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

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

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

_____ New Submission XX Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Garden Apartments, Apartment Houses and Apartment Complexes in Arlington County, Virginia: 1934-1954

(2011 Amendment) (VDHR File Number 000-8825)

B. Associated Historic Contexts

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

Depression-Era Decline in Housing Construction
Federal Programs to Revive Housing Industry
Origins of the FHA's Housing Philosophy
The FHA's Influence on Apartment Design and Construction in Arlington
Apartment Construction in Arlington County
- World War II-Era Construction
- Post-World War II Construction
- Acceleration of Apartment Construction
- Turning Point

C. Form Prepared by

name/title Laura Trieschmann, Architectural Historian and Andrea Schoenfeld, Historian

organization EHT Traceries date February 2, 2011

street & number 1121 Fifth Street, NW telephone 202-669-5122

city or town Washington state DC zip code 20001

e-mail ltrieschmann@traceries.com

D. Certification

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

Signature and title of certifying official | Date

Virginia Department of Historic Resources
State or Federal Agency or Tribal government

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

Signature of the Keeper | Date of Action

Garden Apartments, Apartment Houses and Apartment Complexes in Arlington County, Virginia: 1934-1954 (2010 Amendment) | Virginia
Name of Multiple Property Listing | State

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

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

Garden Apartments, Apartment Houses and Apartment Complexes in Arlington County, Virginia 1934-1954 (000-8825) (2011 AMENDMENT)

E. STATEMENT HISTORIC CONTEXT: ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION

This amendment augments and expands upon the text of the original MPD Form (2002), providing the following additional documentation necessary to understanding the context and architectural styles of garden apartments in Arlington County from 1934 to 1954.

Forces that shaped development of apartments in Arlington County:

- *New Deal programs designed to stimulate the economy and reverse the precipitous decline of the construction industry in the Great Depression*
- *Growth of population with expansion of the federal government, first with the New Deal, then World War II and, after 1945, returning veterans*
- *Pent-up demand for quality housing that civil servants and other moderate income families could afford*
- *Urban planning and housing reform movements that sought to bring the benefits of quality housing design and construction and well-planned communities to people of moderate incomes*

The era of apartment construction in Arlington County was shaped by economic, social, and political forces that were national in scope. This seminal period in multi-family housing design commenced with the 1936 groundbreaking for Colonial Village, a 40-acre complex composed of over 1,000 units with a companion shopping center. The design, planning, and construction of this premier garden-apartment complex incorporated many of the ideals espoused by forward-thinking planners and housing reformers, many of whom worked for the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Colonial Village and other contemporaneous garden apartments in Arlington served as prototypes for the FHA as it sought to perfect national standards and guidelines for multi-family housing across the country. During this period of experimentation, between 1936 and 1954, no other county matched Arlington in the construction of garden-apartment buildings and complexes. Favored but not mandated by the FHA, the traditional and overwhelmingly accepted Colonial Revival style was initially employed by developers. The style came to dominate multi-family garden apartments and single-family dwellings erected in the twentieth century in Arlington County. Yet, stylistic ornamentation was always secondary to the building design and site planning, which were more commonly affected by the social needs of prospective residents and the financing requirements controlling construction. Architects and

builders focused on developing interior plans and building configurations that were consistent with the design principles promoted by the FHA, including improved air and light circulation, landscaped outdoor common spaces, and cost effective construction. These principles, combined with the tremendous need to provide adequate housing for moderate-income residents, especially civil servants and military families, ultimately required the restriction of stylistic expression. This was particularly true during the post-World War II years, when architectural design was transitioning between the Colonial Revival style recognized by most Arlingtonians and the starkness of the Modern Movement era, which rejected all traditional styles and links to the past.

INTRODUCTION

At the time Colonial Village and other contemporaneous garden-apartment complexes like Buckingham and Arlington Village were being constructed in Arlington County, the nation was still in the grips of the Great Depression. Housing starts—the number of dwelling units begun annually—had declined precipitously in Arlington County and nationally, although the number of new households was increasing. With rising unemployment and a resulting high foreclosure rate, an increasing proportion of the population required rental housing. The existing housing stock available for people in the low- to moderate-income ranges was far short of the demand and was often deficient in quality.[1]

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, after assuming office in March 1933, sought various ways to revive the housing industry and improve housing conditions. Accordingly, in 1934, Congress passed the National Housing Act, which created the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Through the mechanism of providing mortgage insurance for both single- and multi-family housing, the FHA created incentives for the construction of both owner-occupied and rental projects, while setting standards for such construction. The FHA's standards and planning guides incorporated the thinking of planners, housing reformers, and proponents of the garden city movement of the time and sought to bring the benefits of modern, efficient interior floor plans and attractively planned residential communities to people of moderate means.

