

I. SURVEY BACKGROUND

Over the past four years, five surveys have been conducted to address various historical themes in East Village. They include: 1) an update of the November 1988 Historic Site Inventory of City Centre East (East Village Survey); 2) an update of the 1989 Bayside Historic Property Inventory; 3) a new survey of properties over 45 years old that have not been previously surveyed; 4) a thematic survey of warehouses required by the Ballpark Settlement Agreement; and 5) a thematic survey of significant African American historic sites requested by the Black Historical Society of San Diego and endorsed by the Historical Resources Board (HRB).

These historical property inventories have been prepared by various consultants under the sponsorship of the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC). Their completion is intended to coincide with the preparation of the Centre City Community Plan Update. The survey results will be used in three ways: 1) to inform land use decisions regarding long-range planning opportunities and constraints in East Village; 2) to support the Environmental Impact Report required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Community Plan Update; and 3) to inform current (and future) property owners of the benefits and responsibilities associated with historical property ownership.

Comprising a total of 210 properties, the surveys have overlapping boundaries, historical themes and periods of significance. Two of the inventories (East Village and Bayside) are updates of earlier surveys. They are being brought to the HRB for review and comment because the Centre City Planned District Ordinance, Section 103.1904(e) of the City Municipal Code, requires that properties identified as potential historical sites in these surveys be reviewed by the City's HRB prior to development. Three of the surveys (Over '45s, Warehouse and African American) comply with Land Development Code Section 143.0212 that requires properties 45 years old or older to be evaluated for historical significance in conjunction with major new construction.

In preparation for the HRB hearings, HRB and CCDC staff initiated a public outreach process that included three mailings to property owners providing background information on the purpose of the historical surveys, the HRB designation process and criteria, and the benefits and responsibilities of historical property ownership. The survey findings were shared with property owners at a public information meeting held on Wednesday, November 10, 2004. The survey findings were also presented to the HRB Policy Subcommittee at its November 8, 2004, meeting.

The inventory findings were first introduced at the November 18, 2004, HRB meeting, where a broad overview of the individual survey contents, as well as their physical and thematic inter-relationships was discussed. The HRB will begin reviewing the East Village, Bayside and Over 45s survey findings, included in this document, for potential adoption commencing with the January 2005 meeting. The HRB will be asked to adopt the findings of the survey in order to advise owners of the potential historical significance of their properties. The HRB will also be asked to subsequently Note and File those resources with no potential for historical significance so these parcels can be cleared for future redevelopment. Property owners may also request designation determinations to be processed upon adoption of the survey. Other than those property owner requests, the HRB will not be taking action on other potentially significant resources at this time. If and when the potentially significant properties undergo redevelopment,

a determination relative to designation will be made at that time by the HRB before permit processing.

With regard to the proposed African-American and Warehouse Thematic District surveys, the HRB will be asked to designate a thematic historic district with identified and appropriate contributors, should the HRB concur with the findings of the studies at future meetings. Complete Historical Overviews and Context Statements for the Warehouse Thematic Historic District and the African American Thematic Historic District are included in those documents, along with maps and DPR forms for district contributors.

1. East Village Combined Surveys

This document, comprised of 85 inventoried historical resources, integrates three historical surveys conducted in East Village between 2001-2004 by the office of Marie Burke Lia & Associates on behalf of the Centre City Development Corporation (Appendix A, Map 1). The survey boundaries, property types and preliminary findings are described below. Survey boundary maps and surveyed historical resources maps are located in Appendix A. Thumbnail photographs of surveyed resources, grouped by age and property type, are located in Appendix B. Major modifications to historic fabric are highlighted in red on the photographs. Consultant-prepared DPR forms for each surveyed property are located in Appendix C, along with historic photographs for some of the properties. A composite map of all surveyed properties that correlates with the numbered DPR forms is found in Appendix A, Map 3.

Readers may note occasional differences in the property architectural descriptions and age between the HRB staff-prepared photographs and spreadsheets and the consultant-prepared DPR forms. This is a reasoned difference of professional opinion, based upon differing source material, independent research and inspection of physical fabric, not an error on the part of either the staff or consultant. Differences of opinion are also evident in the consultant's findings versus the HRB staff's findings. Again, a difference of opinion between professionals is not uncommon. It is expected that the Historical Resources Board will take the best thinking of all the preservation professionals involved in the surveys and come to a reasoned conclusion of its own design.

Staff also prepared additional materials addressing HRB Criterion A for East Village residential patterns for HRB consideration. This information is located in Section III. Information on auto-related historical resources and taxpayer blocks will be mailed with the January HRB agenda packets, along with several maps currently under preparation. Additionally, as previously directed by the HRB, staff has returned one deferred property identified in the Centre City Core Historic Survey in conjunction with staff's analysis of the Taxpayer Block property type under Criterion C.

A. East Village Survey Update

This survey is an update of a 1988 survey whose slightly larger boundaries have been modified to Russ Boulevard and San Diego City College to the north; 17th Avenue and Interstate 5 to the east; J Street on the south; Sixth Avenue to the west to E Street; and the south side of the 600

through 1100 blocks of E Street and the east side of the 1000 through 1300 blocks of 12th Avenue on the west (Appendix A: Map 2).

The 1988 survey identified 109 properties. Through survey boundary adjustments, HRB designations or Note and File decisions, demolitions and relocations, the original 109 properties have dwindled to 69. Consultant Marie Lia and Associates determined that three sites appeared eligible for the National Register of Historic Places; 30 appeared eligible for local listing under HRB Criterion C (Architecture); and 21 sites appeared to merit Note and File recommendations. Fifteen properties were not evaluated pending further historical research to determine significance.

Due to the passage of time since the consultant fieldwork, two properties in the East Village survey have been designated and two have been demolished after an HRB recommendation to Note and File their designation applications, leaving 65 properties for HRB staff review. HRB staff evaluated the 15 unevaluated properties and concluded that 14 of them meet HRB Criterion C for local designation. Of the remaining 50 properties, HRB staff determined that 34 meet HRB Criterion C for architecture and 16 are recommended for Note and File. One of the individually significant properties is a contributor to the proposed African American Thematic Historic District. Although not eligible for individual designation, one of the Note and File candidates is a contributor to the proposed Warehouse Thematic Historic District. Both of these properties have been removed from the East Village 1989 Survey Update and placed in the more appropriate survey for HRB consideration at a later time.

Property types in the survey include single and multi-family residential units that range in date from the 1870s through the 1920s and encompass the popular styles of their day. Commercial properties include hotels, auto showrooms, garages and auto repair establishments, as well as miscellaneous manufacturing, vending and warehousing enterprises that require large, utilitarian spaces and inexpensive rents to prosper.

B. Bayside Survey Update

Boundaries of the 1989 Bayside Survey encompassed the area south of J Street, east of the I-5 Freeway and north of Commercial Street. The western boundaries angled northwest along Harbor Drive to 6th Avenue, concentrating on historical resources around what is now Petco Park (Appendix A, Map 2). As a result of the intense redevelopment activity in this sector of East Village, only 11 of the 27 original properties remained from the 1989 survey to update. They were re-evaluated by consultant Marie Lia and Associates and added to the East Village Survey for HRB review.

The consultant-prepared updates concluded that three of the 11 properties meet HRB Criterion C for local designation, while eight are recommended for Note and File. After a field review and additional research, HRB staff concluded that seven of the properties appear to meet HRB Criterion C for architecture and four appear to be contributors to the proposed Warehouse District. The Warehouse District contributors have been removed from the survey and will be brought back to the HRB for consideration at a later time in conjunction with that historical context. Property types are similar to those noted in the East Village Survey.

C. Over 45s Survey

In preparation for the Community Plan Update process, CCDC mounted an effort to evaluate all properties over 45 years of age in East Village that were not previously surveyed (Appendix A, Map 2). This resulted in an initial list of 152 properties that were evaluated by a committee of stakeholders including CCDC staff and consultants, HRB staff and consultants, Save Our Heritage Organization (SOHO), the Black Historical Society, the Chinese Historical Society and downtown residents and property owners. Through group consensus, the preliminary list was reduced to 61 properties that were formally evaluated by CCDC consultants, Marie Lia and Associates.

The consultant findings concluded that six of the 61 properties meet HRB Criterion C for local designation and 54 properties were recommended for clearance by HRB staff. Upon reviewing the submitted material and conducting field reviews, HRB staff determined that 14 properties appear eligible for local designation under HRB Criterion C for architecture. Of that number, eight are mid-twentieth century commercial properties and six are Victorian or Craftsman vernacular residences. An additional five properties contribute to proposed districts in East Village. Two contribute to the proposed African American Thematic District and three contribute to the proposed Warehouse District. These five properties have been removed from the survey and will be brought back to the HRB at a later time within the appropriate historical context. The remaining 42 properties had no potential for historical or architectural significance, primarily because of irreversible alterations, and were cleared by staff from further review.

II. EAST VILLAGE HISTORICAL OVERVIEW (Scott Moomjian)

The history of the Bayside and Centre City East areas are inexorably linked to the development of downtown San Diego and its founder Alonzo Erastus Horton. Horton, who came to San Diego in 1867, purchased 960 acres of land for \$265.00 for his "New Town" San Diego development. Horton divided the acres into blocks and lots, a number of which were present in the Bayside and Centre City East areas. Thus, "Horton's Addition" was established. Later subdivisions in the area include "Sherman's Addition," and "Remondino's Subdivision of Sherman's Addition."

During the 1860s and 1870s, the Bayside area, then known as "South San Diego," relied heavily upon the wharf established at the foot of Fifth Avenue. Prior to the establishment of Horton's wharf, a few warehouse structures were located along the bay, but none remain today. These early businesses transported stored grain, honey and other products. They also received incoming shipments of lumber, iron, ore, and other necessities from other parts of the nation. In 1869, McDonald's store (later known as the San Diego Lumber Company) was erected at Sixth Avenue and L Street. Lumber, floated down the bay from Northern California and Oregon was pulled from the bay by Native Americans and stacked at the lumber company building, which was erected on redwood planks in order to protect the wood from muddy soil. In 1872, Bailey's Foundry (later known as San Diego Foundry) was constructed at the corner of 8th Avenue and M Street (now Imperial). This business provided much of the structural ironwork for businesses and commercial buildings in the Gaslamp Quarter (Lia/Brandes 1988:1; Lia/Brandes 1989:1; Lia 1999:1).

During the 1880s, New Town San Diego businesses spread north to H Street (currently Market Street), which was at the time considered the main cross road. Commercial growth was centered around Fifth Avenue and Market Street. Ultimately, San Diego expanded to D Street (currently Broadway) and beyond as merchants moved northward. With the coming of the railroad, Horton and other prominent business leaders lobbied for a railroad link which would facilitate transportation to this area. In 1885, the California Southern Railroad, a subsidiary of the Atchison, Topeka, and Sante Fe line, established tracks into San Diego from the north. This line greatly increased San Diego's population in the late 1880s. A later link with the Southern Pacific Railroad along the United State/Mexico border proved beneficial as well, particularly to the Bayside and Centre City East areas (Lia/Brandes 1988:1; Lia/Brandes 1989:1-2; Lia 1999:2) San Diegans, however, longed for an eastern railroad terminus.

