in The Report of the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia, Dec. 15, 1935, p. 1.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 62

Private Needs

To fill the needs of the expanding New Deal government and its enormous work force, many apartment buildings were converted into offices. Few downtown apartment buildings were spared. In some cases, the apartment buildings were simply seized by the government and the interiors were renovated into functional office spaces. Other times, buildings were demolished to make space for new office construction. Strong public opposition was voiced to these government take-overs, for not only did they seem unfair to owners and tenants, there was no housing available to take the place of the confiscated properties. The competition for housing in Washington escalated to new heights. As had been the case during the World War, city officials responded to the public outcry for rent control laws.

Several new privately funded garden apartment complexes were constructed in the late 1930s and early 1940s, in response to the growing housing shortages. **Brentwood Village** in northeast Washington was designed by Raymond A. Snow and built by Ring Construction Company in 1937. The 17 apartment buildings were designed to serve lower-income families. A variety of massing schemes and a modernist aesthetic maximized the architectural character of this low-cost project. Kirkuff and Bagley designed the distinctly 1940s Colonial Revival style garden apartments that form **Ordway Village** east of Wisconsin Avenue in Cleveland Park. The developer of this 1942 project was Meadowbrooks, Inc., the company started by Monroe Warren, Sr., after 1929. This new company developed a significant number of moderate income apartments and houses in Washington and the neighboring areas of Maryland. An entire apartment building neighborhood was created in the 1940s west of Glover Park in northwest Washington. Dozens of four-unit "house-type" apartment buildings were built to the designs of Dana B. Johannes, Jr. for H. E. Davis and Eugene Phifer. Combining Georgian Revival and Art Moderne elements, these buildings complemented the more sophisticated small Moderne style garden complexes scattered in the area. Johannes designed other garden complexes for Phifer including the group on **700 and 900 Blocks of Quincy Street and Quincy Place, N.E.** (1936). He also designed the two-building Classical Revival **Wayne Terrace** at 204 and 216 Wayne Place, S.E. for Greendale Apartments, Inc.; a group flanking the **200 block of Mississippi Avenue, S.E.** (1943) for Martin Brothers Realty Corporation. A total of 37 buildings are known to be of his design from 1936 to 1943.

A few large luxury apartment buildings were completed before war was declared at the end of 1941. The pressing need for apartments and the large percentage of unmarried workers resulted in the reduction of apartment size to minimum levels. The Art Moderne style **General Scott** (1940) at 1 Scott Circle features numerous amenities, but one factor separated it from the luxury buildings of the past: over 80 percent of the apartments were efficiencies consisting of one room

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 63

and a bath with the remaining apartments limited to one-bedroom. Careful design incorporated solariums into the efficiency units. The building, designed and developed by architect Robert Scholz, former partner of David Baer, opened in 1940. George Santmyers' **Delano** (1941) is one of the architect's most outstanding works. Designed for the Brown Brothers Corporation, this building was primarily arranged as efficiencies. It is massed in an H-shape using the International Style with Art Deco interior detailing. Its lobby is one of the best designed in this style in Washington.

Frances Koenig designed the rectilinear **Dorchester** at 2480 16th Street, N.W., for a 1941 opening. This Art Moderne style building is massed as a cross truncated at its street facade. The projecting wings and an X-shape arrangement at the intersection of its wing provide the opportunity for an interesting floor plan for the some of the apartment tiers. The building holds 394 units (70 efficiencies, 291 one-bedrooms, and 33 two-bedrooms) on eight floors.

The **Carlyn**, designed by Koenig for Gustave Ring (concealed as Ring Engineering and the Carlyn Apartment Company), opened on December 7, 1941. This plain brick building which alludes to the International Style contained 275 apartments (59 efficiencies, 197 one-bedrooms, 17 two-bedrooms, and 2 three-bedrooms) and did not include central air-conditioning. Gustave Ring, who named the building for his daughter (following in the footsteps of his friend and colleague Morris Cafritz) resided in the building until he sold it in 1951.

Mayfair Mansions, constructed between 1942 and 1946, represents a major shift in housing for African-Americans. Designed by African-American architect Albert Cassell for Elder Lightfoot S. Michaux, the 17 buildings were sited to take advantage of 28 acres of verdant grounds as a garden apartment complex. Sited along the Anacostia River, Cassell's plan was for a "complete, self-sustaining community."⁶⁸ The complex was designed in the Colonial Revival in style, a symbolic gesture for the representation of the American dream and the opportunity for fair housing for African-Americans that many associated with Washington in the 1940s.⁶⁹

All over the city, garden apartments were being built. A War Production Board was organized to review new construction. Through the Board's effort, over 300 garden apartments in the Colonial

⁶⁸ "Mayfair Mansions" Landmark Application, April 2, 1989, p. 1.

⁶⁹ "Mayfair Mansions" Landmark Application, April 2, 1989, p. 1.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 64

Revival and Art Moderne styles were constructed, creating what James Goode claims is the "single most important group of garden apartments in any American city."⁷⁰

Government Requirements

As quickly as America's involvement in the war was formalized, so was the response by the military and civilian branches responsible for organizing wartime activities in Washington, D.C. In 1941, the federal government purchased the site of Evalyn Walsh McLean's "summer" residence "Friendship" at Wisconsin Avenue between Porter and Rodman Street, N.W., for \$1,000,000 in order to build a large complex of apartment buildings to house government workers.⁷¹ Kenneth Franzheim, a New York architect and his associate Allen B. Mills designed the **McLean Gardens** complex. By August 1942, the Defense Homes Corporation began construction on 40 large three-story, Colonial Revival style apartment buildings: 31 buildings held 721 small apartments and the remaining nine buildings were designed as dormitories. Amenities included a nursery school, cafeteria, as well as a ballroom. Social programs were organized under the auspices of the Federal Public Housing Authority. Defense Homes Corporation was a federal agency organized to provide housing for the swelling ranks of defense workers charged with strengthening the military in case of war. Established under the auspices of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it was incorporated as part of the FPHA in 1942. Building thousands of housing units in prime military areas across the country, in Washington it was responsible for **McLean Gardens** (1942; Langley Court, N.W., 39th Street N.W., Newark Street N.W. and Porter Street, N.W.) and **Naylor Gardens**.

The Future of the Apartment Building

With the war's end, the historic cycle of post-war work was repeated. Washington, D.C. was unprepared for the imminent modern era destined to be shackled by political and racial unrest. The economic decline, and racial unrest of the American inner-city in the post-war years is well documented. Urban renewal efforts, the growth of business district into residential areas, and the

⁷⁰ Goode, Best Addresses, p. 325.

⁷¹ Evalyn Walsh McLean was the daughter-in-law of early apartment building developer John McLean.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 65

tremendous growth of the suburbs dramatically reshaped Washington, D.C. Many apartment buildings gave way to more profitable office buildings or newer apartment buildings while interest in single-family dwellings was renewed. Integration and the promise of the garden apartment movement eventually drew much of the middle class from the city to Washington's suburbs, following the more prosperous who had relocated directly after the war. After a period of abandonment, the baby boomers interest in urban life promised a revitalization of the city. This both helped and hurt the historic apartment buildings as the magnetism of new development grew side by side with the fledgling preservation movement. Now, as interest in the apartment building as an historic building type increases, so does the potential for recognition and rehabilitation of these important buildings.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 1

F. Associated Property Types

(Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)

OUTLINE OF ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

APARTMENT BUILDING

- I. CONVENTIONAL LOW-RISE APARTMENT BUILDING
- II. CONVENTIONAL MID-RISE APARTMENT BUILDING
- III. CONVENTIONAL HIGH-RISE APARTMENT BUILDING
- IV. ROWHOUSE-TYPE APARTMENT BUILDING
- V. MANSION-TYPE APARTMENT BUILDING
- VI. GARDEN APARTMENT BUILDING
- VII. GRAND GARDEN APARTMENT BUILDING
- VIII. HOUSE-TYPE APARTMENT BUILDING
- IX. COMMERCIAL-RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDING
- X. LUXURY APARTMENT HOUSE
- XI. STACKED FLATS APARTMENT BUILDING

F. Associated Property Types

(Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)

1. APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Type: Apartment Buildings of Washington, D.C.
(NRIS code: Multiple Dwelling; DCHS code: Apartment)

Description:

The purpose-built apartment buildings of Washington, D.C. include buildings designed and constructed specifically to function as multiple dwellings. These buildings are at least two stories high, contain at least three self-sufficient apartment units and were constructed after 1870. These buildings retain sufficient integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance, significant character defining features, and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units. Analyzed by form, there are numerous sub-types of this property type. Nine identified sub-types represent significant variations of exterior forms; two (stacked flats and the luxury apartment house) represent interior forms. More detailed descriptions of this property type follow under the specific sub-types presented below.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 2

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as multiple dwellings

- containing at least three self-sufficient apartment units
- being at least two stories high
- located within the District of Columbia
- constructed primarily between the years 1880 and 1945
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units.

Significance:

The Purpose-Built Apartment Building (1880-1945) is significant to the historic context specifically for its role in changing domestic life of the residents of Washington, D.C. Although early conversions of single-family or other building types to multiple dwellings introduced the idea of the apartment building, it was the purpose-built apartment building that made a significant impact on residential patterns as well as the physical heritage of the District of Columbia. The purpose-built apartment building established the concept of multiple dwellings as a fundamental type of housing, slowly affecting attitudes and lifestyles to fit its form. These purpose-built apartment buildings institutionalized new residential organization and dictated new approaches to day-to-day living. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1880-1945," the property type holds the key role as the very building type which defines the apartment building in its seminal period in the District of Columbia.

The apartment building provided housing solutions for a rapidly expanding population in the District. This new building type supplied many needed "dwellings" quickly with optimum use of available architectural and financial resources. Further, it permitted maximum use of land in locations already served by public transportation and utilities, directly affecting patterns of population growth. The advent of the purpose-built apartment building changed the course of social and domestic trends, affecting patterns in location, building type, social interaction, and public services.

This property type holds significance primarily in the area of ARCHITECTURE. Other areas that specific buildings may illustrate include COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, ECONOMICS, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, LAW, SOCIAL HISTORY, and TRANSPORTATION.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 3

Apartment buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this property type is primarily for its contribution to the state history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's Capitol, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type was developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to its Criteria A, B, and C.

A-1 Buildings associated with specific events that have made a contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

A-2 Buildings that illustrate the initial development of the apartment movement as it relates to the need for housing, including the introduction of the building type and the specific forms seen in this early period throughout the city.

A-3 Buildings that are part of clusters, corridors, or districts that illustrate the patterns of development of the city.

A-4 Buildings that reflect economic forces, both external and internal, that altered the development of the city.

A-5 Buildings that reflect trends in the attitudes toward the stratification or segregation and integration of religious, racial, economic or other social groups through the buildings' residential character, architectural form, and/or location.

A-6 Buildings that reflect changes in the development of social attitudes towards multi-unit living as expressed through their interior architectural organization.

A-7 Buildings that are part of corridors or zones that illustrate changes in zoning and planning trends and specific regulations.

A-8 Buildings that were the residence of groups of people (social, economic, racial, ethnic, or otherwise defined) whose lives were meaningfully affected by (or during) their association with the building.

B-1 Buildings that were the residence of persons important to our past.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 4

B-2 Buildings that are associated with the workplace of architects, developers, craftsmen, engineers, sculptors, artists, or others important to our past.

C-1 Buildings that introduced or illustrate technological achievements that influenced the architectural form of future buildings.

C-2 Buildings that reflect changes in the form of the building type in response to health and safety trends or specific regulations.

C-3 Buildings that reflect changes in aesthetic philosophies.

C-4 Buildings that reflect divisions of demography in multi-unit living as typified by specialized organization of their tenants or interior arrangement.

C-5 Buildings that illustrate types of multi-unit buildings (such as efficiencies, luxury flats, inclusion of retail and recreational services for tenant).

C-6 Buildings that illustrate expressions of architectural styles, either rare, notable or influential to the aesthetic development of the apartment building or architecture in general.

C-7 Buildings that illustrate the apartment buildings' role in the various plans and aesthetic movements characteristic to Washington, D.C.

C-8 Buildings that illustrate use of materials, either rare, notable or influential to the development of the apartment building.

C-9 Buildings that introduced or made contributions to the expression and appreciation of amenities affecting the architectural form of the building type.

C-10 Buildings that are the work of skilled architects, landscape architects, urban planners, engineers, builders or developers.