At the time the legislation was enacted, many localities had neither building codes nor zoning regulations. Others had building codes that had not been updated for many years. The FHA drew up standards that varied by region to accommodate differences in climate and building traditions. It did not directly impose these standards on states and localities, which would have been politically impossible, but it would not insure projects that did not conform to them. Because

[1] Mason C. Doan, *American Housing Production, 1880-2000: A Concise History* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1997), 43.

FHA's mortgage insurance programs were often critical to the financial viability of housing developments, builders accepted them and often pressured their communities to adopt zoning and building regulations that would meet FHA approval.

Much of the housing development stimulated by FHA's mortgage insurance programs was constructed in suburban areas like Arlington County. Cheaper suburban land permitted economical lower density development of both single- and multi-family projects, thus making low-rise and garden apartments an attractive option. The rapid growth in automobile use had opened up suburban areas for development across the nation. By 1930, the majority of households owned an automobile—there were 30,000 households and 23,000 registered automobiles.[2] In Arlington County, however, residents continued to use the various modes of public transportation available. In 1934, county officials reported that 6,500 pleasure automobiles had been registered for a population of more than 30,000.[3] The low percentage of automobile ownership in the suburban county was consistent with the more urban population of Washington, D.C., and proved an ideal situation for the garden apartment that offered little, if any, on-site parking and was typically located along or near primary roadways where public transportation traveled.

DEPRESSION-ERA HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

National statistics on housing construction show how dramatically residential construction declined in the decade between 1925 and 1935. The resulting shortages were particularly acute for low- and moderately priced housing. In the 1920s, the economy had expanded rapidly and the housing industry responded to the pent-up demand that had developed during World War I. Much of that construction was geared to the higher end of the housing market. By the mid-1920s, construction had reached a frenzied pitch that exceeded market demand.[4] In 1925, new construction commenced on 937,000 housing units; the vast majority of these were single-family dwellings rather than two- or multi-family dwellings. By the late 1920s, the housing industry was suffering from overbuilding and its difficulties contributed to the stock market crash in October 1929. As the Depression deepened, the decline in housing construction continued. The Depression "was slow to hit Washington, chiefly because of the steady Government payroll here

[2] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970, Bicentennial Edition, Parts 1, 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975), Series A335-349, 42 and Series Q 148-162, 716.
[3] "7,500 Qualified To Cast Ballot At Arlington," *Washington Post*, 17 April 1935, 12; "Sheriff Asks Police Radio For Arlington," *Washington Post*, 18 March 1934, 6.
[4] Doan, *American Housing Production, 1880-2000: A Concise History*, 29.

and so in 1931 there was a slight upsurge in building."[5] Within the next few years, though, new construction notably declined in the Washington area, as it had nationally.

Revival of the housing industry was widely viewed as essential to the recovery of the general economy. The National Housing Act, which created the Federal Housing Administration, was enacted in the second year of Franklin D. Roosevelt's presidency as part of his New Deal program. Its twin objectives were to revive the homebuilding industry and to stimulate the construction of quality housing for families of modest means. As a result, in the Washington metropolitan area, new construction returned to normal by 1935, two years after President Roosevelt was inaugurated. This was the direct result of the rapid expansion of the federal government in the mid- to late 1930s and early 1940s and the influx of modestly paid civil servants and military workers in need of housing. Many of these new residents sought homes in Arlington County, which was quickly "recognized as one of the most advantageously located residential sections in the entire Washington area." The county, touted as a "political subdivision of 25 square miles," experienced "prosperous and unprecedented growth," with a population increase of 40,000 within thirty years. In the year 1938 alone, new construction included "12,172 single-family dwellings [and] 12 apartment structures with 2,111 family units.…" Multi-family dwellings comprised about seven percent and single-family dwellings contributed more than 71 percent to the county's revenue that year.[6]