With the 1885 railroad connection, an influx of newcomers to the San Diego area sparked a four-year building boom. In the Bayside and Centre City East area, simple Victorian single-family cottages were erected on 16th and 17th Avenues to accommodate laborers, porters, clerks, and other blue collar workers (Photo 1). The Rood Rental cottage, Bay View Hotel, Sheldon House and Joseph Ireland Building are examples of Victorian structures built during the boom. Standard iron works erected its manufacturing business on the corner of 7th Avenue and L Street, and the Silver Gate Warehouse, owned by local entrepreneur John Ginty, was constructed on 8th Avenue and M Street (later Imperial) (Lia/Brandes 1989:2; Lia 1999:2).

In 1886, the San Diego Gas Company enlarged its gas operations. The company, which had started from modest beginnings on 9th Avenue between M and N Streets (Imperial and

Commercial) in 1881, expanded in order to supply the needs of San Diego's growing residential and business community. The San Diego Gas Company built a new electric generating plant at 10th Avenue and M (Imperial) adjacent to the old gas plant. In 1887, the San Diego Gas and Electric Light Company was incorporated as the successor to the San Diego Gas Company and began supplying electricity for arc lights on a sundown to midnight basis in downtown San Diego (Photo 2). After the bust of 1889, the gas and electric company found it could easily service the utility needs of San Diego with existing equipment. Therefore, no new major additions were made to the plant until 1905 (Lia/Brandes 1989:2; Lia 1999: 2).

After 1900, businesses chose the Centre City East area from which to conduct operations due to the area's proximity to the railroad tracks and the wharf. San Diego's commercial center continued to expand as harbor facilities and the city's population grew. All types of commercial structures were built south of Broadway and along the water's edge (Photo 3). Warehouses, manufacturing centers, bars, restaurants, laundries, and hotels all provided services and goods for city residents and businesses. The entire area south of Broadway from the water to the east was a large commercial center for the city (Crawford 1996:6; Lia 1992:2) (Photo 4).

Businesses anticipated the creation of a much needed railroad line that would link San Diego to Arizona and then eastward across the southern part of the United States. It was believed that such a line would encourage the exchange of goods between the West and East Coasts of the United States through Yuma. In 1905, the Southern Pacific Railroad desired to break the Sante Fe Railroad's monopoly. Southern Pacific Railroad officials approached sugar magnate and San Diego businessman, John D. Spreckels to act as the "front man" for an operation that would build the railroad from San Diego to Arizona. Although the San Diego and Eastern Arizona Railroad would not be completed until 1919, railroad line and commercial advantage speculation drew local businessmen to the Centre City East area (Lia/Brandes 1988:2; Lia/Brandes 1989:3; Lia 1999:2).

By 1906, three piers had been constructed in the Centre City East area. One was located at the foot of 6th Avenue, called the San Diego Lumber pier, one at the foot of 7th Avenue called the Sheldon pier, and one at the foot of 9th Avenue called the Bailey Pier. These piers, connected to various railroad spurs, enabled warehouses and commercial enterprises in the vicinity to receive goods from other parts of the nation and world. The railroad spurs themselves extended onto the piers, and goods were unloaded from ships, put on waiting boxcars, and taken directly to businesses, or put on one of the major railroad lines out of San Diego (Lia/Brandes 1988:2; Lia/Brandes 1989:3; Lia 1999:3).

Local companies took advantage of spur line use during the first three decades of the twentieth century. In 1909, the Western Metal Supply Company, located at 215 7th Avenue was constructed. Designed as an up-to-date modern building by Chicago architect Henry Lord Gay, the company produced "everything in iron and steel from carpet tracks to structural beams." Between 1910-1911, the Schiefer & Sons Warehouse was built on 8th Avenue. In 1911, the Simon-Levi Company building was erected at 7th Avenue and J Street in order to serve the wholesale grocery business. In 1912, development reached J Street. The Julian Produce Company, the Hotel Salem (formerly identified as Loring stationers), and the Enid Apartments were all constructed in that same year. In 1913, the Nason and Company building was

constructed in order to house the commission and wholesale produce enterprise. During this same year, the impressive Simon Levi Company Building was constructed on J Street, as were the Broderick Apartments. Finally, in 1922, the San Diego Ice and Cold Storage Company took over the Silver Gate Warehouse, located at 800-822 Imperial Avenue and established "one of the finest plants in the city." The company claimed that it was "located at the heart of the industrial district," and had "excellent shipping facilities afforded by spur tracks to the San Diego and Arizona and Sante Fe railroads as well as to the waterfront" (Lia/Brandes 1988:2; Lia/Brandes 1989:3; Lia 1999:3).

During the 1920s, many San Diego businesses flourished in the Centre City East area. In 1921, the San Diego Broom Works Building was constructed on J Street. Three years later in 1924, the Showley Brothers Candy Factory was constructed at 305 8th Avenue. In 1926, the Ballinger Company warehouse was built at 944 K Street. In 1927, the Levi Wholesale Grocery Building was constructed at 330 8th Avenue, as was the Wheelworks Building on J Street. In 1928, the Qualitee Dairy commercial building was erected. Despite the fact that the Centre City East area of San Diego was affected by the Great Depression during the late 1920 and early 1930s, this area in general continued to benefit from new development. In 1930, the San Diego Gas & Electric Company constructed the San Diego Company Office Building on 10th Avenue. In some instances, however, businesses closed. Structures were left in a state of disrepair as some businesses migrated to locations north of Broadway (Lia/Brandes 1989:4; Lia 1995; Lia 1999:3).

The Second World War affected the Centre City East area as it did the entire country. A surge of activity occurred in the Centre City East area. Very few structures were constructed during the war years, and although little new construction took place during the early 1940s, many of the Centre City East buildings were drafted into service. The Schiefer & Sons factory, located at 371 8th Avenue, was used by the Standard Parachute Corporation from 1941-1945. Although no longer in existence, the Standard Parachute Corporation also used the building located at 304 11th Avenue as a supply stockroom from 1943-1948. In addition, the San Diego Machine Company, an airplane parts manufacturer, operated from 345 15th Avenue between 1934-1958. During the war years, the San Diego Gas and Electric Company had all new utility extensions put on hold, since copper wire and steel pipe were in short supply (Lia/Brandes 1988:4; Lia/Brandes 1989:4; Lia 1995; Lia 1999:4).

During and after the Second World War, as suburbs developed, many businesses relocated to newer communities where land was cheaper and buyers more plentiful. The amount of people residing in the Centre City area also declined, resulting in less local support of goods produced by the downtown businesses. From the late 1970s to the present, Centre City East has slowly become revitalized with the development of the Gaslamp Quarter, which has brought new businesses and life into the old industrial area. (Crawford 1996:6-7).

In 1999, portions of the Bayside and Centre City East areas were included in the cultural resources study prepared as part of the *Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report to the Final Master Environmental Impact Report for the Centre City Redevelopment Project and Addressing the Centre City Community Plan and Related Documents for the proposed Ballpark and Ancillary Development Projects, and Associated Plan Amendments*. As a result of the 1999

study, one of the sites included in the original November 1988 Centre City East Survey were designated by the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board.

III. EAST VILLAGE HISTORICAL CONTEXTS

1. Residential Development Patterns

The purpose of this historic context is to recognize early residential patterns in San Diego's East Village area prior to 1930. Included in the study are single and multi-family residences in a variety of income brackets, including large, high-style Victorians, middle class Victorians and working class Victorian cottages. Modest Progressive Era duplexes and apartments, as well as high style hotels are also represented in the study, whose period of significance is roughly late 1870s to 1930. The context was developed by examining and comparing Sanborn Maps for East Village from 1887, 1888, 1906 and 1921 for residential development patterns over the 50 year period of the study. Where possible, maps were cross-referenced or augmented with historical photographs, published and archival materials noted in the bibliography.

A. Residential Patterns prior to 1887

The earliest Sanborn Map, dating to 1887 (Appendix A: Maps 4A & 4B), shows downtown commercial activity clustering along Fifth Avenue between D and I streets. The St. James Hotel at the northeast corner of Sixth Avenue and F Street is clearly the most prestigious short-term living experience in East Village. Seven smaller residential hotels, alternately described as "hotels, lodgings, or boarding" establishments, are scattered about the neighborhood, mostly within a block or two of the emerging Fifth Avenue commercial spine. The main exception is a clustering of modest lodging establishments around the intersection of 7th Avenue and K Street, presumably for people working in industries located around the harbor, like the lumber yard, gas works or grain and produce yards.

a) Property Type: Single Family Vernacular (Folk National Style)

Wooden single-family dwellings make up the majority of structures outside the Fifth Avenue commercial core and the industrial node around the Fifth Street wharf. The building footprints are boxy and of rather modest size, indicating that the buildings are utilitarian in nature with minimal architectural refinement. The buildings are widely scattered, with many platted but still undeveloped lots between them. Historic photos testify to the frontier nature of the city prior to the coming of the railroad (Photo 5). The primary building material, wood, was shipped down the coast in great lumber rafts and milled locally at San Diego lumberyards. Although mass production methods identified with the Industrial Revolution was resulting in fancy band saw Gothic Revival trim, Victorian cutwork shingles, or Eastlake-influenced lathe-turned posts in more prosperous parts of the globe, this architectural embellishment not highly evident in this first wave of San Diego building.

The most common façade treatment for commercial lodgings, characteristic of most Western frontier towns, is a flat parapet false front extending above the roofline (Photo 6). The façade extension functioned as billboard space for painted lettering to identify the business located within. A shed-roof extension supported on simple square posts shelters the front of these buildings, often covering a raised board sidewalk. None of these buildings exist today.

For single family dwellings, a simple front gable faces the street, either as a latent nod to the Greek Revival or purely a utilitarian gesture to shed rain (Photo 7). A variation on this form is the front gable with perpendicular side wing, where the wing often sports a full or partial porch covered by a shed roof. Over time and as dictated by necessity, these simple houses incrementally added single story extensions off the rear elevation for ancillary functions. Medium pitched front or side gabled roofs, or hipped roofs with shallow open eaves are characteristic of these modest one and two story dwellings, while flat roofs predominate on the commercial blocks. Vertical double-hung windows prevailed, featuring one-over-one, four-over-four or six-over six light panes.

Earlier milling favored wide boards (approximately 6 inches) with deeply grooved one-inch channels on the upper horizontal edge that locked into the board above it with a tongue and groove or rabbeted edge. When the upper part of the board had a concave curve, this treatment was known as “rustic” or “German” siding. Alternatively, board and batten siding, popular with Gothic Revival vernacular, was used. This treatment consisted of long vertical boards whose seams were covered by thin wooden strips known as battens. Horizontal shiplap siding, where the top and bottom edges were joined by a close fitting rabbeted or lapped joint, was also used.