C-11 Buildings that illustrate the work of skilled architect/developer teams.

C-12 Buildings that include notable work of craftsmen, artists or sculptors.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 5

Registration Requirements:

To be eligible for listing the characteristics and qualities described above must be sufficiently illustrated and the degree of integrity required must be sufficient to support the significance of the building's specific contribution to the historic context. Aspects of integrity to be considered include location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value.

Generally, this requires that purpose-built apartment buildings retain the architectural composition, ornamental details and materials of their original primary exterior elevation. Due to the changing uses that many of the most important buildings within this context have undergone, many buildings no longer are intact to their original architectural design, and some even are difficult for the layman to identify as to their original purpose. Therefore, each sub-type and related buildings within the property type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the National Register, and that no building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of architectural elements (although certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish a building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing and trim, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

For example, buildings which illustrate significant patterns in the development of the apartment movement through their location in areas no longer residential in character may be determined to hold great integrity by virtue of their existence. Correspondingly, a building that is determined significant by virtue of its role as the location of an innovative floor plan which is no longer extant should not be considered to retain sufficient integrity for listing.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 6

SUB-TYPES

I. CONVENTIONAL LOW-RISE APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: Conventional Apartment Building
(DCHS code: Conventional)

Description:

The Conventional Apartment Building was designed and built specifically to function as a multi-family residence. It contains at least five self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units, is at least two and no more than four stories high, and has a single main public entrance door.

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment buildings

- containing at least five self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units
- being at least two and no more than four stories high
- having a single main public entrance door
- not containing an elevator
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable
- identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- constructed primarily between the years 1880 and 1945
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Conventional Low-Rise Apartment Building (1880-1945) is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a new type of housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1880-1945," the Conventional Low-Rise sub-type holds the principal role as the basic and most prevalent example of the building type that defines the apartment building in its seminal period in the District of Columbia. These purpose-built apartment buildings introduced new residential organization and dictated new approaches to day-to-day living, and continue to represent the property type beyond the study period to the present day.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 7

The Conventional Low-Rise Apartment Building provided a solution to needs of a rapidly expanding population in the District. This new building type provided many residential dwelling units with an increased effectiveness of available architectural and financial resources. Further, it permitted efficient use of land in locations already served by public transportation and utilities, directly affecting patterns of population growth. Further, the advent of the Conventional Low-Rise Apartment Building changed the course of social and domestic trends, affecting patterns in location, building type, social interaction, and public services.

Conventional Low-Rise Apartment Buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this sub-type is primarily for its contribution to the local history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. This is outlined within the Property Type section above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

Generally, this requires that conventional apartment buildings retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation. Due to the changing uses that many of the most important buildings within this context have undergone, many buildings no longer are intact to their original architecture, and some even are somewhat difficult for the layman to identify as to their original purpose. Therefore, each building within the sub-type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the National Register, and that no building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of first floor architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location,

NPS Form 10-900-b
OMB No 1024-0018
(Revised March 1992)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 8

siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 9

II. CONVENTIONAL MID-RISE APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: Conventional Mid-Rise Apartment Building
(DCHS code: Conventional Mid-Rise)

Description:

The Conventional Mid-Rise Apartment Building was designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building. This sub-type was designed to contain at least 15 self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units, is at least five and no more than eight stories high, and has a single main public entrance. These buildings were constructed between the years 1890 and 1945 and are located within the District of Columbia.

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at least 15 self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment dwelling) units
- being at least five and no more than eight stories high
- having a single main public entrance
- may but does not have to contain an elevator
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type-including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim
- constructed primarily between the years 1890 and 1945
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Conventional Mid-Rise Apartment Building (1890-1945) is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a new type of housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1880 -1945," the Conventional Mid-Rise sub-type holds a critical role in the development of the apartment building in the District of Columbia. These purpose-built apartment buildings have a greater number of stories than the Conventional Low-Rise sub-type. Significantly, this larger sub-type resulted from the emergence of the passenger elevator which allowed for the construction of taller buildings. The taller building encouraged new architectural approaches to the broad

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 10

organization of the building type, as well as to possibilities of interior organization of individual units. This taller version of the Conventional Low-Rise sub-type is a critical component of the important Apartment Building property type.

The Conventional Mid-Rise Apartment Building augmented the potential for solving the problems inherent to quickly housing a rapidly expanding population in the District. This sub-type provided many more residential dwelling units than possible with the lower Conventional sub-type, increasing the effectiveness of available architectural and financial resources. Further, it permitted a more efficient use of land in locations already served by public transportation and utilities, directly affecting patterns of population growth. The advent of the Conventional Mid-Rise apartment building changed the course of domestic trends, affecting patterns in location, building type, social interaction, and public services.

Conventional Mid-Rise apartment buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this sub-type is primarily for its contribution to the local history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. This is outlined within the Property Type section above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident. Notably, the interior elevator shaft and related lobby areas should remain.

Generally, this requires that Conventional Mid-Rise apartment buildings retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, trim, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation. Due to the changing uses that many of the most important buildings within this context have undergone, many buildings no longer are intact to their original architecture, and some even are somewhat difficult for the layman to identify as to their original purpose. Therefore, each building within the sub-type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the National Register, and that no building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 11

detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of first floor architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, specific architectural elements, and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements, for excellence of their interior design and detailing, or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 12

III. CONVENTIONAL HIGH-RISE APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: Conventional High-Rise Apartment Building
(DCHS code: Conventional High-Rise)

Description:

The Conventional High-Rise Apartment Building was designed and constructed specifically to function as an apartment building. The building contains at least 27 self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units, is at least six and no more than twelve stories high, has a single main public entrance, and was designed to hold an elevator for gaining access to upper stories.

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at least 27 self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment dwelling) units
- being at least six and no more than twelve stories high
- having a single main public entrance
- having at least one elevator
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- constructed between the years 1922 and 1945
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Conventional High-Rise Apartment Building (1922-1945) is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a new type of housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1880 -1945," the Conventional High-Rise sub-type holds a critical role in the development of the apartment building in the District of Columbia. These purpose-built apartment buildings have a greater number of stories than the Conventional or Conventional Mid-Rise sub-type. This tallest sub-type was possible through the development of modern technology that allowed Washington's tallest buildings to be constructed. These buildings included passenger elevators and were constructed with steel-frame structural systems and fireproofing methods.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 13

The taller building encouraged new approaches to the architectural organization of the building type, as well as to possibilities of interior organization of the individual units. This tallest version of the conventional sub-type is a critical component of the important Apartment Building property type

The Conventional High-Rise Apartment Building added a new dimension to the property type by providing the potential for large numbers of dwelling units using a small footprint, and through the association of this sub-type with similar buildings in other cities around the country. The sub-type provided the opportunity for housing many family units within one building, providing many more residential dwelling units than possible with the lower Conventional and Conventional Mid-Rise sub-types and provided them more economically. Further, it permitted a more efficient use of land in locations already served by public transportation and utilities, directly affecting patterns of population growth. The advent of the conventional apartment building changed the course of residential patterns, affecting patterns in location, building type, social interaction, and public services.

Conventional High-Rise apartment buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this property type is primarily for its contribution to the local history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. This is outlined within the Property Type section above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

Generally, this requires that Conventional High-Rise apartment buildings retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation. Due to the changing uses that many of the most important buildings within this context have undergone, many buildings no longer are intact to their original architecture, and some even are somewhat

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 14

difficult for the layman to identify as to their original purpose. Therefore, each building within the sub-type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the national Register, and that no building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of first floor architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, trim, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 15

IV. ROWHOUSE-TYPE APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: Rowhouse-Type Apartment Building
(DCHS code: Rowhouse-Type)

Description:

The sub-type known as the Rowhouse-Type Apartment Building was designed and constructed specifically to function as an apartment building containing at least five self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units. These buildings are at least three but no more than five stories high. They feature multiple main public entrance doors and present the massing and general architectural detailing associated with the District of Columbia's rowhouse building type. Rowhouse-type apartments represent many of the earliest purpose-built apartments in the city. The earliest identified extant rowhouse-type building dates to 1887.

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at least five self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units
- being at least three and no more than five stories high
- not having an elevator
- having multiple main public entrance doors
- presenting the massing and general detailing associated with a row of attached dwellings
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- constructed primarily between the years 1887 and 1919
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Rowhouse-Type Apartment Building (1887-1919) is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a new type of housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1880 -1945," the Rowhouse-Type sub-type is a significant transitional form for the building type. By retaining an exterior appearance that was associated with a traditionally accepted housing

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 16

form, the apartment building was successfully introduced into the District of Columbia housing stock. These new purpose-built apartment buildings provided hesitant potential occupants with familiar aesthetic standards, making the new form a more satisfactory, and even comfortable choice.

Although the apartment building proffered new residential organization and dictated new approaches to day-to-day living, the association with established architectural aesthetics and patterns allowed the property type to gain the acceptance of the middle classes. The Rowhouse-Type Apartment Building provided a solution to the housing needs of a rapidly expanding population in the District. This new building type provided multi-family units within a familiar frame in established residential neighborhoods. Further, it permitted efficient use of land in locations already served by public transportation and utilities, directly affecting patterns of population growth. The advent of the Rowhouse-Type Apartment Building changed the course of residential patterns, affecting patterns in location, building type, and social interaction.

Rowhouse-Type Apartment Buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this property type is primarily for its contribution to the local history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. These criteria are outlined above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

The Rowhouse-Type apartment buildings should retain the general architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of architectural elements of the facade (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 17

historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 18

V. MANSION-TYPE APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: Mansion-Type Apartment Building
(DCHS code: Mansion-Type)

Description:

The Mansion-Type apartment building was designed and constructed specifically to function as a multiple dwelling containing at least five self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) dwelling units. These buildings are at least three and no more than six stories high and feature a single main public entrance door. Significantly, they present the massing and sophisticated detailing associated with a mansion building type. This includes a formally designed facade that aspires to the appearance of a substantial, single-family residence. Unlike the Rowhouse-Type sub-type, the construction of this sub-type is primarily associated with the 20th century.

Buildings designed and constructed specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at least five self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units
- being at least three and no more than six stories high
- having a single main public entrance door
- presenting the massing and general detailing associated with the mansion building type
- sited as a free-standing entity
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- constructed primarily between the years 1890 and 1930
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Mansion-Type Apartment Building (1890-1930) is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a new type of housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1880-1945," the Mansion-Type sub-type is a significant transitional form for the building type. By retaining an exterior appearance that was associated with traditionally accepted housing form, the apartment building was successfully introduced into the District of Columbia housing stock. These new purpose-built apartment buildings provided hesitant potential occupants with familiar

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 19

aesthetic standards, making the new form a more satisfactory, and even comfortable choice. Although the apartment building proffered new residential organization and dictated new approaches to day-to-day living, the association with established architectural aesthetics and patterns allowed the property type to gain the acceptance of the middle classes. Townhouse-type form continues to have significance through the study period for its role in attracting occupants to the concept of multiple dwellings, and its typically high quality of architecture.

Mansion-Type apartment buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this property type is primarily for its contribution to the local history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

Generally, this requires that Mansion-Type apartment buildings retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation. Due to the changing uses that many of the most important buildings within this context have undergone, many buildings no longer are intact to their original architecture, and some even are somewhat difficult for the layman to identify as to their original purpose. Therefore, each building within the sub-type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the national Register, and that no building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of first floor architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 20

VII. GARDEN APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: Garden Apartment Buildings
(DCHS Code: Garden)

Description:

The sub-type known as the Garden Apartment is composed of individual buildings forming a group of at least two buildings designed and constructed specifically to function as a multiple dwelling. These small buildings were designed to contain at least four self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) dwelling units. Each building is at least two and no more than four stories high and has a single main public entrance. The buildings do not have an elevator. The group is designed and sited to relate to surrounding landscape. Garden Apartments were constructed in Washington beginning in 1921 and continue through 1945.

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at least four self-sufficient (containing private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units
- being at least two and no more than four stories high
- having a single main public entrances
- designed to relate to surrounding landscape
- not having an elevator
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- constructed primarily between the years 1921 and 1945
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Garden Apartment Building sub-type (1921-1945) is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a new type of housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1870 - 1945," the Garden sub-type holds an important role in the development of the apartment building in the District of Columbia. These purpose-built apartment buildings represent a distinctly 20th century idea of multi-residential building, that of groups of apartment building designed in relationship to each other and the landscape. Their small mass, low height and

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 21

moderate density set within a landscaped environment separate them from more urban forms of the property type. This sub-type resulted from changing social ideals calling for a healthier approach to residential patterns. Developed after the general acceptance of multiple presentation of the same building design and the growing interest in more suburban environments, the Garden Apartment Building allowed for several buildings to be grouped in a pleasing aesthetic plan intended to provide a more hospitable and healthier life for the occupants. The sub-type played a major role in the development of public housing ideals of the 1930s and is a critical component of the important Apartment Building property type.

Garden Apartment Buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this sub-type is primarily for its contribution to the local/state history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the 1985-87 D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type was developed. This extended criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. These criteria are outlined above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

For buildings associated with the sub-type Garden to be eligible for registration they should retain their general original architectural composition, key ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevations (not necessarily only their facades). Due to the significance of the relationship of these buildings with their sites, the site and its landscaping should hold physical integrity. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) do not necessarily diminish a building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, trim, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people

NPS Form 10-900-b
OMB No 1024-0018
(Revised March 1992)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 22

significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 23

VIII. GRAND GARDEN APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: Grand Garden Apartment Buildings
(DCHS code: Grand Garden)

Description:

The sub-type known as the Grand Garden Apartment Building include buildings that were designed and constructed specifically to function as a dwelling. They are at least five stories high, include at least one elevator, and feature a single main public entrance. Each building was designed to contain at least ten self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) dwelling units. In contrast to the lower scale, more modest treatment associated with the Garden sub-type, the Grand Garden sub-type building presents a sophisticated aesthetic that is responsive to architecture and landscape design. Designed to relate to surrounding landscape, each building is carefully sited. When designed as part of a group, each building is designed and sited in careful relationship to one another. Grand Garden Apartment buildings were constructed in Washington through the 1930s.

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at least ten self-sufficient (containing private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units
- being at least five stories high
- having a single main public entrance
- designed to relate to surrounding landscape
- having at least one elevator
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- constructed primarily between the years 1921 and 1935
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Grand Garden Apartment Building (1921-1935) is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a new type of housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia,

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 24

1880 -1945," the Grand Garden sub-type holds an important role in the development of the apartment building in the District of Columbia. These purpose-built apartment buildings represent a distinctly 20th century idea of multi-residential building. Their larger mass, substantial height and moderate density set within a landscaped environment separate them from more urban forms of the property type. This sub-type resulted from changing social ideals calling for a healthier approach to residential patterns. Developed after the general acceptance of multiple presentation of the same building design and the growing interest in more suburban environments, the Grand Garden Apartment Building like the Garden Apartment Building allowed for several buildings to be grouped in an aesthetic plan intended to provide a more hospitable and healthier life for the occupants. However, the Grand Garden sub-type is associated with the resort hotel movement of the early 20th century, and its owners clearly attempted to provide an affluent and verdant environment for the apartment dweller. Finely landscape grounds were critical to the Grand Garden sub-type and did much to move the apartment building into the acceptance of the middle class, and ironically, re, its mass use for public housing in the 1930s. The Grand Garden is a important component of the Apartment Building property type.

Grand Garden apartment buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this property type is primarily for its contribution to the local/state history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. These criteria are outlined above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

Generally, this requires that buildings associated with the Grand Garden sub-type generally retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevations. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 25

doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, trim, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 26

IX. HOUSE-TYPE APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: House-Type Apartment Building
(DCHS code: House-Type)

/

Description:

The House-Type Apartment Buildings are two or three stories tall and were designed and constructed specifically to function as an apartment building containing four or six self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units.

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at four or six self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units
- being two or three stories high
- having a single main public entrance door
- having an appearance associated with a single-family dwelling
- not having an elevator
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- constructed primarily between the years 1900 and 1945
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The House-Type Apartment Building (1900-1945) is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a 20th century variation of multiple dwelling housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1880-1945," the House-type is a common form of the building type. By retaining an exterior appearance that was associated with a traditionally accepted housing form, this sub-type of apartment building was successfully introduced into residential neighborhoods throughout the District of Columbia. These purpose-built apartment buildings provided hesitant potential occupants with familiar aesthetic standards, making the new form a more satisfactory, and even comfortable choice.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 27

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

Generally, this requires that House-Type apartment buildings retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation above the first floor. In that the ground floor elevation used for commercial enterprise have rarely been left intact, it is not necessary that these details be extant. Each building within the sub-type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the national Register, and that no building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of show windows, doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of first floor architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 28

X. COMMERCIAL/RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: Commercial/Residential Apartment Building
(DCHS code: Commercial/Residential)

Description:

The sub-type known as the Commercial/Residential Apartment Building was designed and constructed specifically to function as a mixed use building containing ground floor holding public-oriented commercial use with at least three self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units above. These units are spread over at least one but no more than three floors. There is a separate entrance to the residential units. The buildings present the massing and general detailing associated with commercial architecture. Constructed between the years 1880 and 1945.

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at least three self-sufficient (with private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units
- ground floor holding public-oriented commercial use
- at least one but no more than three floors of residential unit above the ground floor
- having a separate entrance to the residential units
- presenting the massing and general detailing associated with commercial architecture
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- constructed primarily between the years 1880 and 1945
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Commercial/Residential Apartment (1880-1945) Building is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a variation on traditional housing modes to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1870 -1945," the Commercial/Residential sub-type is a significant transitional form from the traditional "house above the store" to the new standards associated with the conventional apartment building sub-type.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 29

The Commercial/Residential apartment building developed in tandem with the conventional sub-type and provided a solution to the housing needs of a rapidly expanding population in the District. Although the sub-type is directly related to the single family dwelling units located above commercial floors, this idea extended the notion of the shopkeeper living above his store to that of making the upper floors available as a commercial venture.

Commercial/Residential apartment buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this property type is primarily for its contribution to the local history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. This criteria is outlined above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

Generally, this requires that Commercial/Residential apartment buildings retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation above the first floor. In that the ground floor elevation used for commercial enterprise have rarely been left intact, it is not necessary that these details be extant. Each building within the sub-type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the national Register, and that no building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of show windows, doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of first floor architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their

NPS Form
NPS Form 10-900-b
OMB No 1024-0018
(Revised March 1992)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 30

contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 31

XI. LUXURY APARTMENT HOUSE

Name of Property Sub-Type: Luxury Apartment House
(DCHS code: Luxury)

Description:

The Luxury Apartment Houses were designed and constructed specifically to function as an apartment building and contain at least five self-sufficient (containing private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units. They are at least three stories high and have a single or multiple main public entrances. These buildings have at least one elevator, a grand public lobby, special facilities to provide for such services as dining rooms, personal care services, laundry/dry cleaning services, reception rooms, garaging for automobiles, and housing for a full-service staff. The Luxury Apartment Building is designed with a high degree of aesthetic concern and offering (or having been built to offer) individual apartment (dwelling) units with special design features including, but not limited to, high quality interior architectural plans and detailing and notable architectural or functional elements. These buildings were constructed between the years 1880 and 1941 and are located within the District of Columbia

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at least 5 self-sufficient (containing private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) units
- being at least three stories high
- having a single or multiple main public entrances
- having at least one elevator
- having a grand public lobby
- having (or having been built with facilities for special facilities to provide for such services as dining rooms, personal care services, laundry/dry cleaning services, reception rooms, garaging for automobiles
- designed with a high degree of aesthetic concern
- offering (or having been built to offer) individual apartment (dwelling) units with special design features including, but not limited to, high quality interior architectural plans and detailing and notable architectural or functional elements
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- constructed primarily between the years 1880 and 1941

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 32

- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Luxury Apartment House (1880-1941) is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a new type of housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1870 -1945," the Luxury sub-type holds an important role in the development of the apartment building in the District of Columbia. These purpose-built apartment buildings are the grandest multi-residential buildings constructed. Their fine architectural detailing, high quality materials, special architectural and service features cause these buildings to stand out within the property type. Among the first variations of the property type, the Luxury Apartment Building was designed to attract the upper and upper middle classes to this new residential form. By offering luxurious surroundings that emulated the finest residential architecture of the country, social mores which opposed the idea of a multiple dwelling lifestyle were reversed. The popularity of the Luxury sub-type paved the way for the general acceptance of the property type and its ubiquitous place in the architectural fabric of our country today. This sub-type played, and continues to play a significant role within the important Apartment Building property type.

Luxury Apartment Houses may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this property type is primarily for its contribution to the local history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. This criteria is outlined above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 33

Generally, this requires that Luxury Apartment Houses retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation. Due to the changing uses that many of the most important buildings within this context have undergone, many buildings no longer are intact to their original architecture, and some even are somewhat difficult for the layman to identify as to their original purpose. Therefore, each building within the sub-type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the national Register, and that no building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of first floor architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, trim, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 34

XII. STACKED FLATS APARTMENT BUILDING

Name of Property Sub-Type: Stacked Flats Apartment Building
(DCHS code: Stacked Flats)

Description:

The Stacked Flats Apartment Buildings were designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building containing at least one self-sufficient (containing private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) unit per floor. These buildings are two, three, or more stories high, have a single or multiple main public entrances.

Buildings designed and built specifically to function as an apartment building

- containing at one self-sufficient (containing private kitchen and bath facilities) apartment (dwelling) unit per floor
- having a single or multiple public entrance
- retaining sufficient architectural integrity and historic characteristics to enable identification with the property type--including the facade appearance and preferably, though not necessarily, the basic configuration of the original floor plan outlining the public halls and apartment units, and interior trim.
- Constructed primarily between the years 1890 and 1920
- located within the District of Columbia

Significance:

The Stacked Flats Apartment Building (1890 -1920)is significant to the historic contexts specifically for its role in providing a new type of housing to residents of the District of Columbia. Specifically, within the general context of "The Apartment Building in the District of Columbia, 1870 -1945," the Stacked Flats sub-type holds an important role in the development of the apartment building in the District of Columbia. These purpose-built multiple dwelling buildings were designed to provide inexpensive housing to the city's impoverished lower and lower-middle classes. Modest scale, simple floor plans, and unpretentious detailing appear to associate the sub-type more with the typical rowhouse rather than the conventional Apartment Building property type. Generally, these buildings are constructed using traditional construction methods associated with rows of single family housing.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 35

Thousands of Stacked Flats Apartment Buildings were constructed throughout Washington, D.C. and many retain much of their original interior organization and detailing. The sub-type is found in a wide variety of executions. Some are blatantly luxurious, following the style of the "French Flat." Other examples of the sub-type mimic the substantial and aesthetically rich single-family rowhouse structures associated with Washington's middle or upper class, while others (possibly significant numbers) exhibit no ornamental detailing or artistic element at all, and were originally constructed without plumbing facilities. As an early means for providing large numbers of inexpensive housing units within the context of multiple dwellings, the sub-type is a critical component of the important Apartment Building property type.

Stacked Flats apartment buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this property type is primarily for its contribution to the local history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. This criteria is outlined above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

Generally, this requires that Stacked Flats apartment buildings retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation. In that this sub-type is generally presented in a very simple form with little or no ornamental detailing, it is important that this modest and unadorned character be maintained.

Due to the changing uses that many of the most important buildings within this context have undergone, many buildings no longer are intact to their original architecture, and some even are somewhat difficult for the layman to identify as to their original purpose. Therefore, each building within the sub-type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the national Register, and that no

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 36

building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of first floor architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, trim, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

The Stacked Flats apartment building provided one of the solutions to the housing needs of a rapidly expanding population in the District. This new building type provided multiple residential dwelling units with an increased effectiveness of available architectural and financial resources.

Further, it permitted efficient use of land in locations already served by public transportation and utilities, directly affecting patterns of population growth.

The House-Type apartment buildings may be listed under the National Register's criteria A, B, and C. The significance of this property type is primarily for its contribution to the local history of the District of Columbia; however, as the District serves as the Nation's capital, and as the property type is found throughout the United States and, indeed, the world, it is not inappropriate to expect that individual buildings may possess significance that should be evaluated as part of a national perspective as well. As part of the effort of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, specific criteria for evaluating the property type has been developed. This criteria is based on the criteria used by the National Register for Historic Places, and is keyed to Criteria A, B, and C. These criteria are outlined above.

Registration Requirements:

To insure that the characteristics and qualities described above are sufficiently illustrated, appropriate aspects of location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association and feeling must be retained to convey its associative, artistic, or informational value. The degree of integrity required must be sufficient so that the building's specific contribution to the historic context is clearly evident.