Vernacular houses influenced by the Greek Revival feature raked molding with eave returns, corner boards and flat or pedimented cornice molding over the windows (H. T. Christian House, 1872), while Gothic Revival influenced vernacular sported cutwork vergeboards and simple spindlework porches (W. R. Norris Speculative House #3, 1872-1887). Italianate-influenced vernacular was distinguished by brackets at the eaves, windows and door trim (Edmund Wescott House, 1881; Norris House, 1880-1890). The Judson Property (c. 1900) is either a late example of the simple 1870s vernacular house, or it is mis-dated due to inadequate records.

This a-stylistic residential vernacular continued in San Diego for very simple, small workers cottages through the turn of the century, with the main differences between periods coming in siding and window treatments. Residential vernacular prior to 1887 is extremely rare in San Diego and its integrity can be expected to be fair to poor, as explained below. Prior to the railroad, the town was small with little economic activity. Although a building boomlet occurred between 1869-1873 associated with platting of New Town and Sherman’s Addition, it soon fizzled and almost nothing remains from that period today. Local lumber was scarce and imported wood was valuable, so wooden buildings were moved, recycled and recombined into other buildings. Many burned or succumbed to dry rot, termites and other types of wood deterioration. Because of their humble construction and utilitarian value, wooden vernacular buildings were not considered “architecture,” so a once common property type that characterized East Village’s foundation vanished with little fanfare.

B. Residential Patterns in 1888

By the late 1880s, the railroad had greatly influenced the city’s physical expansion and prosperity. The 1888 Sanborn (Appendix A: Maps 5A & 5B) shows development in East Village extending from 13th Street to 17th Street, with infill beginning in the westernmost lots platted as part of Sherman Heights in 1869. Out of approximately 120 blocks in the study area, only four have no development. Dwellings continue to be of modest scale and simple profile, particularly

below I Street, where blocks H 136 and H 149 feature a number of tiny cottages on single lots. Duplexes also begin to make an appearance. This was often an opportunity for middle class individuals to invest in real estate by living in one unit of the duplex, while renting the other.

Opportunities for boarders proliferate, especially in the four blocks adjacent to the intersection of 7th and K Streets, where a number of rooming houses were located. The city's population spurt is also reflected in the densifying commercial node along Fifth Avenue. Ten hotels now cluster within a block of this commercial spine, while rooms for rent occupy second and third floor spaces in many business blocks. Buildings identified as apartments now cluster along 7th Street, interspersed with hotels, while boarding and rooming houses continue to intermingle with single-family dwellings and the new duplexes east of the commercial area. Representative of this type of housing arrangement are The Tourist (1881) and the Joseph Ireland Building (1888), both mixed-use buildings with commercial space on the ground floor and rooming accommodations above.

a) Property Type: Single Family Folk Victorian Cottages

With prosperity, architectural styles become more elaborate. The popular Queen Anne Revival and Eastlake Victorian styles join the earlier Italianate trend, with the Gothic and Greek Revival styles waning in popularity. These High Victorian styles feature asymmetrical massing with turrets, bay windows and corner-wrapping porches, as well as elaborate cutwork shingles and spindlework porches. Two buildings in the East Village Study area, the Bay View Hotel (1889) and the Sheldon House (1886) are exemplary representatives of High Style Queen Anne Victorian.

Folk Victorian cottages retain the simple massing of the earlier vernacular houses, but add Victorian details, particularly in the gable, porch and window treatments (Photo 8). This is due to modest budgets and narrow city lots that reduced the desired picturesque massing of high style examples to the more visible street frontage. The Norris Rental (1887), for example, features asymmetrical massing, scalloped shingles in the gable end, and coupled one-over-one windows, while the Porter Long House (1894) and Rood Rental (1887) sport the characteristic three-sided bay with elongated sash windows. Spindlework porches are increasingly rare in San Diego, as many have been lost due to weathering and time. Fortunately, several properties in the study area still retain their ornate turned porch posts, if not the associated cutwork bracketing, spindlework friezes and ladder railings. These include the Morse House (1887), the Porter Long House (1894) the residence at 1321 C Street (1887) and the Olsen House (1890).

Once the predominant cultural landscape in East Village, Folk Victorian cottages are now rare due to land use conversion associated with economic development. They are significant because they represent the typical accommodations of laborers whose economic contributions to San Diego's industrial base have been historically overlooked. Their expected integrity can be anywhere from good, if recently rehabilitated to poor, if neglected by time and deferred maintenance.

b) Property Type: Pyramidal Roof Cottage

The pyramidal hipped roof vernacular house has a very long life in America. In San Diego, they appear in the earliest photos as simple wooden cubes with pyramidal roofs. By the late 1880s, the

roof hip has been truncated and accented with ornamental ironwork, while turned porch posts, cutwork brackets, scalloped shingle siding and other modest Victoriana embellish the main façade. Examples in the study area include the Padilla House (1870s), Smith House (1887), the Olsen House (1890) and the Norris Speculative House #2 (1900). In the study area, these cottages are rare due to extreme loss of a once common property type. Their expected integrity is good to fair.

c) Property Type: Second Empire Houses

Two houses in the East Village Study area are rare representatives of a residential building style not common to San Diego. The Wright House (1882) and the Thomas House (1889) sport mansard roofs characteristic of the French Second Empire Style popularized during the reign of Napoleon III (1852-70). It was used extensively in American public buildings during the administration of Ulysses S. Grant (1869-1877), and found favor among the Gilded Era Nouveau Riche once architect Richard Morris Hunt returned from his studies at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris and set up a fashionable practice in New York. The Wright House is a hybrid Italianate Victorian with a mansard roof over the porch, while the Thomas House is a rather late and very modest example of the Second Empire Style that was at its height in the 1870s and early 1880s. Its appearance in 1889 testifies as to how long it took fashion to arrive from Paris to the San Diego middle class. It is rare in San Diego.

d) Property Type: Dutch Colonial Revival House

The Johnson House, constructed somewhere between 1888-1906, is another example of a rare style in San Diego, the Dutch Colonial Revival. Originating in the Dutch Colonies along the Hudson River in New York, the Dutch Colonial style represents the brief period of Dutch exploration in the New World (1614-1664) prior to the arrival of the English. Because the English permitted feudal Dutch landholders, some of whom controlled large tracts along the Hudson, to retain their property, building traditions practiced by Dutch immigrants continued in the area through the early 19th century. The distinctive gambrel roof exhibited at the Johnson House originated around 1750. The main entrance of gambrel-roofed houses was centrally located on the long wall of the house. Although brick and stone were commonly used in the Hudson Valley, timber houses with double hung sash windows were more common on western Long Island. Also characteristic of the Dutch Colonial Style is divided door, developed to keep livestock out of the house while allowing in light and air.

The Dutch Colonial Revival is part of a larger American Colonial Revival movement that began in the 1880s and has continued to the present day. The revival began in the northeastern part of the country and eventually spread nationwide through the influence of architectural pattern books, mail order catalogues and popular literature. Although an early design for what would later become known as “Dutch Colonial” was published in *MacLagan’s Suburban Homes* in 1898, it was East Coast architect Aymar Embury II, who is generally credited with popularizing the Dutch Colonial Revival Style. Embury designed several Dutch inspired houses beginning around 1905 and published a book entitled *The Dutch Colonial House* in 1913. Nonetheless, gambrel roofs were cheerfully mixed in with other stylistic elements by popular/commercial designers during the 1890s because of their picturesque qualities. It was not until the 1920s and 1930s that more “correct” Dutch Colonial Revival made its way into American residential design.

The Johnson House is most probably a representative of the earlier “picturesque” phase of the Dutch colonial Revival. Although its exact date is uncertain and a rather large front extension obscures its main façade, it is a very rare example of an unusual style, particularly for the West Coast.

C. Residential Patterns in 1906

The turn-of-the-century period is characterized by homeownership expanding to the working classes. Live-in servants were becoming less prevalent (especially for the middle class) and housing styles in general were simplifying under Progressive ideals of good government through universal suffrage and political reform. During this period, it was widely thought that many urban ills brought on by industrialization and unbridled capitalism could be resolved through elevating the lower classes into the middle class through home ownership. As a result, an unprecedented attention was given to housing design, production, and financing instruments.

In San Diego, the 1906 Sanborn Map (Appendix A: Maps 6A & 6B) reflects these wider national trends, as well as local economic recovery and continued urban expansion due to railroad-related in-migration. Population growth is evident in residential patterns that clearly reflect denser living conditions more characteristic of cities than of towns or villages. Hotels and boarding establishments have a diminished presence in East Village, while apartments or rooms-to-rent are now dispersed throughout the expanded business district between Fourth and Seventh Avenues. Many of these residential arrangements are located on the second or third floors of business blocks, strengthening the trend noticed on the 1888 Sanborn Map.

While single family residential development has spread eastward to 19th Street, representing incipient development in Sherman Heights, several blocks of sparsely developed land remain between 16th and 18th Streets. Conversely, many single family residences between 8th Street and 12th Street have been converted to multi-family accommodations, indicating an interest in living quarters within walking distance to the business center of the city. Less change is obvious south of I Street, where modest cottages continue to fill in previously platted parcels. The node of boarding houses at 7th and K, however, is no longer evident, reflecting both the eastward spread of the warehouse district and the rise of modest living arrangements elsewhere in the city.

a) Property Type: The Foursquare

By the turn-of-the-century, the pyramidal hipped house is once again fashionable. The simplest examples are associated with a wildly popular residential building type known as the Foursquare, which was prized for evoking “massiveness and strength.” Spread nationwide by pattern books and mail order catalogues, the Foursquare is characterized by a centrally-located front door, flanked by symmetrical window arrangements on both upper and lower floors. A full or partial porch, supported on columns or square posts is attached to the first floor. In San Diego, Transitional (Late Victorian/Colonial Revival details), Craftsman and Prairie style elements embellish typical Foursquare massing during the decades flanking 1900.

Because this is a major period of growth for the city, there is a good representation of this of the housing type in neighborhoods adjacent to East Village, like Sherman Heights, Golden Hill, South Park, North Park and Uptown. Integrity in most cases is excellent to fair, depending upon

regular maintenance practices and appropriate rehabilitation techniques. Within the East Village study area, both simple one-story cottages and two-storey single-family dwellings in Transitional styles (moving from Victorian to Craftsman) are found. They feature regular massing captured within a square footprint and pyramidal roof, but retain controlled asymmetry in details like bay windows. Window styles and rhythms also shift from paired tall and narrow sashes to triplets with a large, fixed center panes flanked by narrower sashes and wide, flat window trim. Classical details like dentil moldings and columns also pay homage to the Classical Revival popularized by the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago. The Hiatt House (1902), Kreiss/Wilcox House (1906), Lee House (1908), and Smythe House (1908) are good representative examples of these trends.

D. Residential Patterns, 1921-1956

By 1921, residential patterns noted in 1906 have matured and taken hold across the East Village study area (Appendix A: Maps 7A & 7B). Residential quarters have been universally eliminated from the business core, now solidly covering 4th through 7th Avenues. Five hotels accommodate short-term visitors, many now arriving in San Diego by automobile to enjoy the area's sunny climate and sandy beaches. Below Market Street, warehouse/industrial uses have expanded eastwards to 15th Street, mainly on vacant land south of L Street. Although modest worker housing remains throughout the study area, commercial and industrial buildings are beginning to encroach on the earlier residential nature of the area.

By 1956 (Appendix A: Maps 8A & 8B), residential uses have been all but eliminated by the expanding commercial and industrial sectors. This wholesale land use conversion was aided by the city's zoning regulations and the aggressive accommodation of the automobile. Auto-related businesses and infrastructure, especially parking lots, consume substantial amounts of land once occupied by dwellings. Construction of the I-5 Freeway eliminated the remaining modest cottages on 18th and 19th Streets, and severed East Village's ties to Sherman Heights. Today, only a small vestige of the area's former residential character remains along 17th Street.

During the first decades of the twentieth century, a new property type, the apartment or apartment-hotel, enters San Diego. This mode of upscale communal living had a rich history in other parts of America prior to its appearance in Southern California. In general, as cities became more crowded and land values increased, housing options other than single family residences were necessary. To investors and speculators alike, apartment construction became increasingly attractive as a real estate investment, particularly in fast-growing areas. Its appearance in mid-19th century urban America responded to the housing needs of both ends of the economic spectrum—the poor and the affluent. To find affordable housing, middle class residents moved to the suburbs where land values were substantially lower. New transportation systems like horse cars, trolleys, and later the automobile, enabled middle class mobility. The rich and the poor, however, coped with rising land values by pooling their resources and modifying their housing preferences.

Much maligned substandard housing, known as tenements, accommodated those of limited means, while apartment living became the glamorous option of choice among society's well-to-do. By the 1870s, the convenience and advanced domestic technology of apartment living fueled

their rising popularity. World War I brought on social changes that lead to the greater independence of women and increased personal mobility, while technological advances in the first part of the 20th century revolutionized domestic life. Although the American dream of home ownership remained, the stigma of apartment living waned, particularly for middle class bachelors of both sexes, who found the apartment an acceptable, and hopefully temporary, solution. As a result, and with financing available at 70-90% in the 1920s, these strains blended together to open the door to a boom in apartment living that continues today. In sum, scarcity of land, economic opportunity and social changes all contributed to shifting housing preferences. A more detailed discussion of the history of both the tenement and the apartment in America follows. Much of this material was taken directly from the National Register Nomination for the East Portland, Oregon Middle Class Apartment Building Thematic Historic District cited in the Bibliography.

a) Property Type: The Tenement

Those on the lower end of the economic scale found traditional single-family housing unaffordable. In the 1830s, to accommodate the masses in this unregulated marketplace, landlords first built "double tenements." These were buildings 3-4 stories high with two families on each floor; a second building was then squeezed into the backyard, also 3-4 stories tall but with only one family per floor. Typically, these had a living room, a kitchen and two bedrooms and offered only a minimum of space, light and ventilation. Access to each room was via the central stairwell or by passing through the other rooms of the apartment. The average tenement in New York or Boston contained 65 people.

In the 1850s, landlords improved on the profitability of "double tenements" with the "railroad tenement." These were larger and more crowded. The railroad tenement was a 90-foot long solid rectangular block that left only a narrow alley in the back of the building. Of the 12-16 rooms per floor, only those facing the street or alley received direct light or air. There were no hallways, so people had to walk through every room to cross an apartment and privacy proved difficult. The open sewers outside that were usually clogged and overflowing, a single privy at best in the backyard, garbage that went uncollected, and mud and dust in alleys and streets made these environments unpleasant and unsanitary.

Recurring outbreaks of yellow fever, cholera, smallpox, typhoid and typhus, and their association with grossly unsatisfactory living conditions, alerted concerns for public health and housing reform. Accentuating the concern was the potential for the spread of these diseases to the upper and middle classes through the handmade products manufactured in the tenements. These included cigars, garters, paper flowers, boxes and other small items. *Harper's, Atlantic, Arena, Municipal Affairs, Scribners*, building trade journals and professional architectural and social work publications, as well as newspapers, all took up the issue of tenement housing and sanitation in the 1870s. The ideal solution was the promotion of inexpensive cottages in the suburbs, accessible through trolleys. Financial realities, however, precluded single-family housing for many, and so architects and planners sought new design options for apartment living.

Several professional journals and magazines sponsored competitions for alternative tenement designs. In 1879, *New York Plumber and Sanitary Engineer* announced what would be the most significant of these competitions. The editors specified that the tenement should yield the highest

economic return, while providing fireproofing, ventilation and sanitation. James E. Ware, Jr. designed the winning entry, immediately labeled the "dumbbell" because it had two narrow airshafts within a solid rectangular block. The *New York Times*, *American Architect* and others all criticized the solution as unsound, unhealthy and cruel. Yet, because of its high economic return, the "dumbbell" became an immediate success among speculative buildings and the prevailing model for new tenement construction.

The typical dumbbell tenement was twenty-five feet wide and ninety feet deep. Indentations 28 inches wide and 50-60 feet long broke the solid block. Entirely closed on all four sides and rising the full height of the building, these airshafts seldom met their stated purposes of providing air and light to inside rooms. Tenants on the upper floors often threw their garbage down into the shafts, where it was left to rot. The first floor usually contained two small shops, with bedrooms behind them and another apartment in the rear. On the other floors, there were two 4-room apartments in front and two 3-room apartments in the rear. The public hallway, usually unlit, contained the stairs and one or two toilets per floor. In New York, in 1893, over 800,000 people lived in these buildings.

b) Property Type: Apartments by Choice

At the other end of the economic spectrum were those who chose to live in apartments. In the United States, this chosen alternative to single-family housing dates to the last half of the 19th century. The first building designed as an apartment house appeared in Boston in 1855, designed by Arthur Gilman. It offered permanent residences for families and bachelors. The real beginning of the movement came, however, in 1869 when Richard Morris Hunt designed the Stuyvesant on Irving Place in New York. The 5-story building offered 6-10 room suites on the lower floors for a rent of \$1200-1800 per year, while the top floor studio apartments rented for \$920 per year.

Hunt imported the concept from France. It also came as a direct response to increased land cost that resulted from population density. Building a multi-family building allowed developers to make more money. A month before Hunt completed construction, the Stuyvesant was besieged with 200 applications. The building, which cost \$150,000 to build, brought in a profit of \$23,000 in the first year. The message to investors was clear. Returns of 10-30% stimulated investors. In New York alone nearly 200 sets of "French flats" were erected between 1869 and 1876. In Chicago, following the 1871 fire, 1,142 apartment buildings went up in a single year.

The notion of apartment living was sold on the basis of efficiency and unheard-of technological advances: the entrances and public spaces were sumptuous. Marble floors and paneling, crystal chandeliers, imported carpets, and walnut or mahogany wainscoting adorned public doorways, lobbies, staircases and elevator carriages. There were central hot-water heating, central gas mains for lighting and fully equipped bathrooms for each unit. Shortly thereafter, apartment buildings featured steam elevators with uniformed operators. Bathrooms became more elaborate with hot and cold running water, hand painted china basins, and hand carved shower stall screens. Architects experimented with electric generators, later connecting the buildings to the streetcar electric service, and installed central vacuum cleaning systems with nozzles in each room connected to a large pump in the basement; individual attachments could be used as hair dryers or reversed as dust collectors. To increase light and ventilation, subsequent designs grouped

apartments around a central courtyard with central corridors. The emphasis on efficiency resulted in some apartments separating the heat and discomfort of cooking and laundry from the living quarters with public dining rooms, kitchens and laundries. Some provided servants for serving meals and cleaning clothes. The cooperative services, technological advances and attention to public spaces made the apartment seem like one of the most advanced institutions in American society.

To the vast majority of Americans, any kind of shared dwelling seemed an aberration of the model home. It was felt that close proximity and shared facilities encouraged promiscuity. Because the proximity of the bedroom to the public spaces in each apartment was particularly worrisome, several architects experimented with interior staircases for two-floor units; but, the expense made it economically wiser to keep all the rooms on one floor. Many believed the reduction of housekeeping chores brought on by the efficiency of the apartment would lead to wifely negligence of duties toward home and children. Finally, for many Americans, the imitation of decadent European living patterns did not seem fitting for good American families.

Well into the twentieth century, the middle class attacks on apartments as inadequate homes continued. *The Ladies Home Journal* issued dire warnings of Bolshevik influence over American women exerted through the increasing number of apartments. *Better Homes in America* captured the sense of alarm when it reported to the 1921 National Conference on Housing that a child's sense of individuality, moral character, and intellectual efficiency could only develop in a private, detached dwelling. The apartment was blamed for the rising divorce rate, the declining birth rate, premarital sex, and the social and economic disparities between rich and poor.

As San Diego was settled primarily in the late 19th and twentieth centuries, it did not experience rapid growth until the first decade of the twentieth century. It wasn't until preparations for the 1915 Panama Pacific Exhibition began that the city's population created a market for apartments. Both individuals coming to work on the Exposition and visitors to the Exposition needed temporary accommodations, and the local housing market responded to the increased demand. Nonetheless, most of San Diego's early apartment buildings were fairly small—few rising to over two or three stories. Simple wood-frame buildings with anywhere from six to twelve units were the norm. By the 1920s, many so-called “apartments” or “apartment-flats” were really converted single-family residences, with few special modifications to accommodate increased densities. Truly, apartment living in San Diego was a “cottage” industry, with many apartments resembling oversized single-family houses. Even the larger buildings (20-50 units) were rather unspectacular in appearance, indicating their builder/contractor origin, rather than an architectural pedigree. Within the East Village Survey Area, the Hamilton Apartments (1886, 1907), Carper Apartments (1913), Menke Family Apartments (1915) and Norris Cluster Apartments (1913) are characteristic of this local trend. Downtown San Diego was once home to hundreds of these small scale apartments, but most have either been demolished or altered, including several in the current survey. Consequently, expected integrity in remaining examples ranges from good to poor. Like the once-plentiful single-family residences in East Village, the modest scale apartment house has experienced severe attrition.

For more substantial buildings, the terms “apartment” and “apartment-hotel” are regularly interchanged throughout this period. These terms indicated a more refined living experience,

with better-appointed private living quarters and shared amenities for residents and their guests. Because of their technological complexity and the gradual adoption of stricter building codes for multi-family construction, architects or engineers were often engaged in these larger buildings. With professional involvement, these buildings more closely mirrored popular architectural trends of the day than the smaller builder/contractor versions.