Generally, this requires that Stacked Flats apartment buildings retain the architectural composition, ornamental details, and materials of their original primary exterior elevation. Due to

the changing uses that many of the most important buildings within this context have undergone,
NPS Form 10-900-b
OMB No 1024-0018
(Revised March 1992)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 37

many buildings no longer are intact to their original architecture, and some even are somewhat difficult for the layman to identify as to their original purpose. Therefore, each building within the sub-type must be evaluated individually to insure that its specific contribution to the historic context is sufficiently intact to merit listing on the national Register, and that no building is rejected inappropriately. Reversible alterations, such as the removal of ornamental detailing, replacement of doors, windows, and their enframements, and scarring of first floor architectural elements (while certainly not appropriate) are common and do not necessarily diminish the building's contribution to the historic context. Interior changes, including the loss of ornamental detailing, specific architectural elements and even the wholesale rearrangement of floor plans may not be significant to the buildings' perceived contribution to the historic context, if the location, siting, or contribution to the streetscape remain intact. Buildings which are identified for their contribution to the understanding of interior spatial arrangements or because of association with events or people significant to our past should have careful interior assessments before determination regarding listing is made.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number G Page 1

G. Geographical Data

The project includes over 3,500 purpose-built apartment buildings constructed between 1870 and 1945 identified throughout the District of Columbia during the D.C. Apartment Buildings Survey.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 1

H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

(Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)

I. INTRODUCTION

The approach to the methodology of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey was based on the Department of the Interior's RP3 methodology as it focused on identification and evaluation. Following the RP3 concept, the proposed study unit was identified as "apartment buildings in Washington, D.C. from their introduction in the 19th century (circa 1880) through the end of World War II (1945)." These dates were proposed because they encompass the introduction of the apartment building through a period of major growth in the city's population due to the World War II.

Due to the large number of apartment buildings in the District of Columbia, an in-depth survey of all apartment buildings was not proposed; instead, research of archival resources formed the basis for the inventory. In preparing the proposal for Phase I, it was anticipated that there were approximately 2,000 buildings. However, by the time the entire project was completed, the actual number of buildings that had to be studied rose to over 4,000--virtually doubling the proposed number of man-hours needed to complete the study.

The Survey was divided into three phases and took two years for the completion of the survey component and six months for the completion of the Multiple Property Document (November 1985 - October 1987 and January 1993 - July 1993).

Phase I involved 1) the identification of every apartment building erected in Washington, D.C. between 1885 and 1945 (both extant and demolished), 2) the development of criteria for evaluating the buildings, and 3) the synthesis of the inventory data in order to develop a conceptual framework outlining the history of the building type. This led to the identification of sub-study units which were investigated in the next research phase.

Phase II had four goals: 1) to assess every identified building against the evaluation criteria developed in Phase I, 2) to write a narrative history of the development of apartment buildings in the District of Columbia, 3) to nominate buildings to the National Register of Historic Places, and 4) to disseminate information on the history of apartment buildings to the public through a series of programs and publications.

Phase III involved the preparation of the Multiple Property Nomination form for Washington, D.C. Apartment Buildings.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 2

II. PHASE I

A. Identification of Buildings

1. Creating the Initial Building List

The first step in identifying the data base was to put together the most comprehensive building list possible. When the Survey began, there was no known list in the District of Columbia. Indeed, there was also no established definition of what constituted an apartment building. Terminology was purposefully left open to definition at the beginning of the Survey, and all buildings which sources indicated as apartment buildings were noted. These included structures which were purpose-built as apartment buildings, and structures which were converted into apartments. In addition, at the onset of the project, it was unclear what the differences were between apartments, flats, tenements and boarding houses because the definition of these terms varies regionally and has changed over time. Thus, it was decided to begin with the widest possible list of buildings and eliminate structures later as the definition of terms and the parameters of the project became clearer.

a. Lusk's Washington Apartment Directory

As a starting point for creating the comprehensive building list, information from a 1963 Lusk's Washington Apartment Directory was entered into a Dbase 3 program in an IBM XT (the information was later transferred to an AT). This directory was used because it was the largest single source of apartment buildings readily available to Traceries. Information entered on each building included square and lot number, address, building name, number of stories, volume, number of units, and date of construction. Although this information created a base of approximately 2,000 buildings, it was neither completely accurate nor comprehensive. The list included only those buildings which were apartment buildings in 1963, the date of the directory. It did not include those which had been converted to other uses by 1963, nor did it include condominiums (which the Lusk Company considered to be individual residences and treated as individual single-family units). And, of course, it did not include apartment buildings which had been demolished. A list of all of these buildings was needed to establish an accurate general context for the history of the development of apartment buildings in the city. Inaccuracies in information generally related to out-dated lot numbers and to the construction date. Lusk listed the date as when the building was entered into the tax records. This was later found to be an average of two years after the building permit was issued (n.b. the building permit date is the accepted standard for this project for the construction date). In addition, the earliest year listed in Lusk was 1915--a date given to all buildings extant in that year, no matter when they were actually built.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 3

b. Maps

Simultaneously with the Lusk entry and the windshield survey (see below), a group of volunteers and student interns conducted map research to identify those buildings not found in Lusk. A new building list, separate from the one culled from Lusk, was compiled at the end of this task and compared to the original one. The purpose was to both verify the information in Lusk and to identify buildings not listed in it. Approximately 1500 additional buildings were identified using this research method.

Most of the work for this task was accomplished by two interns and one volunteer. Traceries staff completed the effort. The work entailed looking at every published insurance and real estate atlas of the city over a series of years and noting each building listed as an apartment. Because no single archival center had a complete series of maps (from the last quarter of the 19th century through 1954), maps at three libraries (the Library of Congress, the Columbia Historical Society, and Martin Luther King Public Library) were checked to obtain the most comprehensive list.

A map form was developed for the purpose of recording each building. The form permits the documentation of the evolution of the building footprint over a series of years as recorded on the maps. At the top of the page the form includes spaces for address(es), square and lot(s), building name, material, shape, number of stories, and the date when the building first appears on the map. The bottom two-thirds of the form is divided into large squares into which the map researcher drew the plan of the building each time it appeared on a map (noting north, address and lot number, location of the street, and location of attached buildings). Each drawing was further identified with the map date, volume and plate number.

Researchers were instructed to begin with the earliest atlas which specifically noted buildings as having apartment use (1903). They went through it page by page, starting a new map form each time they found a building labeled as an apartment. Lot numbers and addresses were noted to help sort out predicted discrepancies caused by renumbering of streets. As buildings were identified, researchers checked earlier atlases (1872, 1888, and 1892) to see if they were extant earlier but not labeled as apartment buildings. When new buildings were identified on later atlases, the researchers traced the buildings back on older atlases to make sure that they too had not previously appeared, unlabeled as apartments. In many cases, it was found that older buildings had been converted into apartment use and thus were not noted as apartments on earlier maps. In some cases the maps were in error for not having noted the building as apartments on earlier maps. In many cases, the researchers found that, in fact, buildings found on later maps did not previously exist. Whenever they found a change in address or lot number, they traced the building back to make sure a labeling mistake had not been made on their part.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 4

With all of the information from the atlases, the windshield survey, and Lusk, it was possible to determine an approximate date of construction and to get a list of old lot numbers and addresses for each building, and to add those buildings which were not listed in Lusk to the computer data base. This initial map research phase took approximately 500 hours. Review and confirmation of map research was conducted later in the project when it became evident that the maps were not as accurate or as comprehensive as had first been believed.

Information gathered on the map forms was then checked against the computer list for accuracy and inconsistencies. All buildings for which there were inconsistencies were noted as candidates for further research. Approximately 1,500 buildings not noted in Lusk were identified.

B. Verification

1. Performing the Windshield Survey

The Windshield Survey was divided into three phases: 1) those buildings identified in Lusk, 2) additional ones found through the map research, and 3) ones found later during permit searches and other research.

Computerized survey sheets were generated for each building entry from Lusk. These sheets include the keyed information as well as labeled blanks to be filled in with specific information by surveyors. This form was named the Windshield Survey Form and was the first in a series of forms developed for the project. The information to be completed by the surveyors included whether the building was extant, and, if so, the present use of the building, the number of stories, the exterior material and trim, its proximity to other buildings, and, in the "Notes" area, any other pertinent information.

After the site-specific Windshield Survey Forms were printed out, they were divided into geographic groups and then further divided into groups of no more than 36. These subdivided groups made up the individual survey packets which were distributed to volunteer surveyors. Each packet was assigned a number and included: 1) the individualized, site-specific Windshield Survey Forms, 2) a roll of 100 ASA, 36-exposure, black and white film labeled with the packet number, 3) a Photo Record Form to record the sequence of pictures taken (also labeled with the packet number; 4) a map, and 5) a Packet Assignment Form which the surveyors signed and dated when they were given the packet. The Packet Assignment Form also included the packet number and a list of addresses contained in that packet. The form was kept by Tracerics. In this way, it was always possible to track who had which packet and address, what had been returned and what was missing, and, later after it was filed, who was responsible for each Windshield Survey Form.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 5

The first phase of the windshield survey included only those buildings identified in Lusk. The second phase included the additional buildings identified during the map research. Additional windshield survey forms were generated for these buildings. Because the map information had not yet been entered into the computer, these forms differed from the computer-generated ones and had to be filled in by hand. The final windshield survey phase took place as more buildings were identified through more in-depth research. By the time the project was completed, over 140 windshield survey packets were distributed.

2. Recruiting and Training Volunteers

The windshield survey packets were distributed to volunteers recruited through DCPL. Notices calling for volunteer surveyors and researchers had been placed in the DCPL newsletter and the response was tremendous. By the completion of the first phase of the windshield survey (as generated by information from Lusk), over 40 people volunteered their time. By the end of the project, over 90 people had been recruited through a series of newsletter announcements and had participated in various capacities with varying amounts of commitment.

Each volunteer was required to attend one training session. Three sessions were scheduled in different parts of the city at different times of the week (weekday evening, Saturday morning, Sunday afternoon) so that it was made as convenient as possible for volunteers to attend. For those who were recruited after the sessions were given, individual meetings were held at Traceries. Training generally lasted 45 minutes to one hour and included 1) an explanation of the project, 2) instructions on how to verify existing information on the form and how to fill out the blank sections, 3) how to take documentary photographs, 4) a brief lesson in how to look at a building and distinguish its basic elements, and 5) definition of terms on the Form. A slide show was presented at the sessions which warned the surveyors about some of the pitfalls. (For instance, many Washington, D.C. apartment buildings look like standard single-family rowhouses. The surveyors were trained to avoid prejudiced observations based on traditional assumptions regarding the appearance of apartment buildings.) Standards were set on how to count number of stories, note exterior materials, define first floor uses, etc.

Surveyors were given one month in which to complete their packets (some took more than one packet). Because both a camera and a car were needed to complete the survey (neither of which were provided by Traceries or DCPL), volunteers were matched according to need--each team had at least one car and a camera. walking distance to their residences or places of work. Some relied on public transportation.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 6

Traceries made follow-up calls to check on progress and to call in delinquent packets. For the most part, this aspect of the survey went very smoothly and was finished in a timely fashion. Because the windshield survey began in mid-February, it was impressed on the surveyors to complete photography before the trees budded and the leaves came out, thus obscuring the buildings. Surveyors worked a total of 638 hours.

C. Data Management

1. Developing the Computer Program

Larry Karr (then associated with Reid Associates) developed a dBase 3 program for the entry of data into the computer. Throughout the project he worked closely with Traceries, DCPL, and the D.C. Division of Historic Preservation to develop data forms which would best meet the needs of the project as well as those of the D.C. Division. This program was refined several times over the duration of the project. Codes were developed to ease data entry. These were later "translated" back into words so that the printed data forms were simple to read without a manual.

a. Data Sheets

Data sheets were repeatedly revised as Larry Karr continued to refine the dBase 3 program. The program was refined to reflect the data collection process and products. A uniform code for entering the building descriptions into the computer was developed allowing for indexing in a methodical way. A data sheet form based on the D.C. Inventory Form was developed. This form includes the following information: address, square and lot numbers (including old and alternate numbers), building name (past and present), date of construction, building type, relationship to other buildings, use (past and present), architect, builder, developer, number of stories, building volume, shape, number of units, landmark status, construction materials, type of complex, photo roll and frame number, notes and significant alteration information.