A good assortment of 1920s and 1930s apartment buildings adjacent to Balboa Park reflect the Spanish/Mediterranean and Art Deco/Moderne styles of those decades. Concentrated on Sixth Avenue and on Park Avenue, many were built for visitors to the 1915 Exposition who decided to relocate to San Diego as a result of their travel experience. Because land next to the park was very desirable, the economic conditions favorable to apartment building prevailed. Another San Diego location for upscale apartment buildings was Cortez Hill, where good ocean views and proximity to downtown created optimum economic conditions for multi-family housing.

In the Centre City Core Area Survey, the recently designated Francis Apartments (1909), Carnegie Apartments (1912) and Amelia Apartments (1911) are good examples of this property type. In the East Village area, the Italianate Style St. Anthony Apartment/ Hotel (1912) demonstrates the growing luxury afforded this emerging local lifestyle. The St. Anthony featured “amusement rooms, a sun parlor, steam heat, a ballroom and ‘the latest improvements and furnishings including private baths and telephones in all apartments.’” Even more refined versions of the property type, including the Biltmore Apartments (1925) and the Munson Apartments (1929) are constructed in East Village during the later 1920s. Expected integrity for these architect-designed properties ranges from excellent to fair.

By the 1920s, tenements and boarding houses in East Village were waning. Very few tenements ever existed in the East Village area of San Diego, and boarding houses, although plentiful in earlier days, were decidedly dwindling by the 1920s. In most other urban areas, tenements were reserved for recent immigrant populations, especially extended families. San Diego’s immigration was of a different, mostly Nativist middle class, nature. Many new residents arrived as individuals, without families in tow. They were accommodated in the numerous boarding and rooming establishments where meals were provided. Many families coming to San Diego were second or third generation Americans who originally lived in the Mid-West, or were retirees looking for sunshine in their sunset years. They could afford more upscale temporary accommodations provided by apartment hotels while searching for a new suburban home.

Even working class families could reside in very modest single family cottages, often stacked five or six to an urban lot, or tucked behind a primary dwelling at the lot’s rear, rather than resort to tenement living. Although San Diego’s abundant supply of vacant land facilitated affordable rental housing for working class families, recent research associated with both the Asian-Pacific and African American Thematic Historic Districts suggests that people of color had more limited housing options, especially during the period of segregation (1920-1950), when many African-American establishments were clustered around Front and F Streets. Specific East Village residential hotels like the Brighton, Carter/Vine, Clermont/Coast, Grant and Latonia were reserved for these immigrant populations through discriminatory regulations. Additional information on these properties will be available in the forthcoming *Downtown San Diego*

African American Heritage Study. In the survey area, the Workman Hotel (1912) is a good representative example of the working class multi-family property type from this period.

c) Property Type: The Bungalow

By the 1900s and well into the 1920s, one option for affordable middle class housing was the bungalow, a small single-family detached house with an emphasis on austere simplicity to promote efficiency and cleanliness. The bungalow was an expression of "democratic architecture" which meant good homes available to all Americans through economy of construction and materials. As expressed by Gustav Stickley, this approach to design could remedy almost every problem facing the middle class family, from lack of servants to the increased divorce rate. By creating a healthy home environment, it also addressed larger social issues such as crime, disease and civil disorder. This perspective was echoed by the *Ladies Home Journal*, with a circulation of 2 million.

The bungalow generally referred to a relatively unpretentious small house. They were one or one and a half stories, between 600-800 sf. Bedrooms were little more than bunk spaces. The kitchen fitted like a ship's galley, accommodating one person. The family ate its meals in a large central area, a combined living/dining space. Rarely did houses have a single-purpose room, such as libraries, pantries, sewing rooms and spare bedrooms.

Condemning decoration and ornament as collectors of dust and dirt, proponents of the new style argued for austere simplicity. Eliminating unnecessary housework, uncluttered space, and smooth surfaces was preferred. Instead of cornices with crevices which had to be dusted, painted stencils began to adorn living rooms. Walls often simply received coats of smooth, white plaster. On the floor were mats, throw rags and a novel product called linoleum. Kitchen walls called for washable tiles or less expensive enameled sheet metal. Materials for walls, floors and ceilings were to be easy to clean and restful on the eyes.

Built-in conveniences abounded: Bookshelves and cabinets in the living room; fold-down tables, benches and ironing boards in the kitchen, medicine cabinets in the bathroom and more closets throughout the house. Venetian blinds replaced curtains in many houses. Rows of simple casement windows with small leaded panes eliminated the need for curtains at all.

These new and simpler bungalows did not necessarily cost less than the elaborate Victorian dwellings of a generation before. Interest in health and efficiency meant that a larger proportion of the construction costs—sometimes upwards to 25%—now went into household technology. After 1905, the bathroom was considered an essential part of the middle class house. At first, lead pipes were left partly exposed, partly from pride and partly from fear of trapped gases. By 1913, built-in bathtubs and sinks were on the market, making claw feet and visible pipes seem old-fashioned. The compact bathroom, its walls and fixtures gleaming white, became the mark of modernization.

The kitchen, too, was compact and carefully planned. It measured approximately 120 sf. One wall contained space for a Hoosier, with numerous wood drawers. New appliances stood center stage. The sink and drain board were of shiny white porcelain or enameled iron. An automatic

pump supplied hot and cold running water. A hood hung over the gas range to cut smells and cookware was intended to hang on the wall.

These changes in house architecture reflected changes in American lifestyle. The average number of children dropped to 3.5 by 1900, and many families only had one or two. Domestic production, such as quilts, home canning, and dowry linens, was disappearing. Formality was declining, with dining habits more relaxed. Family meals were less frequent and dinners had fewer courses. Entrance halls no longer served as a receiving area, while the parlor was viewed old-fashioned. With kindergarten and social groups such as Boy Scouts and Campfire Girls, the home also was no longer the center for training children.

Even with the reduced cost and size of the bungalow, for many, home ownership remained outside financial reality. In the 1920s, only 46% of all American families were homeowners. That figure was lower in metropolitan areas. An economic depression in 1921 aggravated the postwar housing shortage, limiting the number of new permits and increasing the price of housing that was being built. The average price of a new house rose from \$3,972 in 1921 to \$4,937 by 1928.

In San Diego, bungalows are very common throughout many of the communities neighboring the Centre City area. Their expected integrity varies, depending upon occupancy, use and maintenance practices. In the East Village Survey Area, several small bungalows are clustered along 16th and 17th Streets, where at one time they would have been part of Sherman Heights. Because of the transitional nature of this area, the integrity and condition of these properties varies. Only one bungalow, the J. W. and Mary Fultz House, located at 39 16th Street, has been proposed for potential designation by the HRB as a representative example of this property type in the survey area. This particular bungalow also happens to be located next to several other small Victorian cottages that have already been designated by the HRB for their contribution to the Sherman Heights cultural landscape.

d) Property Type: The Courtyard Apartment

The bungalow court and garden apartment, which appeared nationally in the 1910s, were additional efforts to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing. Developers promoted these apartment forms as modern living environments. They offered convenience, efficiency and simplicity of the bungalow to bachelors of both sexes, thereby freeing them from the constraints of domestic chores. In Southern California, working class families, retirees and artists were other demographic groups that enjoyed bungalow court living. With mortgages of 70-90% available in the 1920s, developers rushed to capture this multi-family market with an onslaught of new construction.

On the West Coast, one theory holds that courtyard housing originated in Pasadena during the first decade of the century by rather high-style architects, who designed the earliest bungalow courtyards to accommodate winter guests bored with hotel living. The grouping of "simple" free-standing cottages (complete with servants quarters!) about a common court allowed sophisticates to "rough it" in style. Built in 1909, St. Francis Court is considered the first bungalow court in the city of Pasadena. Its layout was possibly inspired by Eastern resort communities, where tourist cabins in the woods organized around a central courtyard provided a prototype. The

bungalows were furnished and equipped with “good furniture, oriental rugs, hangings, silver, linen, kitchen utensils and such things.” Rented either furnished or unfurnished, by the month, or by the year, these alternative tourist quarters included water, electricity and a gardener. Ultimately, one outcome for this mode of temporary housing was the motel. The successor to informal roadside auto camps, the motel modified the bungalow court design by converting the central common space to auto use. (Pasadena bungalow court architect Arthur S. Heineman registered the name “Mo-tel” with the Library of Congress in 1925.) The bungalow court flourished from 1910 through the 1930s, with construction virtually halting during the 1940s.

The tourist-oriented bungalow court concept rapidly spread to the common builder, who simplified, cheapened and proliferated it. The typology evolved during the first two decades of the twentieth century as a purely local response to climate, strong housing demand, an interest in indoor/outdoor living and a predilection for the free standing single family home. Originally, single-story units were informally grouped about a common open space. As the type evolved, the unique individuality of each unit became subsumed by the overall unity of the complex. Private living space and communal open space merged into a conceptual whole. As described in a 1912 article titled “New Idea in Apartments”:

The “community court” idea, or plan, consists of taking two, and sometimes three or more city lots, each about 40 or 50 feet wide and from 120 to 150 feet deep, located reasonably close to the business part of the city, and constructing on the plot thus created a number of up-to-date and modernly equipped cottages, or bungalows, through the center of which runs a sort of park-way, or court. Such plots of ground will allow the building thereon of from eight to fifteen of these little individual homes.

Eventually these complexes separated space into public, semi- public and private areas in a rather predictable formula, with variations dependent upon lot size, shape and terrain. The Bungalow Court Significance Statement for the City of Pasadena identified seven typologies: A) Detached Wide Court (Enclosed) (e.g. U-shaped); B) Attached Wide Court (Enclosed) (eg. V-shaped); C) Attached Wide Court (Open); D) Detached Narrow Court (Enclosed); E) Detached Narrow Court (Open); F) Attached Narrow Court (Enclosed); and G) Half Court or “L” Shaped. As city building blocks, these urban fragments often ingeniously solved site-specific problems, such as parking and circulation, as well as more general urban design issues, such as contextualism and continuity of the streetscape.

In the sprawling, low-density metropolis of 1920's Los Angeles, the Mediterranean Revival courtyard *parti* achieved a richness particularly appropriate to Southern California. Many highly-trained architects using historically correct massing and motifs inspired by the masterpieces of Andalusia began working with the typology in earnest. Others added architectural detailing like a baker adds frosting to a cake. Tudor, French, Egyptian, Moorish, Chinese and Shingle styling interchangeably graced facades of the Los Angeles courtyard apartments. Hollywood's influence is also responsible for the more theatrical flights of fantasy present in many of these complexes. Ideally, architectural massing, exterior motifs and landscaping created an instant sense of place and history in this young city that was formed in a featureless desert at the ocean's edge. Oasis-

like in its cooling shade, peace, privacy and exotically lush landscaping, the courtyard apartment provided respite from the heat, bustle and impersonality of a growing city.

Like Los Angeles, San Diego also quickly adopted the bungalow court apartment as a preferred multi-family alternative to impersonal high-rise living. Offering a compromise between single family and multi family living arrangements, the courtyard apartment flourished in our sunny Mediterranean climate. Early suburban neighborhoods like Uptown and North Park feature many fine examples of this property type. Two courtyard apartment complexes featured within the East Village Survey Area are recommended for HRB designation. The Morse Courts from 1924 represents the Craftsman aesthetic, with several tiny bungalows regularly arranged on a lot with limited landscaping. In the Pasadena lexicon, they most closely resemble Type E, the Detached Narrow Court (Open) typology. The 1956 Sanborn Map for this property indicates that the site originally had nine units arranged in three rows of three, with the units fronting on Market Street. Although the widest spacing occurs between the two rows towards the rear of the lot, it is difficult to describe this space as a landscaped “common area” characteristic of bungalow courts. Both today and as originally configured, the property more closely resembles low cost worker cottages arranged on the lot for maximum rent return than a typical courtyard apartment, so the property’s inclusion as a courtyard apartment is open to debate. Nonetheless, the property is a good example of the typical approach to low cost, free standing worker housing in East Village. The 1940 Saliba Auto Courts present a streamlined modern version that fans out around a common area. Here the layout approximates Pasadena Type B, the Attached Wide Court (Enclosed) typology. Both properties are typical modest working class examples of the courtyard apartment dwelling in East Village.

In conclusion, the wide variety of housing options exemplified in the East Village study area reflect the small city atmosphere of early San Diego, before later 20th century land use transitions and city-imposed zoning transformed the area into today’s commercial and industrial core. They are left over remnants of a residential cultural landscape that reflect what the city once was and are therefore worthy of designation under HRB Criterion A. These properties are found in Table 1 and Appendix A: Map 9 (both forthcoming).

TABLE 1 GOES HERE (FORTHCOMING)

BACK SIDE OF PAGE WITH TABLE 1

2. Commercial & Industrial Development

The Industrial Revolution profoundly affected the shape of the city. Changing roles in employment created an expanded middle-class that no longer wanted to live within the confines of the city. Suburbanization followed suit. The expansion of the city was seen as a natural evolution. In 1929, Earnest Burgess compared the progression of the city to a biological organism growing by subdivision, becoming more complex and specialized. As the population grew, it was thought the natural place for development was at the periphery. Transportation systems, first railroads, horse cars and electric streetcars and later the automobile, allowed people to move further out while giving them the ability to continue their employment in the city. Rail lines stretched across the metropolitan landscape converging on the central city. They encouraged and reinforced the center's dominance over its hinterland and at the same time facilitated decentralization of certain land uses from the central city, particularly housing. They started a pattern of suburbanization that was enhanced with the advent of the automobile. While rail lines and automobile pushed into the suburbs, the central business district continued to dominate the industrial and consumer economies; however, speculators eager to cash in, realized that small stores constructed along transportation routes could serve the burgeoning residential market by selling convenience items while saving the suburbanite a trip downtown.

A. Taxpayer Blocks

The speculator's building type of choice was the one-part commercial block, or taxpayer block, as it was known in many parts of the country. Taxpayers were widespread in the early twentieth century urban landscape. Typically located along streetcar routes and later auto boulevards, they were inexpensive to construct and their flexible design allowed them to be built with little consideration for the ultimate tenant. It was assumed that more dense urban development would naturally spread from the urban core along major arterial streets, making the land much more valuable in the future. Taxpayers were seen as interim investments; owners wanting to hold a desirable piece of land, rather than leave the property vacant, built taxpayers to produce an income sufficient to pay the property taxes and sometimes to produce a small profit.

As a building type they are distinguished by their flexibility. Typically they are distinguished by a one-story row of storefronts lining the street, although a common variant includes an additional story housing offices or apartments. Designed as a shell, they are easily adapted to a wide variety of commercial uses. Their modular plan was vital to their success; essentially rectangular boxes, or bays, additional units could be appended in any number needed in order to take full advantage of a parcel. Most were built in two and three unit configurations, although they were frequently made up of six units, and in rare cases, as many as ten bays could make up a single building. As they were built on speculation and the ultimate tenants were unclear, the flexibility of design made finding tenants easier than a building designed for a specific occupant.

The system of street facing bays is essential to the form of a taxpayer block. The flexibility of the bay system allowed a single business to occupy multiple bays, or several businesses to occupy one section each. The interior could be reconfigured with little effort. On the exterior, each bay is filled with large display windows and, in most cases, a door in the center. Doors can also be situated to either side of a bay, leaving the remainder for an even larger display. In some cases,

when a business occupied multiple sections, a bay may not have a door at all. A solid kick plate is located below the windows, often covered with decorative tile. Transom windows are typically positioned above the door and display windows. On corner lots, the bay system often continues around the side of the building with a doorway located at the corner, set on a forty-five degree angle. Many times a canopy is added to shade the storefront and shelter patrons from the elements.

These utilitarian buildings were constructed of inexpensive materials, often wood-frame, brick or clay tile and sheathed in clapboards or stucco. Most have flat roofs sloping to the rear of the building. Ornamentation is infrequent and not limited to any particular architectural style. If decoration was applied, it is typically limited to tiles below display windows, or an ornamental parapet. Although attractive, parapets also function as the ideal location for a sign. In most cases, taxpayer blocks are humble; however, in certain circumstances, additional detailing may have been added. This is particularly true for those found downtown, as well as in more upscale suburban areas. In these cases, taxpayers are dressed-up with the addition of cast stone elements, ornamental ironwork, decorative window treatments such as leaded glass, patterned brick and decorative stuccowork.

Taxpayer blocks were once a common part of the San Diego commercial landscape, especially in the downtown area along streetcar lines and major arterials. Today only a handful of this property type remains. Those that do persist are expected to have had alterations within the bay systems. The series of pilasters that create the bay system, as well as the decorative elements above the bays, are the primary features of the property type and it is important that they are recognizable. The window and door system configuration within the bays are a less important feature. Seven taxpayer blocks were identified within the East Village survey areas that retain sufficient integrity and condition to be proposed for designation under HRB Criteria C as representatives of a distinctive type, period and method of construction (see Table 4). One taxpayer block (109-113 C Street, College Inn) identified in the Centre City Core survey is also included here. All eight examples retain the bay systems and their ornamentation, and some, like 801-921 F Street, still maintain most of the original window and door configuration within the bays. Others, like the MacMarr Grocery Store (705 6th Avenue), Schiller Book Bindery (760-770 11th Avenue) and College Inn (109-113 C Street) have had changes that have been found to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

B. Auto-related Properties

The purpose of this historic context is to identify early commercial and industrial patterns associated with automobile in San Diego's East Village area prior to 1956. Included in the study are buildings used as auto maintenance and repair garages, storage garages, car painters, auto wreckers and car showrooms. The context was developed by examining and comparing Sanborn Maps for East Village from 1888, 1906, 1921 and 1956 for auto-related development patterns over the 70 year period of the study. Where possible, maps were cross-referenced or augmented with historical photographs, published and archival materials noted in the bibliography. Properties discussed in this section are listed in Table 2 and charted on Map 13 in Appendix A. They have been included in one or more East Village survey(s) in order to provide a robust picture of San Diego's adoption of the automobile and its impact on local commercial activities;

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

BACK SIDE OF TABLE 2

however, due to severely compromised integrity of this property type, only a handful of the properties mentioned in this section are actually recommended for potential designation.

The internal combustion engine automobile had a tremendous impact on American culture, the spatial organization of American cities and the shape of individual buildings. The creation of mass auto ownership required major changes in infrastructure such as road improvements, construction of bridges, and later, the development of highway networks. The car caused changes in the built environment too, both through the introduction of new building types as well as the modification of existing forms. The relationship between buildings and the street also demanded changes.

Prior to the advent of Henry Ford's Model T in 1908, the automobile was a toy of the wealthy. Only a few American manufacturers attempted to build an inexpensive car for common man; most were satisfied competing with European imports for the urban luxury market. The relatively restricted availability of gasoline, as well as its high price and the need for mechanics knowledgeable in their repair, kept cars out of reach of most Americans. Geographically, the lack of good roads outside cities limited most early autos to urban areas, particularly larger cities of the East.

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, middle class suburbanites became increasingly frustrated with the crowds, slow service and high fares of the streetcars. The automobile provided an excellent alternative. Motorist could go anywhere they wanted at any time. And they could go farther and get to their destination faster. The increased popularity was furthered through higher wages and the lower costs that came with Ford's revolutionary technological advancement: the assembly line. The efficiency of the assembly line allowed Ford to cut the cost of the Model T from \$950 in 1910 to \$290 in 1924. Before long, the automobile became the primary mode of transportation in the United States, rendering carriages and streetcars obsolete.

The first automobiles appeared in San Diego around the turn of the century. John U. Widrin, owner of a bicycle repair shop, sold the first car in San Diego. By 1903 there were enough cars in town for the City Council to adopt ordinance 1269, limiting the maximum speed of an automobile in downtown to eight miles an hour. In 1905, the secretary of state was empowered to register and license motor vehicles, which provided a uniform statewide registration system. The first vehicle license issued in San Diego was to Clyde Adair, for the operation of a Rambler. Amusingly, the 1905 *City Directory* listed his occupation as a machinist and the next year as an "automobile operator."

Due to the rarity of automobiles, especially in the West, few businesses catered specifically to the car at the turn of the century. Early on, cars were maintained and repaired either by a chauffeur in a private garage, or at a blacksmith, a carriage works, or other business catering to the horse and buggy trade. Few, if any, of these structures remain. By the 1920s, independent repair garages specifically serving the automobile had replaced earlier horse-based businesses. Buildings designed with the auto in mind started replacing older building forms. Gas stations, repair shops and auto dealerships--building types that didn't exist 20 years before--became increasingly common, especially along major arterial roadways.

As would be expected for such an early date, the 1888 Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps do not reveal automobile related land uses in the East Village area. There were however a number of uses related to the maintenance and storage of horses and horse carriages. The majority of these uses were clustered in the two blocks bounded by Sixth and Eighth Streets and I and H Streets (now Island and Market respectively), a block east of the city's major commercial street. The two blocks housed five blacksmiths, two carpenters, three painters (two of which were described specifically as carriage painters), a trim shop, an upholstery shop, wagon parts storage, two buggy sheds, a carriage repository and two carriage warehouses. Interspersed throughout were liverys, corrals and feed yards. Significantly, the San Diego Electric Rapid Transit rail line ran on H Street, past the area. Additionally, the public horse auction market was located immediately south of the site. A number of lodging houses and hotels were located nearby including the American, Commercial and Garibaldi Hotels. Scattered throughout the remainder of the East Village, there were at least thirteen other businesses (either described as liverys, stables or corrals) identified as related to the care and maintenance of horses.

By 1906, the East Village district supported at least four automobile-related businesses including two automobile repair shops and two stores selling feed as well as fuel (Appendix A: Maps 10A & 10B, forthcoming). The area also supported five bicycle shops. The number of carriage and horse-related businesses within the East Village increased substantially from what was noted in 1888. The maps also depict the San Diego Truck Company and Pioneer Truck Company, the latter owned by Roscoe Hazard. Although not specifically listed as catering to the car, many of the carriage-related businesses, as well as the bicycle shops, probably offered automobile maintenance and repair in addition their normal services. As seen in 1888, horse and carriage-oriented concerns continued to cluster in the two blocks bounded by Sixth and Eighth Streets and I and H Streets; this was also the case for the bicycle and automobile businesses in 1906.