The data sheets were printed out three times during the course of the study: 1) with the basic Lusk information 2) with map, permit, photo, and windshield survey information and 3) with all corrections and final additions.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 7

b. Building Complex Codes

The project director developed a system for numbering buildings which are part of a complex. A complex, for the purposes of this study, consists of two or more, attached or unattached buildings that were built as part of one project. This system was developed so that 1) by looking at an individual file, one would immediately know if there are related buildings and, if so, how many; and 2) it would be easy to find related buildings (they do not necessarily have consecutive street addresses). In addition to numbering the complexes, the buildings were also given a code to indicate whether or not the buildings within a particular complex are identical in design. (Example: Benning Heights is a complex of 38 buildings of varying design. The code for the buildings is Multi-038-001-V. The first set of numbers refers to the number of buildings within the complex. The second identifies the specific building within the complex. The "V" indicates that the buildings are of varied design.)

This additional set of codes proved to be very useful not only in retrieving information on specific complexes, but also in analyzing patterns in the development of complexes as an urban feature.

c. Building Footprint Codes

The completed Map Forms were studied for patterns in plan design and a system was developed for coding the footprints of the buildings. The intent was to note the shape of the footprint and add this information to the computer base, thereby gaining an understanding of the development of apartment building forms over time. Each Map Form was assigned a code according to the shape of the building footprint; this code was entered into the computer data base on each building. The code letter was later changed into a descriptive word which appears on the final data sheet.

D. Creating the Paper Filing System

By the time the Map Forms were completed, the initial round of Windshield Survey Forms were being returned. As they were returned, they were checked by Traceries staff and a folder was made for each form. The tabs of the folders were color coded to indicate city quadrant (N.E., N.W., S.E., S.W.), whether the building was extant, and whether or not the building was purpose-built as an apartment building. The folders were filed in filing cabinets by address within each quadrant. All information subsequently gathered for each building was placed into these folders.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 8

a. Photographs

Film taken during the windshield survey was developed into contact sheets, taking care that the contact sheets were labeled with the proper roll number. This was done to avoid confusion and to match each roll of film with its appropriate Photo Record Form. This process worked most of the time. For those sheets which lost their labels during processing, detective work had to be done to properly identify the sheets. Next, each photo on the contact sheet was labeled on the back of the sheet according to information on the Photo Record Form. The backs and fronts of the contact sheet were then xeroxed. The xeroxes were put into a notebook with the accompanying negatives (in negative sleeves labeled with the roll number for easy retrieval). The contact sheets were then cut up, taking care not to cut off the frame number.

The photos were then attached to their appropriate individualized computer data sheets. Care was taken to verify that, indeed, the image matched the description on the data sheet. Photographs which did not match were set aside and later sorted through to solve problems. This was a very time-consuming task. The roll and frame number of each photograph (which had been noted on both the Windshield Survey Form and the photo record form) was noted on the data sheet.

Several problems occurred with the photography. 1) In some cases, the surveyors were poor photographers and the photographs had to be retaken by other volunteers or by Tracerics staff. This was very time-consuming. 2) Some surveyors were not meticulous in noting on the Photo Record Form every photo taken. This created problems in labeling the contact sheets and in assigning addresses to those photos which were not noted. In most cases, through information either on the Packet Assignment Form or by process of elimination, Tracerics was able to assign correct addresses to the unrecorded images. Again, this was an extremely time-consuming process for which enough time had not been allotted in the original proposal. 3) Sometimes, after the photograph was labeled with the address provided by the surveyor on the Photo Record Form, it was evident that the photograph did not match the description on the individualized computer data sheet. 4) In some cases, because the film had been inexpensive and purchased at a discount (to meet the project's budget and the unexpectedly increased number of buildings), the roll actually began at a random number anywhere between "0" and "86". This threw off the project's numbering system and rendered the assigned numbers useless for retrieval purposes. Before the project was completed, the frame number on every data sheet had to be corrected to reflect the actual number on the contact sheet. 5) After the film was developed, it became evident that the photo numbers on the contact sheets rarely matched those assigned on the Photo Record Form. This was attributed to the variance in how far the film was wound in the individual cameras. 6) The photography lab sometimes printed the negatives backwards or in incorrect numerical order. This error was surprisingly easy to miss and it caused severe confusion in labeling when the error

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 9

went unnoticed initially. The entire photo process was repeated, or continued, with each new phase of the windshield survey.

b. Initial Research

While the windshield survey was underway, general research was being conducted. Information was collected from several sources, namely the photo collection of the Library of Congress, the vertical files of the Washingtoniana Division of the Martin Luther King Public Library, the vertical files of the Columbia Historical Society, and the personal files of historian James Goode. His files were comprised of articles on apartment buildings which appeared in contemporary architectural journals and local newspapers. These articles were both about specific buildings and about the development of apartment buildings as a building type. Mr. Goode's files proved to be the most comprehensive and useful. (His work on a book on luxury apartment buildings in Washington, D.C. provided the basis for much thought and direction for this project.) Research into the files at the various resource centers was general in nature. Later, site-specific research was begun on those buildings identified in Lusk or on maps as having a pre-1915 construction date. Building permit research was conducted to obtain an accurate construction date on the earliest (or oldest) buildings, and to gain an understanding of the early development of apartment buildings as a building type in Washington, D.C.

Building Permits are on microfilm (with the exception of those issued between 1904 and 1915) and are found through a square or an address index. In searching the indices for the pre-1915 buildings, Traceries noted all other apartment buildings (whether they were pre- or post-1915). It was found that there were some apartment buildings which had been identified neither in Lusk nor on the maps. It was determined that the building list was not yet comprehensive--there were still gaps in information.

Traceries read through every reel of the permit indices and noted every permit which indicated that it was for the construction of an apartment building. This was then compared to the data base and a Windshield Survey Form was prepared for every building that was not found in the data base. The entire survey process was then repeated for these new-found buildings (windshield survey, photography, maps).

Even by going through the indices and noting addresses of apartment buildings, this was not a fail-safe method for tracking down every apartment building. The index does not always indicate the type of the building. While it generally specifies whether or not the permit is for a dwelling, it does not necessarily note whether the dwelling is for single- or multiple-family use. A potentially fail-safe method to finding every apartment building would have been to read through each reel of building permits--to find not only building permits for every apartment building, but also repair permits indicating conversions from another building type into apartment buildings.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 10

However, this would have been a very time-consuming task for which time was not allotted in the project proposal and the result would not have been worth the amount of time it would have taken. (Note: building permits were also found for apartment buildings which were never constructed.)

Traceries then looked up every pre-1915 apartment building permit and recorded the information on Permit Forms created for that purpose. For all other addresses (post-1915) for which a permit number and date had been located, a Permit Form was labeled with that information. These forms were then put in chronological order and collated into packets of 40 permit forms each for volunteers to search. Clear instructions were written on how to find the permits and how to record the information. These permit packets were distributed to volunteers for completion. This did not prove to be as popular a task as the windshield survey had been and not as many people volunteered. Because of lack of enough help and time constraints, only permits through the 1920s were researched. While permit dates and numbers were recorded for buildings erected in the 1930s and early 1940s, additional permit information such as builder and architect was not recorded (with the exception of selected buildings dating from that period.

c. Initial Reviewing of the Paper Files

While permit research was being conducted, all 4,000+ building folders were reviewed by the project director. This step performed an important check-point for the data. The review caught missing information, photographs which were mislabeled or needed to be re-shot, and inadequate map information.

E. Development of Criteria and Sub-Study Units

As the Survey progressed, criteria or evaluating the buildings were developed and refined. This was a laborious task which lasted many months as new information was revealed and it became clear that the buildings could be evaluated in many different ways. This task involved close negotiations with the D.C. Office of Historic Preservation. The guidelines which were developed are based on criteria developed by the National Register of Historic Places and the D.C. Office of Historic Preservation, and on the historic context that was developing as a result of research completed for this study.

After the criteria were developed, sub-study units based on the developing historic context were developed to test the criteria. They included areas of study such as the work of particular architects and developers; buildings with important landscape features, structural systems or unusual building materials; early apartment buildings; buildings with special shapes; or buildings which represented aesthetic movements or technological advances.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 11

1. In-Depth Survey

As part of the test of the criteria, 180 buildings were selected for in-depth architectural analysis. The buildings were chosen as representatives of the sub-study units. An in-depth survey form, or Inventory Form was developed. This four-page form allowed for the collection of very specific information on the architectural details of each building. Again, volunteers were recruited to complete these forms. Generally, volunteers with some background in architecture or those with proven experience with previous survey work were asked to help in this effort. An in-depth training session was held on how to complete the forms. And a lexicon was specifically developed for this survey and distributed to the surveyors.

F. Synthesis of Phase I

The identification of the building list was thus completed with the windshield survey, photography, map research, general and permit research, in-depth survey, development of the paper files, and data entry of this basic information. In summary, the identification and research on buildings could be broken down into four levels of effort, two of which were completed in Phase I. Level I included a windshield survey and map research. This was completed for every building and was the end point only for those buildings determined to be the least significant to the study. Level II included the windshield survey, map research and building permits. This level of documentation was completed for more than 50% of the buildings, so that an accurate date of construction, architect, builder and developer were identified.

In addition to the identification of the buildings, the ground-work was laid for their evaluation. Criteria based on local and national standards were developed and sub-study units were developed to test the criteria.

Phase II would lead to Levels III and IV of the research effort and to the writing of the narrative history of the development of apartment buildings and to the writing of National Register nominations. Level III of the research effort included the steps in Level II of Phase I, plus the comprehensive architectural survey and library research. Level IV was to National Register standard and included a study of all the traditional resources. Individual National Register nomination forms were prepared for these buildings.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 12

III. PHASE II

A. Selecting the Buildings

It was determined that ten buildings (to meet the original grant requirement) should be selected for individual nomination. The selection of these ten buildings focused on the sub-study units and the evaluation criteria. Frequency reports indicated that the percentage of buildings coded under each of the criteria. The sub-study units which initially formed the basis of the development of the criteria, were brought back into action as checks for the criteria coding. Buildings that had been surveyed under sub-study units samplings were reviewed to determine if they had been coded appropriately. Samplings of buildings meeting the criteria were listed by the computer. Several different approaches to making the final selection were discussed by staff, until it was ready to present two different approaches to the Advisory Committee for discussion. These included a Multiple Property Listing for a single avenue or a cross section of evaluation criteria samplings.

In June, the Advisory Committee convened for an intense morning session to weigh the pros and cons of different approaches, and the more detailed levels of actually identifying the ten buildings. It was determined that the model character of the project and this early use of the new National Register program forms, would be best served with a cross section. This would result in the illustration of several different ways that a single building type could meet the National Register criteria.

The criteria approach was made easier as the computer data was reviewed for significant findings. Of the 23 criteria, buildings had been coded to fall under 16 of these. Using the computer data, individual buildings were then selected as potential nominees for each of the criteria that had been coded.

Some criteria had many buildings, others had only one or two. The computer frequency reports were reviewed for information relevant to the criteria. For instance, Criteria C-11 (work of an architect) led the staff to review the architect's report in depth to allow for the selection of an architect whose work extended beyond an individual building to the property type itself. The potential nominees were narrowed down after reviewing data in their folders, or after determining that additional research had not yielded sufficient documentation to support an individual nomination. In August, the ten buildings were finally selected. Research had been undertaken on many more, including an extensive study of buildings constructed prior to 1900. However, the depth and breadth required by the individual nominations still indicated that only ten nominations could be prepared.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 13

1. Organizing and Writing the National Register Nominations

One of the required products of the Survey was the preparation of ten National Register nominations. Because one of the goals of the project was to develop what was then an unknown historic context, the requirement did not define whether the nominations would be thematic, by district, individual or a combination of these.

During the course of the Survey, the National Register changed its regulations and created a new nomination format, the Multiple Property Listing. The Multiple Property nomination is not actually a listing of buildings, but rather a broad statement of significance under which individual buildings may be grouped. Individual or district nominations must still be prepared, but they may share the statement of significance defined in the Multiple Property Listing. This change in the regulations allowed for a broad historic context to be developed for the apartment survey which could cover the entire history of the building type.