By the 1910s, the automobile was in general use throughout Southern California. For the year of 1913, the Automobile Club of Southern California listed 4,811 cars registered within the County or one automobile for every 16.5 persons. Automobile ownership only continued to increase as time progressed. Throughout the 1910s, Colonel Ed Fletcher pushed for a link between San Diego and the new national highway system, even donating the wood to build the plank-road through the sand dunes in Imperial County. A review of the 1920-1921 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps shows a significant increase in auto-related industry in the East Village (Appendix A: Maps 11A & 11B, forthcoming). The most predominant feature was the number of auto-storage buildings associated with single and multi family units. In 1906 no such building existed and by the 1920s there were at least 60, many capable of housing multiple vehicles. These outbuildings were scattered throughout the East Village in no discernable pattern and appear mostly to have been added to rear yards of existent buildings.

In terms of businesses serving motorists, garages, either for service and repair or for storage, were numerous. Easily identified by the numerous garage doors and warehouse-like massing, they were typically single story buildings constructed of inexpensive materials with limited ornamentation (much like a taxpayer block). A number of storage garages were developed in East Village many in the vicinity of luxury hotels north of Market Street. Garages such as J. McInyre's and the Elite (both holding a maximum of 50 cars) and the Maryland Hotel Garage (holding 90 cars) were all located near the Maryland Hotel. Other garages devoted to vehicle

storage were found scattered throughout East Village like White's Garage, J.W. Freidan's Garage, Boylan and Gulick, Tanley Garage as well as Broadway and American Garages. Garages dedicated to maintenance and repair were also found throughout the region.

A significant grouping of auto businesses, particularly showrooms, was located on the block bounded by 15th and 16th Streets, Broadway and E Street. Known as the McKnight Block for the original developer J. F. McKnight, the entire block was devoted to auto sales and service. Three major automobile brands were represented on the block including Cadillac, General Motors and Studebaker and White Trucks. Each of these maintained a sales floor and service department. Davis-Overland and Chevrolet were also located nearby. The surrounding blocks hosted many other businesses offering services to motorists, especially auto repair shops, auto painters, tire sales and battery sales and reconditioning. The location of these auto-oriented businesses along Broadway and 16th was not accidental. By the 1920s there had been a shift in the commercial retail and banking industries moving to Broadway from Fifth Street (now Avenue). What was originally the northern boundary of the business district was now at the heart. Broadway had developed into a major east-west corridor that connected downtown with the mesa top suburbs to the north and the east of Balboa Park. From Fifth Street east, parcels that once supported residential uses were replaced by commercial speculation. A once contiguous neighborhood was divided by commercial uses. This was also the case to the south where commercial and industrial buildings encroached on residential parcels.

As the area transitioned from residential to commercial, auto-related businesses, which needed large parcels, took advantage of the burgeoning arterial, the proximity to the central business district and lower land costs found in the East Village. As a result, a significant portion of San Diego's auto industry located in the area, particularly east of 10th Street. Other auto-related businesses devoted to more offensive uses such as junkyards, auto wrecking, trucking companies, blacksmithing and paint shops were located south of Market Street. While the automobile had become the dominant mode of individual transportation by 1920, a few businesses in East Village still catered to dwindling modes of horse-related transportation. Sanborn maps show ten horse-related businesses, all located south of Market Street, including liveries, carriage works, feed yards and hay storage areas. Even before the advent of zoning in San Diego in 1923, industry was separating itself into concentrated districts.

Throughout the 1920s, downtown retailers continued to dominate the metropolitan scene; however newer shopping districts were beginning to emerge along Fifth Avenue in Hillcrest, University and 30th in North Park and Adams Avenue in Normal Heights. These smaller districts took some of the strain off the mounting parking dilemma in the downtown; however, by 1928, traffic congestion in the central business district could no longer be ignored. In April, the City Council adopted a new traffic ordinance (Ordinance 11650), which defined the central traffic district (essentially an area surrounding the business district) and outlined specific traffic rules for the district. The most significant aspect of the ordinance was the regulation of parking within the central traffic district. Following the ordinance, parking was limited to one hour between 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM and to two hours in the area surrounding the district. The hope was to decrease congestion by encouraging parking space turnover by limiting the allowable time shoppers, who arrived predominantly by car, could park on the street.

At the same time the city's engineers were trying to figure out what to do with the cars already in the city, other agents were working to encourage more motorists to visit the Silver Gate. In April of 1928, the Automobile Club of Southern California, in coordination with the San Diego Chamber of Commerce and other organizations, sponsored a motorcade from San Diego to Memphis, Tennessee. Part of the good-roads movement, the motorcade traveled what was coined the "Broadway of America Highway," with the purpose promoting the development of a transcontinental highway system and to publicize the Pacific Coast as tourist destination accessible to the motorist. Many of San Diego's most prominent businessmen participated in the motorcade, including Colonel Fletcher, J. S. McKean (rear admiral of the 11th Naval District) and Harry C. Clark (mayor of San Diego from 1927 to 1931). Ford dealer Walter M. Casey even donated a new Tudor Ford sedan to the Chamber of Commerce for the trip.

The new ordinance regulating parking in the central traffic district had little result. Midway through 1929 the five-story Adair Garage opened at "A" and Seventh Streets, next to the Fox Theater. The 300-car capacity facility couldn't have opened at a worse time. As with the rest of the nation, the market crash of October 1929 had an enormous effect on the economy of San Diego. The rapid growth of the prior decade dropped significantly with the onset of the Depression. Business failure and unemployment was extensive. With tenants hard to find and rents dropping rapidly, property owners looked for a way to secure the maximum return with only modest improvements. The answer: scrape the existing building and replace it with a parking lot. The downturn in San Diego reached its lowest point in 1934 and by 1935, the economy started to turn around.

East Village, by 1956, had been completely transformed into a commercial and industrial landscape (Appendix A: Maps 12A & 12B, forthcoming). Only remnants remained of the area's residential past. It had also been changed into environment wholly subservient to the automobile. Maps reveal Broadway now completely lined with commercial structures. And most importantly, there was plenty of room for the auto in off-street surface parking lots. Most lots were located immediately adjacent to businesses, either to the rear or the side. This was the result of tactics used by property owners during the Depression, as well as enlarged demand brought on by increased automobile use among the expanding middle class. Parking lots were scattered throughout East Village in no apparent pattern. In most cases, whole parcels were cleared and covered with asphalt, replacing mostly housing. In total, more than ten city blocks were given over to parking by 1956. The design of buildings was also changed to accommodate the car. Buildings were pushed back from the street to leave as much room as possible between the road and the front door for parking. Large signs were added to draw customers who arrived solely by auto. Streamline forms, mimicking those of cars themselves, further added to the auto-centered landscape. Within the East Village Study Area, the E. Harris Grocery Store (1925), Todd's Market (1947) and the Davidson Furniture Store (1940) exhibit streamline design characteristics influenced by the automobile. These include long horizontal lines, window walls of plate glass protected by cantilevered horizontal canopies, and blade or fin signs oriented toward the motorist.

The node of automobile dealerships noted earlier at Broadway and 16th Street was expanded to include most parcels fronting Broadway from 16th to 12th Avenue. There were at least fourteen businesses selling cars, including Chevrolet and Ford, as well as a number of used car

dealerships. Most of the new dealers along the strip employed an updated design in dealerships; service bays, parts storage and office space were kept to the rear of the lot, leaving the frontage free for cars to be shown in a lot that lined the street.

Other patterns previously noted had changed by the 1950s. While in the 1920s maintenance and repair garages were found throughout East Village, by 1956 most were located near the Broadway auto-strip. The number of gas and service stations increased to at least 20. While Broadway had become the principal commercial thoroughfare, Market Street emerged as a major industrial arterial. With the City's industrial sector expanding south of the Market, the roadway became the boundary between the commercial area to the north and the industrial uses to the south. In 1956, the road supported a carhop restaurant, five tire shops and no less than nine gas stations. Businesses devoted to more offensive uses, such as junkyards, auto wrecking, trucking companies and paint shops, continued to locate south of Market Street.

a) *Property Type: Automobile Showrooms*

Early showrooms were basic affairs, often simply a corner in a hardware store. As the auto increased in popularity, changes were made in the way they were merchandised. By the 1920s, architects were being hired to create buildings specifically designed for the requirements of retail auto sales. Most buildings consisted of two or more levels housing the company's sales floor, inventory and service areas. Architectural styling and ornamentation was concentrated on the showroom portion, particularly around formal entrances. Large expanses of plate glass windows were the dominant feature of the primary façade. High ceilings, waiting rooms and decorative floors distinguished interior showroom spaces. The interiors of the services areas were characterized by bare concrete floors, exposed walls and roof trusses and skylights.

The J.F. McKnight Block is a good representative example of an early auto showroom. The building featured a showroom fronting Broadway with a service department, accessed via 16th Street, located behind the sales floor. Designed by the San Diego architect Eugene M. Hoffmann for Studebaker and White Trucks, the building featured a stucco façade with large plate glass windows along the Broadway and 16th Street. These elevations allowed passersby to view cars in the most up-to-date showroom. A cantilevered marquee highlighted the entrance. Above this, the second floor sported three bays of multi-light windows. Ornamentation was modest with a simplified geometric Mission Revival parapet and decorative tile work bands.

A few blocks west of the McKnight Block is a later Streamline Modern version of the auto showroom. Walter D. Teague, the noted industrial designer responsible for the Ford Building in Balboa Park, as well as the famous porcelain-enameled metal-clad Texaco box gas stations, is believed to have designed this building. Located on the corner of Broadway and 12th Avenue, suburbanites returning home from the central business district were offered views of the newest Ford models through the glass expanses of the corner rotunda. The building's surface was covered in smooth stucco and cool black tile. Large display windows on Broadway continued around the corner onto the 12th Street façade. The entry on 12th Avenue seemed to float within the black vitrolite glass. The ribbon windows of the second story were accentuated with flow-lines suggesting motion. The northern portion on of the 12th Avenue façade housed the service department.

b) *Property Type: Automobile Garages*

Early on, gasoline, routine maintenance and major repair, as well as sales, occurred in a variety of buildings. Blacksmiths, livery stables and carriage works typically provided repairs for motorists. Gas was sold through hardware stores and feed suppliers. Independent garages offering service became common in the 1920s. These buildings were very simple affairs, often little more than a shell to protect the mechanics and vehicles from the elements. Typically single story buildings, they were constructed of inexpensive materials and had limited ornamentation. They are easily identified by the numerous garage doors and warehouse-like massing. Most had unfinished interiors exemplified by concrete floors, exposed interior walls and roof trusses. Most had electric lights to supplement skylights; however they usually didn't have power or heat. Exteriors were simple: decoration was limited to little more than a parapet to hide the gable roof. Most of the garages in East Village maintained a simple Mission Revival style, which was easily accomplished through the application of a curved or stepped parapet, a coat of stucco, and decorative tiling. The J.O. Hosman/ Marriott and Drummond Garage (c. 1920), the Tenth Street Garage (c. 1925-1926), the Kidd & Krone Auto Painter Building (1925) and the H.J. Goodman Garage (c. 1925) are all good representative examples of this trend.