2. Preparing the Nominations

Critical to this process was the dove-tailing of the D.C. Apartment Buildings Survey's and the National Registers' computer programming. Bulletin #16 reflects the National Register's computerization efforts and mandates the use of pre-determined terminology for completion of the Register forms. The D.C. Apartment Buildings Survey had found itself enmeshed in the computer's requirement for rigid terminology. As well, Bulletin #16 introduced a thorough presentation of historic context, something intrinsic to the D.C. Apartment Buildings Survey project. Through the preparation of the nominations, the methodology of the Apartment Buildings Survey was tested for its ability to take information from the on-site survey, essentially raw data, all the way to the National Register. The Multiple Property Listing form requires the following elements of information: name of multiple property listing, associated historic contexts, geographical data, statement of historic contexts, associated property types, summary of identification and evaluation methods, and major bibliographical references. All these were available as direct products of the Apartment Buildings Survey. Further, the required narrative could be developed from the contextual information collected in the data base and from follow-up research.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 14

A standardized outline was developed for the Statement of Significance and the Physical Description to ensure a uniform quality of nomination and to ease the writing process. This was based on Bulletin #16 instructions for the writing of these sections.

The writing of the specific narratives was based on a review of the building folders, an evaluation of the criteria and a synthesis of the National Register requirements with the building's specific history. In each case, the criteria evaluation and coding allowed the nomination to clearly state the building's significance and valuative contribution, have a direct focus, and to use terminology that echoed the National Register's instructions (directly relating it to computerized data on file at the National Register).

This work pointed out ways that the D.C. Apartment Buildings Survey would reconcile terminology differences and refine its survey form to better serve a long-term goal of meeting National Register requirements.

B. Dissemination of Information

During Phase II of the project, Traceries was responsible for presenting three public information programs and for producing a public information brochure.

1. Lectures

The first public meeting, sponsored by DCPL for its membership, was a panel of speakers addressing various aspects of the project. Kim Hoagland, Project Liaison, described the need for and goals of the project; James Goode spoke about the history of luxury apartment buildings in Washington, D.C.; Emily Eig, Project Director, explained the methodology; Larry Karr, Computer Specialist, explained the use and importance of computers to the project; and Julie Mueller, Project Administrator and Historian, spoke about the volunteer effort.

The second program was presented at the Fourteenth Annual Conference of Washington, D.C. Historical Studies. A presentation followed by a panel addressed the history of apartment buildings in the District. Emily Eig presented a slide show discussing the D.C. Apartment Building Survey, its approach and findings to date.

At the Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians held in San Francisco, the project was presented by Emily Eig during a session sponsored by the Preservation Committee on preservation-related surveys.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 15

In addition to the three required public programs, Emily Eig presented a slide talk on early apartment buildings in the District to the Greater Washington Chapter of the Victorian Society of America. And a lecture and tour of Washington, D.C.'s apartment buildings with lavish lobbies was given during the National Trust for Historic Preservation's Annual Conference. The lecture was presented by James Goode who later guided a tour, as did Emily Eig.

2. Publications

Tracerics produced a public information brochure which describes the project, its goals, and its preliminary findings. The brochure was prepared during the early months of Phase II so that it could be distributed at the public meetings.

The Survey also received public notice in newspapers and journals. Three articles written by Tracerics about Survey findings were published in the DCPL Newsletter. An article describing the goals of the survey appeared in the New York Times (January 12, 1986, pg. 34). And another short article describing the use of volunteers in a survey effort was published in the September/October 1987 issue of Historic Preservation.

C. Administration

1. Management Planning and Scheduling

The administration of the project required several tasks. First, a management plan and a schedule had to be developed. This was done for each of the two phases. In each case, the schedule had to be modified as the project progressed to take into account unforeseen problems which emerged.

For Phase I, a ten-month project schedule was originally proposed. However, the study began to fall behind schedule at the start of the project due to a one-month delay in the signing of the contract. An extension of one month to make up for this lag time was requested and received. Further delays occurred because significantly more data was located during the map research phase than was originally anticipated. Map research itself too considerably more time to accomplish than had been allotted, but it also yielded significantly more information than expected. Because of this, more data had to be entered into the computer and extra time had to be allotted to survey and photograph a significant number of additional structures (approximately 1500). Data entry time for the computer in general was underestimated from the start of the project due to the number of unknowns. Despite these set-backs, the required products of Phase I were delivered on schedule.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 16

Due to the requirements of the D.C. Grants cycle, planning for Phase II had to be done when Phase I was only half way complete. A plan was proposed with the realization that it would have to be amended once Phase I was completed and the parameters were better understood. While it was apparent even then that extra personnel and time would be needed, it was not possible to accurately estimate exactly how much work (and therefore how much time) would be required.

The major time-consumer for which not enough time had been allotted was the "clean up" of the Phase I data in preparation for the evaluation that would occur during Phase II. A second set-back was a change in National Register regulations which required, among other things, a re-organization of the data and thought-process in the preparation of the proposed National Register nominations. After the management plan and schedule were developed, tasks were assigned to each staff member.

2. Staffing

The D.C. Apartment Building Survey was administered by Emily Hotaling Eig, Traceries (Project Director); Alison K. Hoagland, DCPL (Project Liaison); Tanya Beauchamp, D.C. Office of Historic Preservation (Grants Administrator); and Julie Mueller, Traceries (Historian and Survey Administrator). An Advisory Committee composed of scholars and preservationists with a wide base of expertise provided guidance and review throughout the Survey effort.

The Project Liaison administered the grant, recruited volunteers, organized the Advisory Committee, served as a liaison between Traceries and the D.C. Office of Historic Preservation, advised on the scope and nature of the project, and assisted in the evaluation of the findings. She met on a weekly or bi-weekly basis with Traceries throughout most of the project and also met with the Grants Administrator on a regular basis.

The Project Director determined the scope and nature of the project in coordination with the Grants Administrator and Project Liaison. She directed and supervised the implementation of the project, oversaw the administration of the professional staff, research, and writing. She was responsible for the development of the evaluation criteria, the general context, final report and recommendations. She met on a daily basis with Traceries staff and on a weekly and monthly basis with the Project Liaison and Grants Administrator. In addition, she was in constant contact with them through telephone calls.

The Historian/Survey Administrator was responsible for organizing, training, and managing researchers and surveyors; assisting in researching, managing, and analyzing data; writing reports and National Register nominations; and administering Traceries' time-keeping, billing and required administrative reports.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 17

The Grants Administrator attended monthly meetings at Traceries, and spoke by telephone to Traceries staff on a regular basis between meetings. She met regularly with the Project Liaison as well. These meetings and conversations insured that the project was meeting the requirements of the D.C. Office of Historic Preservation, and that it was on track at all times. They also provided a forum for discussion of problems and how to solve them in the best interest of the Office, the eventual users of the final product. Monthly Progress Reports prepared on standard D.C. forms were submitted to the Grants Administrator who shared the information with the Grants Management Office. This office closely monitored the expenses and man-hours spent on the project through exacting records kept by all participants (detailed time and travel forms). In addition to the Monthly Progress Reports, quarterly narrative reports and a final report were prepared during Phase I for the Grants Administrator.

The Advisory Committee advised on the scope and nature of the project, assisted in the evaluation of the findings, and reviewed all products. They met as a full committee twice--once during each phase. During the entire project they were kept apprised of progress and were frequently asked to comment on both progress and problems. Generally through letters, but also by office visits and telephone conversations, most of the committee members actively participated in the entire study. They served as a sounding board on how to organize the study, define terms and develop evaluation criteria during Phase I. During Phase II, their comments were sought on how to best organize the information into National Register nominations. The importance of their input cannot be emphasized enough. The variety of expertise as well as the breadth of viewpoints brought to the project were invaluable. In making up the committee, Traceries sought to bring together professionals with different needs and interests. Thus scholars, government officials, lawyers involved in zoning and real estate development issues, and professional preservationists were asked to join the committee. Rarely were their views in conflict with one another. Rather, they were able to guide the project so that the product would be useful to the largest number and type of professionals possible.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 18

The committee was comprised of 1) James Goode, former Curator of the Smithsonian, who is currently preparing a book on Washington, D.C.'s luxury apartment buildings. He brought a broad knowledge of Washington apartment buildings, architects, and builders to the project and assisted in the development of the sub-study units. He also generously provided access to all his files. 2) Elizabeth Cromley, Professor of Architectural History at SUNY at Buffalo, had undertaken a major study of apartment buildings in New York and is a nationally recognized scholar on this subject. She contributed information on the background of the development of the building type from a national perspective. In addition, she was able to give advice as a person who had done a study of apartment buildings and was able to give a critical review of the findings. 3) Carroll William Westfall, Professor of Architectural History at University of Virginia, is currently researching and teaching on the subject of apartment buildings. Because of his research and his experience in the development of comprehensive surveys, he was able to offer insight into the building form and how best to organize the findings. 4) Anne Adams, architectural historian with Wilkes, Artis, Hedrick and Lane, a local law office, has extensive expertise and experience in the survey process and the analysis and evaluation of historic buildings against National Register criteria. As a former staff member of the D.C. Office of Historic Preservation, she provided advice on survey methodology and landmark potential. In addition, she volunteered her time as a surveyor, and her personal building files to add information to the Survey. 5) Ron Andrews, National Register Co-ordinator for the Maryland Historical Trust, contributed insight to how to best organize the material for the National Register. Others who contributed their insight and expertise included 6) Christopher Collins, attorney with Wilkes, Artis, Hedrick and Lane, specializing in zoning regulations; 7) George Colyer, an urban planner; and 8) Mark Andrich, a graduate student of early local apartment buildings.

The support staff included not only the large corps of volunteers, but also the professional staff retained by Traceries. This included researchers, computer data operator and a clerical assistant. Key research was completed by Laura Harris, Alison Stone and Katherine Grandine. Laura Harris and Katherine Grandine also served as the computer data operators.

Upon the completion of Phase I, it became clear that a data manager and administrator (who were not part of the research staff) were needed. During Phase I, most of the researchers' and historian's time was spent sorting and co-ordinating information, problem solving, co-ordinating volunteers, and keeping up with the tremendous amount of paperwork required under the grant. The vast amount of information would have been more efficiently coordinated had there been a separate data manager. Paperwork included Monthly Progress Reports, explicit time and travel records, quarterly billing (a process which often required several days to coordinate), and correspondence. For the Phase II grant proposal, a position for a data manager was included, but the amount of time needed was underestimated. Although more time was allotted to the Historian for administration, the responsibilities were not passed on to another person.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 19

D. Final Comments

The project had to be continually monitored, revised and updated as new information was revealed and it became apparent that the original work plan was not adequate for the vast amount of information which had to be collected and synthesized. These unknowns centered around the impossibility to accurately calculate, before the project began, the number of buildings and the amount of available information. There was not enough flexibility in the grant to allow for changes in personnel needs, budget, or time extensions needed by staff and not allotted for during the initial planning and proposal phase due to the number of unknowns. The parameters of the project evolved as the study progressed and many unpredictable events occurred which required added staff and staff time to resolve. Because a survey of such magnitude and detail had never been undertaken in Washington, D.C., it was impossible to accurately estimate time and cost. In the end, despite hundreds of hours of volunteer time, the actual cost of the project was far higher than originally estimated. Estimated funds in the project proposal and changes in the grant requirements which occurred after the award was made did not cover the actual cost of the project, so additional funding was sought. In seeking these funds, the grantees were able to reorganize the project as needed (and as reflected in the revised work plan submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation). The importance of the project was recognized with a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

III. Final Phase

1. Writing the Historic Context and Associated Property Types

The Narrative History is the historic context into which all the apartment buildings studied during this project can be placed. It traces the history of the development of apartment buildings in the District of Columbia from their introduction in this city through the end of World War II.

The initial outline for the Narrative History was written at the conclusion of Phase I. It was further developed for the public information brochure produced during the early stages of Phase II. As the study continued and more information was synthesized by the computer, the outline and format of the historic context continued to develop, and was finalized as part of this Multiple Property submission.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 20

Similarly, the preparation of the narrative for the associated property types was begun at the conclusion of Phase I, and was further developed as a result of additional research and data collected during Phase II of the survey. The synthesis of data and information about the purpose built apartment buildings in Washington, D.C. as a building type is brought together and documented in Section F of the Multiple Property Document.