Within the East Village survey area, six properties related to automobile sales, service or storage are being brought before the Board; however only five are noted as potentially eligible for designation. The sixth property (Federal Motor Truck Company) has had significant alterations, compromising its integrity and is therefore recommended for Note and File. Potentially significant properties include three auto showrooms (J. F. McKnight Cadillac & Studebaker, G. M. Truck Sales & Service and the Ford Motor Building) and two garages (Maryland Hotel Garage and the Southern California Telephone Company Garage). Other properties discussed in this context statement have either been cleared by staff due to severely compromised integrity, or are part of the Warehouse Thematic District and will be brought to the HRB shortly.

In conclusion, although auto-related properties were once widespread, relatively few remain. Many have been demolished to make way for new development while others suffer from years of neglect. The two remaining showrooms demonstrate both an early example (McKnight Block) and a mature form (City Ford) of the indoor auto dealerships. This property type offers insight into the introduction of what was a new mode of transportation in the early Twentieth Century. It also serves as evidence of the important role retail automobile sales businesses played in the economic development of San Diego. Independent garages supplied the maintenance and repair needs of motorists and represent a new business type that grew out of the introduction of the automobile. Both property types are significant in revealing the increasing importance of the automobile as America's favored method of private transportation from 1900 to 1956. Those remaining auto-related buildings are the remnants of a commercial landscape reflective of the City of San Diego in the first decades of the Twentieth Century and are worthy of designation under HRB Criterion A.

IV. SURVEY FINDINGS & STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The complete survey findings are located in Table 4 at the end of this section, where the consultant recommendation is found in the column titled “Lia Rec.” and the HRB Staff recommendation is found in the column titled “Staff Rec.” A summary comparison of the two reviewer’s recommendations is found in Table 3.

Table 3. Comparison of Survey Results

OHP Status Code*	3S	5S1	5S2	6Z	7
Consultant Recommendation	3	29	7	32	14
Staff Recommendation	10	0	59	16	0

*California Historical Resources Status Codes, published by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), are used in this survey. OHP status code interpretation follows below:

- 3S Appears individually eligible for the National Register or California Register through survey evaluation.
- 5S1 Individual property that is listed or designated locally.
- 5S2 Individual property that is eligible for local listing or designation.
- 6z Found ineligible for National Register, California Register or Local designation through survey evaluation.
- 7 Not evaluated for National Register or California Register, or needs reevaluation.

In Table 4, the recommended Historical Resources Board Criteria are found in the column titled “HRB Criteria.” In all cases, historical resources that are recommended for designation are recommended under HRB CRITERION C (Architecture) by both the consultant and HRB Staff. In all cases, those historical resources that are recommended for local designation have received the highest state status code warranted by the property’s significance. In some cases, HRB staff is also recommending additional local criteria, based upon new staff research, or upon research from earlier surveys that has been omitted (in some cases) on the updated forms on the basis that the information is already in the public record. Staff is carrying that material forward for HRB consideration to consolidate all known information in one place. Properties recommended for Note and File have either been substantially modified, are architecturally undistinguished, or lack historical significance.

The “Comments Column” in Table 4 indicates the specific HRB criteria staff is recommending, as well as any other information (such as integrity issues) relevant to potential designation or Note and File decisions. Integrity issues are also addressed in the Thumbnail Photos of sites included in the survey, found in Appendix B, where modifications are noted in red. California State Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record Forms (DPR 523A) and Building, Structure and Object Forms (DPR 523 B) are located in Appendix C, where detailed information is found on each property included in the survey. The DPR forms are organized by lettered streets, followed by numbered streets. Each form is numbered in the upper right hand corner for quick reference. The form number corresponds to the Form Numbers in Table 1, the map numbers on Identified Sites Map #3 and the Thumbnail Photo numbers in Appendix B.

This is a revised draft of the East Village Combined Historical Surveys, 2005. Additional Sanborn maps on auto-related resources will be available on-line and at the HRB January meeting. Please indicate on the form enclosed in the binder front pocket those properties where you disagree with the staff recommendation, or have questions you would like to discuss with HRB members during the regular public meeting on January 27, 2005. Sign the form and return it to staff by FAX or in the enclosed envelope. To facilitate survey review, only these properties will be culled for discussion. Kindly return the forms by 9:00 am, on Monday, January 24, 2005, so staff can organize the results for the HRB January 27 meeting. It is assumed that the survey findings will be modified pending HRB review and public testimony at the January meeting. After the HRB provides preliminary approval of the document findings, it will be revised, as appropriate, for formal adoption at a subsequent HRB meeting. When the survey findings are adopted, properties that do not meet HRB designation criteria will be formally Note and Filed as a separate action so they may be cleared for future development. Properties that meet HRB criteria for local designation can be formally designated at the owner's request once the survey findings have been adopted.

V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apartment Hotels in Birmingham, Alabama (1900-1930), National Register of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination Form, 1984.

Ashley, Joe, *Roadside Architecture Along US 2 in Montana*, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form, October 1993.

Bibb, Leland and Kathleen Flanigan, *The Role of Transportation in the Growth of the City of Oceanside*, City of Oceanside, 1997.

Bottles, Scott L., *Los Angeles and the Automobile: The Making of the Modern City*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1987.

Brandes, Ray & University of San Diego, *Historic Resources Inventory (of the) Uptown Area San Diego, California*, San Diego, June 1981.

Burgess, Ernest, "Urban Areas" in T.V. Smith and Leonard D. White, eds., *Chicago: An Experiment in Social Science Research*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1929.

California Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation, *California Historic Resources Inventory Survey Workbook*, Third Revision August 1986.

California Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation, *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*, Current Revision March 1997.

Ching, Francis, D.K., *A Visual Dictionary of Architecture*, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1997.

Crawford, Kathleen, *Architectural and Historical Evaluation of 672 8th Avenue, San Diego, California*, January 1996.

Eig, Emily Hotaling and Laura Harris Hughes, *Apartment Buildings in Washington, D. C. (1880-1950)*, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form, 1993.

Fogelson Robert M., *Downtown: Its Rise and Fall, 1880-1950*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2001.

Gowans, Alan, *The Comfortable House: North American Suburban Architecture 1890-1930*, Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press, 1986.

Grimes, Teresa, *Early Auto-Related Properties in Pasadena, California, 1897-1944*, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form, 1996.

Heritage Architecture and Planning, *Historic Assessment Report for a Proposed Warehouse Thematic District*, San Diego, Centre City Development Corporation, 2004.

Hunter, Christine, *Ranches, Rowhouses and Railroad Flats*, New York & London, W. W. Norton & Company, 1999.

Jackson, Kenneth T., *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1985.

Lettieri-McIntyre and Associates, Inc., *Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report to the Final Master Environmental Impact Report for the Centre City Redevelopment Project and Addressing the Centre City Community Plan and Related Documents for the Proposed Ballpark and Ancillary Development Projects, and Associated Plan Amendments*, v. I-II, San Diego, September 13, 1999.

Lia, Marie Burke, *Warehouse District Proposal for Centre City East*, July 1995.

Lia & Brandes Team, *Historic Site Inventory of Bayside For Centre City Development Corporation*, San Diego, May 1989.

Lia & Brandes Team, *Historic Site Inventory of Centre City East For Centre City Development Corporation*, San Diego, November 1988.

Liebs, Chester H., *From Main Street to Miracle Mile: American Roadside Architecture*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Longstreth, Richard & The National Trust for Historic Preservation, *The Buildings of Main Street; A Guide To American Commercial Architecture*, Washington, D.C., Preservation Press, 1987.

Longstreth, Richard, *The Drive-In, the Supermarket, and the Transformation of Commercial Space in Los Angeles, 1914-1941*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2000.

Longstreth, Richard, *City Center to Regional Mall*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1997.

McAlester, Virginia & Lee, *A Field Guide To American Houses*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1986.

McShane, Clay, *Down the Asphalt Path, the Automobile and the American City*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1994.

Moomjian, Scott A., & Elizabeth Bradbury, *Appendix To Cultural Resource Study For The Draft Environmental Impact Report; Ballpark and Ancillary Development Projects and Associated Plan Amendments Project*, January 1999.

Painter, Susan A., *San Diego's Fifth Avenue: An Interpretation of Historical Photographic Images*, MA Thesis, San Diego State University, 1991.

Phillips, Steven J., *Old House Dictionary: An Illustrated Guide to American Domestic Architecture 1600-1940*, Washington, D. C., Preservation Press, 1992.

Polyzoides, Stefanos, Roger Sherwood and James Tice, *Courtyard Housing in Los Angeles*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1992.

Pourade, Richard F., *The Rising Tide*, San Diego, The Union-Tribune Publishing Company, 1967.

Reading, James E., *History of San Diego Highway Development*, San Diego, CA, San Diego Highway Development Association, 1977.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, San Diego, New York, Sanborn Map Company, 1888, 1906, 1920, 1921, 1956.

San Diego City Directories, 1944/1945-1984.

San Diego County Assessors Office.

Sicha, Richard J., *Historic Resources of Pasadena (Partial Inventory: Bungalow Courts)*, National Register of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination Form, 1976-1981.

Starr, Raymond G., *San Diego: A Pictorial History*, Norfolk, The Donning Company Publishers, 1986.

Stein, Susan R., ed., *The Architecture of Richard Morris Hunt*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Talley-Jones, Kathy and Letitia Burns O'Connor, *The Road Ahead: the Automobile Club of Southern California 1900-2000*, Los Angeles, CA, The Automobile Club of Southern California, 2000.

Tess, John M. and Robert L. Munson, *Middle Class Apartment Buildings in East Portland, Oregon (1920-1945)*, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form, 1996.

Thompson, Philip, *Transportation-related Properties of Jackson, Tennessee*, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form, February 1992.

Tinsely, Wendy, *How Cities Grow: a History of San Diego's Neighborhood Development Patterns; 1769-1955*, Master's Thesis, San Diego State University, 2003.

University of San Diego, Department of History, Graduate Division, *San Diego Architects*, 1868-

1939, San Diego, University of San Diego, Spring 1991.

United States Department of the Interior, *How To Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, National Register Bulletin 15, Revised 1991.

Wachs, Martin, and Margaret Crawford, Eds., *The Car and the City*, Ann Arbor, MI, The University of Michigan Press, 1991.

Chris Wilson, *Auto-oriented Commercial Development in Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1915-1956*, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form, September 1996.

Wright, Gwendolyn, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1983.