2. Review and Comment by the Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee reconvened in July, 1993 to review and comment on the Draft Multiple Property Submission. Again, the importance of the committee's input was invaluable to the improvement of the final document. The variety of expertise as well as the breadth of viewpoints made for a better final product. In reconvening the committee, Traceries sought to bring together professionals with different needs and interests. Thus several new members were added to the committee--people who have worked with apartment buildings over the years or who initially served in an official capacity on the apartment building survey and had moved onto other responsibilities. As a result of the Advisory Committee meeting Traceries responded to the comments of the Advisory Committee, corrected editorial problems within the text and tied up all loose ends within the text

3. Preparation of National Register Multiple Property Document

The final phase of the D.C. Apartment Building Survey involves the preparation, writing and organization of a National Register of Historic Places Multiple Properties Documentation Form for apartment buildings in the District of Columbia. The project includes over 3,500 purpose-built apartment buildings constructed between 1880 and 1945 identified throughout the District of Columbia during the D.C. Apartment Buildings Survey. To complete the required multiple property documentation, Traceries identified the specific historic contexts and associated property types as required by Multiple Property documentation. The original Advisory Committee was reconvened with additional members joining the group. These included Sally Berk, Architectural Historian; Howard Berger, Architectural Historian; Julie Mueller, Architectural Historian; and Tanya Beauchamp, Architectural Historian.

The Multiple Property Document will result in the formalization of the methodology necessary to evaluate the significance of apartment buildings, providing the framework for designating those apartment buildings worthy of preservation. The development of a Multiple Properties Nomination Form will heighten public awareness of the importance of apartment buildings in the history of the Nation's Capital and focus attention on the usefulness of a comprehensive survey such as the D.C. Apartment Building Survey. The completed MPD will be a tool to assist the Historic Preservation Division in explaining the purpose of the historic context, in expanding the

NPS Form 10-900-b
OMB No 1024-0018
(Revised March 1992)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 21

public's understanding of the database, and in clarifying the processes used to identify and evaluate historic apartment buildings.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 1

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.)

BOOKS

Abel, Joseph H. and Fred N. Severud. Apartment Houses. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corp., [need date].

Alpern, Andrew. Apartments for the Affluent. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Alpern, Andrew. New York's Fabulous Luxury Apartments. New York: Dover Publications, 1975.

Borchert, James. Alley Life in Washington: Family, Community, Religion and Folklife in the City, 1850-1970. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980.

Bunsby, Katherine Graves. Home Life in America. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1910.

Bushong, William; Judith Helm Robinson; and Julie Mueller. A Centennial History of the Washington Chapter, 1887-1987. Washington, D. C.: The American Institute of Architects, 1987.

Commission of Fine Arts. Massachusetts Avenue Architecture. Washington, D.C.: Commission of Fine Arts, 1973.

Cox, Warren; Hugh Newell Jacobson; Frances D. Lethbridge; and David R. Rosenthal. A Guide to the Architecture of Washington, D.C. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Diner, S. J. Housing Washington's People: Public Policy in Retrospect. Washington D. C.: Department of Urban Studies, University of the District of Columbia, 1983.

Dixon, Roger and Stefan Muthesius. Victorian Architecture. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Ford, James. Slums and Housing, History - Conditions - Policy, with Special Reference to New York City. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Goode, James M. Capital Losses, A Cultural History of Washington's Destroyed Buildings. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1979.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 2

Goode, James M. Best Addresses. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1988.

Green, Constance McLaughlin. Washington Capital City, 1879-1950. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962.

_____. The Secret City: A History of Race Relations in the Nation's Capital. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Gutheim, Frederick. The Federal City: Plans and Realities. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1976.

Gutheim, Frederick. Worthy of a Nation. The History of Planning for the National Capital. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1977.

Haar, Charles M. and Kayden, Jerold S., editors. Zoning and the American Dream. Washington, D.C.: American Planning Association, Planners Press, 1989.

Hawes, Elizabeth. New York, New York: How the Apartment House Transformed Life of the City (1869-1930). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.

Hitchcock, Henry Russell. Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958.

Illustrated Washington: Our Capitol 1890. New York: American Publishing and Engraving Company, 1890.

Jones, William Henry. The Housing of Negroes in Washington, D. C.: A Study in Human Ecology. Washington D. C.: Howard University Press, 1929.

Junior League of Washington. An Illustrated History of the City of Washington. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.

Kemp, Barbara H. and Shirley Cherkasky. "Public Housing in the District of Columbia," Eleanor Roosevelt's Washington. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, __.

King, Anthony D. "The Apartment House in Urban America." Buildings and Society. Essays on the Social Development of the Built Environment. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, _.

King, Leroy O. 100 Years of Capital Traction: The Story of Streetcars in the Nation's Capital. Taylor Publishing Company, 1972.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 3

Kirkland, Edward C. A History of American Economic Life. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts (Educational Division) Meredith Corporation, 1969.

Kober, George. History and Development of the Housing Movement in the City of Washington, D.C., 1877-1927.

Kohler, Sue A. and Jeffrey Carson. Sixteenth Street Architecture. Washington, D.C.: Commission of Fine Arts, 1978.

Lynes, Russell. The Domesticated Americans. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Logan, Rayford W. and Winston Michael R., Dictionary of American Negro Biography. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1982.

Mitchell, J. Paul. Federal Housing Policy and Programs, Past and Present. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1985.

Perks, Sydney. Residential Flats. London: B.T. Batsford, 1905.

Proctor, John Clagett. Washington Past and Present. A History. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., Inc., 1930.

Schneider, Thomas Franklin. Selections from Work of T.F. Schneider, Architect. Washington, D.C., 1894.

Service, Alastair. Edwardian Architecture. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Sexton, R.W. American Apartment Houses Hotels and Apartment Hotels of Today. New York: Architectural Book Publishing Company, Inc., 1929.

Slauson, Allan B. A History of the City of Washington; Its Men and Institutions. Washington, D.C.: Washington Post Co., 1903.

Stern, Robert A.M., Gregory Gilmartin and John Massengale. New York 1900: Metropolitan Architecture and Urbanism, 1890-1915. New York: Rizzoli, 1983.

Tunick, Susan. A Field Guide to Apartment Building Architecture. New York: Friends of Terra Cotta/NYS, 1986.

Verrity, Frank T., Edwin Hall., and Gerald C. Horsley. Flats, Urban Houses, and Cottage Homes. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 4

Wirz, Hans and Richard Striner. Washington Deco, Art Deco in the Nation's Capital. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1984.

Wright, Gwendolyn. Building a Dream: A Social History of Housing in America. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.

PERIODICALS

Abrahms, Doug. "To Cut Energy Use, Developer Tries Cogeneration." Washington Business Journal (5 June, 1989): 18.

"Apartment Hotels in New York City." The Architectural Record ("AR") 13 (1903): 35-91.

"Apartment House Development, 13 Designs and Plans." Beaux Arts Institute of Design, New York Bulletin 11 (Dec. 1934): 7-18, 29-30.

"Apartment House on East 21st Street, New York. Mr. Bruce Price, Architect, New York." The American Architect and Building News ("AABN") 3 (4 May, 1878): 157, pl. 123.

"Apartment House on 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C." AABN 100 (Nov. 29, 1911): ___.

"Apartment Houses." AABN 100 (29 Nov., 1911): 229m, editorial.

"Apartment Houses I." AABN 29 (27 September, 1890): 194.

"Apartment Houses II." AABN 30 (15 November, 1890): 97-100.

"Apartment Houses III." AABN 31 (19 January, 1891): 20-23.

"Apartment Houses IV." AABN 31 (27 January, 1891): 37-39.

"Apartment House Projects by A.L. Kocher." Creative Art 9 (Aug. 1931): 166-7.

"Apartments, Architectural Records--Building Type Study #123." AR 101 (March 1947): 85-106.

"Apartments for the Average Wage Earner." AR 70 (July 1931): 49-50.

"Apartment Roundtable Asks: What Price Urban Living?" Architectural Forum 120 (March 1964): 84-91.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 5

"Architectural Aberrations -- The Cairo Apartment House, Washington, D.C." AR 4
(April-June 1895): 473-76.

"Are Apartments Necessary?" American Architect (July-Dec. 1920): 78.

"Bachelor Apartments on Willow Street, Boston, Mass." AABN 39 (18 March, 1893): 175,
plate 899.

Benslyn, William T. "Recent Developments in Apartment Housing in America." Journal of the
Royal Institute of British Architects 32 (27 June, 1925): 504-19.

Blanke, Everett, N. "The Cliff-Dwellers of New York." Cosmopolitan 15 (July 1895): 354-59.

Boyd, John Taylor, Jr. "The Suburban Apartment House." The Architectural Forum 43
(Sept. 1925): 131-142.

Buckham, C.W. "The Present and Future Development of the Apartment House," AA 100 (29
Nov., 1911): 224-27.

Bull, Walter E.A. "The Financial Aspect of Flat Development." The Architect's Journal 81 (2
May, 1935): 665-68.

Castle, Raymond T. "Low-Cost Flats in America." The Architect's Journal 114
(19 July, 1951): 83-85.

Clark, T.M. "Apartment-Houses." AABN 91 (5 January, 1907): 3-11.

"Community Apartments, New Development in Housing." Architectural Forum 54
(Jan. 1931): 43-48.

"The Cooperative Plan -- One Answer to the Low Cost Housing Problem." Architectural
Forum 54 (Feb. 1931): 241-43.

"The Cordova Apartments, Washington, D.C." AABN 96 (22 December, 1909): plate.

Curtis, Arthur E. "Cooperative Apartment Buildings." Architectural Forum 43
(Sept. 1925): 143-46.

David, A.C. "A Co-operative Studio Building." AR 14 (1903): 237-54.

"Designers Notes on Low-Cost, Multi-Family Housing." Architecture 67 (Jan. 1933): 1-6.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 6

-
- "The Design of Our Tall Office Buildings - The Latest Phase." AR 11 (1902): 705-11.
- Deutsch, Davida Tenenbaum. "The Osborne, New York City." Antiques (July 1986): 152-58.
- "Efficiency Apartments for Washington Workers." AR 96 (Oct. 1914): 75.
- "The Everett." AABN 39 (20 October, 1893): 175, pl. 899.
- "Experimental Low-Cost Housing in the U.S.A." Build International 2 (Sept. 1969): 32-40.
- Flagg, Ernest. "The Planning of Apartment Houses and Tenements." The Architectural Review (1903): 85-90.
- "FPHA Dormitories for a Midwestern Bomber Plant." AR 92 (July 1942): 40-43.
- "FPHA Duration Dormitories for Industrial War Workers." AR 92 (July 1942): 44-45.
- Goldstone, Lafayette. "The Modern Apartment." Architecture 27 (1918): 142-43.
- "Governor Shepard Apartments, Washington, D.C." Architectural Forum 74 (May 1941): 322-23.
- Guillemot, Maurice. "How a Rich Man May Live in Paris." AR 14 (1903): 79-91.
- "High Apartments or Low." Architectural Forum 96 (Jan. 1952): 100-117.
- "Higher Housing for Lower Rents." Architectural Forum 61 (Dec. 1934): 421-34.
- "The Highlands' Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. - Arthur B. Heaton, Architect." AABN 91 (5 January, 1907): plate 24.
- Holden, Arthur C. "Should We Regulate the Form and Plan of Apartment Buildings?" AR 65 (March 1929): 313.
- Hubert, Pirsson, and Hoddick. "New York Flats and French Flats." AR 2 (1892): 55-64.
- Hunt, Myron. "Suburban Apartments." Architectural Review 10 (1903): 101-105.
- "Improved Housing for Washington, D.C." AR 9 (May 1946): 132-34.
- Ives, Douglas. "The Moderate Priced Apartment Hotel." Architectural Forum 53 (Sept. 1930): 309-12.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 7

"The Kenesaw Apartments, Washington, D.C." AABN 96 (22 December, 1909): plate.

Klauer, Eugene H. "Reducing Apartment Costs by Economy of (1) Planning, (2) Construction, (3) Operation." AR 71 (March 1932): 12-18.

Lewis, Arnold. "An European Profile of American Architecture." Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians [need full cite]: 265-82.

"Look At These Figures." The Apartment House (July 1911): contents page.

"Low Rent Apartment Group Designed by N. Rice." AR 70 (Dec. 1931): 440-41.

"Low Rent Suburban Apartment Buildings, Design Elements Which Affect Rentability and Operation." AR 86 (Sept. 1939): 88-92.

MacDougall, A.E. "New Features in Apartment House Building." Architectural Forum 43 (Sept. 1925): 153-61.

Marcou, Paul Frantz. "The Modern House in Paris." AR 2 (1903): 324-31.

Mazade, F. "Living in Paris on an Income of \$3,000 a Year." AR 11 (1902): 700-704.

Mechlin, Leila. "The Work of Wood, Donn and Deming, Washington, D.C." AR 19 (1906): 245-58.

"Moderate Priced Apartment Hotel." Architectural Forum 53 (Sept. 1930): 309-12.

Moore, Evelyn. "Chicago's Michigan Boulevard Garden Apartments." Historic Illinois 9 (June 1986): 12-13.

"New Standards in Apartment Design." AR (August 1941): ___.

"The Ontario Apartments, Washington, D.C." AABN 96 (22 December, 1909): plate.

"PBA Residence Halls for Women, Washington, D.C." AR 92 (July 1942): 40-43.

Pelham, George F. "Efficiency Apartments." Architectural Forum 43 (Sept. 1925): 147-52.

"Pioneering Program of Prefabrication." AR (March 1944): 66-72.

"Planning for Maximum Income." AR 96 (Oct. 1944): 72-74.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 8

Pommer, Richard. "The Architecture of Urban Housing in the United States During the Early 1930s." Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians (Dec. 1978): 235-64.

Pond, Irving. "Architecture of Apartment Buildings." Brickbuilder 7 (1898): 116-117, 249-52.

"Post-War Design for a Medium Cost Location, The Winchester-Tewksbury, Washington, D.C." AR 96 (Oct. 1944): 92.

"The Present Situation in Washington." The Apartment House (Feb. 1911): 22-__.

Putnam, J. P. "The Apartment House." AABN (4 January, 1890): 3-5.

Putnam, J. P. "The Apartment House, Part II." AABN (15 November, 1890): __.

"The Radical Evil of Life in Apartment Houses." AABN 91 (5 January, 1907): 1.

"Recent Developments in Apartment Housing in America." Royal Institute of British Architects Journal 32 (1925): 504-19.

Riley, F. "An American Home in Paris." AR 13 (1903): 97-118.

Saglio, Maurice. "City Apartment Houses in Paris." AR 5 (1896): 347-61.

Scheible, Albert. "Coming Developments in Apartment Houses." The Apartment House (Oct. 1911): 11-12.

"The Small Flat." AABN 138 (May 1934): 217-18.

"Some Parisian Apartment Houses." AABN 91 (5 January, 1907): 18-20.

"Southern Apartment and Flat Houses." AABN 91 (5 January, 1907): __.

Springsteen, George W. "The Practical Solution." Architectural Forum 54 (Feb. 1931): 243-46.

"The Stoneleigh Court Apartments, Washington, D.C." AABN 96 (22 December, 1909): plate.

Taylor, R.E. Lee. "Design and Plan of Small City Apartment Buildings." Architectural Forum 43 (Sept. 1925): 121-130.

"270 Park Avenue." Architecture 27 (1918): 143.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 9

"Want A Name For Your New Apartment House?" The Apartment House (Feb. 1912): 30.

Webb, Warfield. "Architectural Terra Cotta For Apartments." The Apartment House (June 1912): 19-21.

Webb, Warfield. "Some Suggestions On Outside Walls." The Apartment House (March 1912): no page number.

Westfall, William Carroll. "Home at the Top: Domesticating Chicago's Tallest Apartment Buildings." Chicago History (Spring 1985): 20-39.

Willauer, Arthur C. "The Modern Home in New York." AA 96 (1909): 261-65.

"The Woodward Apartments." AABN 100 (29 November, 1911): ____.

Wright, Henry. "The Apartment House: A Review and a Forecast." AR 69 (March 1931): 187-195.

Wright, Henry. "How Can Apartment Facilities Be Improved For Low Income Groups?" AR 71 (March 1932): 147-66.

Wright, Henry. "The Modern Apartment House." AR 65 (March 1929): 213-45.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

"Apartment House Has 2,000 Rooms and 600 Baths." Washington Post, 21 June, 1931.

"Architect is Found Shot to Death Here." Washington Post, 16 May, 1932.

"Architect Tests Gun and Then Ends Life in Apartment." Washington Star, 18 May, 1932.

Bowman, LaBarbara. "1,100 Apartments Foreclosed." Washington Post, 12 February, 1983.

"Dining Room Will Open October 15." Washington Post, 11 October, 1931.

"Fit for Millionaires." Washington Post, 5 February, 1894, 16.

Forgey, Benjamin. "The Apartment House Celebrated." Washington Post, 1 October, 1988, C1.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 10

Forgey, Benjamin. "Breaking the Mold, Apartment Buildings that Blend New and Old." Washington Post, [no date].

Gray, Christopher. "Making a Tall Building Taller." New York Times, 14 May, 1989, 10.

"Hey, You Old Buzzards, Leave the Ladies Alone." Washington Star, 13 December, 1975.

"Kennedy-Warren Receiver is Named." Washington Post, 20 April, 1932.

"The Kennedy Warren Section," Special Supplement. Washington Post, 13 September, 1931.

"Kennedy Warren to be Enlarged." Washington Star, 12 May, 1935.

Lewis, Roger K. "Garden Apartments: A Nice Suburban Idea, But Parking Space Comes Before Trees." Washington Post, 22 March, 1986, F2.

Lewis, Roger K. "Why New Affordable Housing is So Scarce." Washington Post, July 8, 1989, F8.

"Man in News Lives Here..." Washington Post, 21 October, 1961.

Oser, Alan S. "East Side Condominium: Prewar Look." New York Times, 12 April, 1985.

"Permit is Asked for Large Hotel." Washington Star, 10 October, 1930.

Plate, Thomas. "Stoneleigh Court Being Torn Down," Washington Post, 25 August 1965, 8.

"The Portland." Evening Star, 12 January, 1884.

"Real Estate Gossip." Washington Evening Star. 1895-1905.

"Rent Increase Approved for Kennedy-Warren." Washington Star, ? January, 1951.

Simpson, Anne. "Renters, Landlords to Debate Extending Conversion Law." Washington Post, May 26, 1988, DC1.

Swallow, Wendy. "Older Garden Apartments Face Pressure." Washington Post, October 10, 1984, section F.

Willmann, John B. "One Million Living in Area Apartments." Washington Post, 21 August, 1966.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 11

"Washington Real Estate." Washington Post, 28 October, 1888.

MAPS

Baist, G. William. Baist's Real Estate Atlas, Surveys of Washington, District of Columbia. Philadelphia: Baist, 1903, 1907, 1909-1911, 1913-1915, 1919-1921, 1924-1928, 1931-1936, 1937-1943, 1945-1948.

A Complete Set of Surveys and Plats of the Properties in the City of Washington, District of Columbia. Philadelphia: G.M. Hopkins, 1887.

Sanborn Map Company. Insurance Maps, Washington, D.C.. New York: Sanborn, 1888, 1903-1916, 1927-28, 1939, 1950.

DIRECTORIES

Boyd, William H., Compiler. Boyd's City Directory to the District of Columbia. Washington, D.C.: By the Author, 1866-1948.

"Apartment Houses, Clubs and Hotels Named in the Directory." Congressional Directory. [year?]

Directory to Apartments of the Better Class. Chicago: n.p., 1917.

Lusk's 1963 Washington Apartment Directory. Washington, D.C.: Rufus S. Lusk & Son, Inc., 1963.

Washington Blue Book. Washington, D.C., 1886-1909.

PAMPHLETS

"The Altamont" (promotional booklet on new apartment house).
Washington, D.C.: n.p., 1916.

"The Ashley" (promotional booklet on new apartment house).
Washington, D.C.: n.p., 1906.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 12

"The Cairo" (promotional booklet on new apartment house). Washington, D.C.: n.p., 1894.

"The Ontario" (promotional booklet on new apartment house).
Washington, D.C.: n.p., 1906.

"The Westmoreland" (promotional booklet on new apartment house).
Washington, D.C.: n.p., 1905.

"The Wyoming" (promotional booklet on new apartment house).
Washington, D.C.: n.p., 1905.

LIBRARIES AND ARCHIVAL SOURCES

American Institute of Architects
Baldwin files.

Historical Society of Washington
Clippings files
James Goode, Architectural files
James Goode, Apartment files

Library of Congress
Geography and Maps Division: maps of Washington, D.C.
Prints and Photographs Division: F.B. Johnston Collection, James Goode Lost Washington
Collection, Theodore Horydczak Collection, and the Geographical files on Washington.

Martin Luther King Library, Washingtoniana Division
Clippings files, City Directories, Photographic files

National Archives and Records Service, Record Group 66, District of Columbia Building Permits
and Commission of Fine Arts, 1910-1952, Shipstead-Luce Act Cases, File 11).

D.C. LANDMARK APPLICATIONS

Bachelor Apartment Building, 1737 H Street, N.W.
National Register Nomination, 1977.

William Edgar Borah Apartment, No. 21, Windsor Lodge
National Register Nomination, n.d.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 13

Cleveland Park Historic District
National Register Nomination, 1987.

Downtown (Washington, D.C.) Historic District
National Register Nomination, 1982.

Foggy Bottom/West End Historic District
National Register Nomination, 1984.

George Washington University Multiple Resource District
Draft, National Register Nomination

Kalorama Triangle Historic District
National Register Nomination, 1985.

Langston Terrace Dwellings
National Register Nomination, 1987.

Andrew Mellon Apartment, McCormick Apartments
National Register Nomination, 1976.

The Mendota Apartments
National Register Nomination, 1983.

Mount Pleasant Historic District
National Register Nomination, 1984.

Mount Vernon Apartments
D.C. Landmark Nomination, 1979

Northumberland Apartment Building
D.C. Landmark Nomination, November 1977.

The Plymouth
National Register Nomination, 1985.

Walton, Arden, Ripley, Dudley, Morton, Ashton, Newton (Wardman Row)
National Register Nomination, 1983.

Wardman Park Annex and Arcade
National Register Nomination, 1979.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number I Page 14

Wardman Park Annex and Arcade
D.C. Landmark nomination, 1978.

Whitelaw Apartment Building
National Register Nomination, 1982.

Wyoming Apartment Building
National Register Nomination, 1980.

Wyoming Apartment Building, Interior of Entrance Pavilion
D.C. Landmark Nomination, n.d.

Wyoming Apartment Building
D.C. Landmark Nomination, 1979.

Sixteenth Street Historic District
National Register Nomination, 1978.

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS

Alley, Paul. "Toward the Luxury Apartment House, Washington, D.C., 1900-1905." University of Virginia, May 1982.

Andrich, Mark C. "Uptown Living: The Connecticut Avenue Apartment Corridor, 1900-1980." The George Washington University, Spring 1984, revised June 1987.

Andrich, Mark C. "The Apartment Houses of Kalorama Triangle, 1901-1939." Statement Before the D.C. Historic Preservation Review Board, 30 July 1986.

Andrich, Mark C. "The Impact of Zoning on Apartment House Development in Washington, D. C., 1920-Present." The George Washington University, Fall 1986.

Cromley, Elizabeth. "The Development of the New York Apartment House, 1860-1905." Draft of paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, 1984.

D'Agostini, Antonio. "Development of the Apartment Building in Washington, From 1890 to 1930." 1986.

Etherridge, Harrison Mosely. "The Black Architects of Washington, D. C: 1900 to Present." Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America (Doctoral Dissertation), 1979.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 15

Fulton, Deborah Anne. "Classical Imagery in Baltimore, 1900-1925: The 1909 City Plan of Carrere, Brunner and Olmsted, Jr. and The Apartment Houses of Edward Hughes Glidden (1873-1924)." University of Virginia, Charlottesville, May 1985.

Goode, James M. "Best Address, The Development of the Luxury Apartment House in Washington, D.C." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, 1984.

Haughey, Richard M. "Analysis of Field Work With the D.C. Preservation League and Traceries." February, 1986.

Haughey, Richard M. "Final Paper for HSAD 386/387 Internship with the D.C. Preservation League and Traceries." May, 1986.

Kay, Steven. Untitled and undated paper analyzing the number of apartment buildings listed in Washington, D.C. city directories between certain years.

Kennelly, Janet. "T.F. Schneider: 'The Napoleon of F Street.'" George Washington University, Washington, D.C., March 1976.

Kilpatrick, Robert. "Notes on the History of the Westmoreland." 1984.

"Ten Year Report of the National Capital Housing Authority, (1934-1944), A Report to the Congress." Issued by the Alley Dwelling Authority for Washington, D. C.

Wasch, Diane Shaw. "The Evolution of 1785 Massachusetts Avenue: From Luxury Apartment House to National Trust Headquarters." National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1989.

Westfall, William Carroll. "Chicago Apartments: 1871-1923." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, 1984.

Wilson, Dreck Spurlock. "Twelve Selected Black Architects, A Historical Perspective." unpublished monograph, Washington, D. C., June 1983.

Zurier, Rebecca. "Visionary in Boston, part 2: The Charlesgate as Housing in a Nationalist Utopia." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, 1984.