In addition to a decline in housing construction, the Depression years were also marked by a decline in home ownership. In 1930, 46 percent of householders owned their own homes. As unemployment rose, foreclosures accelerated. The number of homeowners is estimated to have dropped by one million, bringing the home ownership rate down as low as 40 percent. By the time of the first housing census in 1940, the percentage of home ownership had risen to just over 41 percent.[7] Thus, in the nation as a whole, almost 60 percent of households were renters. Developers and investors recognized the tremendous need for rental housing, overseeing the construction of "…the Nation's largest rental housing projects, constructed under FHA plan[s]" in Arlington County.[8]

[5] "Washington Enjoys Its Most Spectacular Building Boom Since 1925," *Washington Post*, 30 July 1939, B7.
[6] "Arlington Seen as Good Home Investment," *Washington Post*, 29 September 1940, R7; "Arlington, Va., Shows Prosperous, Unprecedented Growth," *Washington Post*, 5 November 1939, R6.
[7] Doan, *American Housing Production, 1880-2000: A Concise History*, 43.
[8] "Arlington Body to Give Dinner for FHA Head," *Washington Post*, 5 December 1937, R4.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS TO REVIVE HOUSING INDUSTRY

As originally enacted in 1934, the National Housing Act was principally designed to stimulate the housing industry through an initial, short-term program of insuring loans for home improvements and a long-range provision for insuring the construction of single-family housing developments. However, it also included a provision, known as Section 207, for insuring mortgages on rental apartment projects developed for moderate-income tenants by limited dividend corporations formed under state housing laws.

Arlington County's Colonial Village, the prototypical garden-apartment complex constructed ca. 1935 , was the first project in the nation insured by the FHA under Section 207. Its well-designed and well-built, two-story buildings, covering only 18 percent of a landscaped site, attracted 10,000 applicants for the first 276 units—an indication of the demand for moderately priced quality rental housing in the Washington, D.C., area.[9] Due to Colonial Village's immediate and widely publicized success, it became a model for garden-apartment construction throughout the nation and was actively promoted by the FHA as an example for other developers and investors.

In 1938, Congress amended and expanded the scope of Section 207, opening up mortgage insurance on apartment developments to for-profit companies. It also added Section 210, which was intended to assist with the insuring of smaller rental projects and offered a more simplified application process. These new provisions greatly accelerated the pace of construction of moderately priced apartment construction in Arlington County, and elsewhere across the country, by facilitating the financing of such projects. In the two years prior to enactment of the 1938 amendments, just four permits were issued for apartments in Arlington County. Two of these were for individual low-rise buildings and two were for large FHA limited-dividend projects—the first sections of Colonial Village and Buckingham. Following adoption of the amendments, four apartment building permits were issued in 1938, ten were issued in 1939, and 24 were issued in 1940. By 1941, the Commonwealth of Virginia was second only to New York State in the number (34) of FHA-insured mortgages on rental housing projects under Sections 207 and 210.[10]

The FHA's programs to stimulate single- and multi-family residential construction were targeted to produce housing for moderate-income workers. They did not include programs for publicly funded housing and did not address the needs of the least well off. Instead, they were designed to

[9] James M. Goode, *Best Addresses* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 1988), 336.
[10] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1942* (Sixty–third edition), (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1942), Table No. 319, 318.

stimulate the private housing market to develop communities and produce housing that reflected urban planning objectives and housing ideals that had been developed in the previous decades at a price that a much wider segment of the population could afford. As a result of these programs, Arlington County developed and grew, offering many advantages to attract new residents.[11]

ORIGINS OF FHA'S HOUSING PHILOSOPHY

In the years following World War I, there was much discussion within the architectural and planning professions, and in the general press, of what the ideal suburb should be. Planned communities such as the Country Club District in Kansas City, Shaker Heights outside Cleveland, Forest Hills in New York, and Radburn in New Jersey, became models for developers across the nation. These subdivisions, generally designed for residents at the upper income levels, drew on the efforts of the planning and garden city movements of the early twentieth century. They were marked by a respect for the natural topography of their sites and the enhancement of the natural environment with landscaping and parks. They sought to address the needs of residents for a cohesive, attractively designed neighborhood with ready access to transportation and community services.

In the 1920s, national attention was also focused on the need to provide good housing for families with limited incomes. Architects, planners, social reformers, the building and real estate industry, and elements of the press sought ways to encourage and facilitate the construction of quality housing for families of moderate means. Their efforts were often endorsed by national and local government officials and organizations. One of the leading organizers of this movement was Better Homes in America, Inc. Initially spearheaded by a women's magazine, it became a national educational organization in 1923 with Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover as its president. The organization's goal was to make "convenient, attractive and wholesome homes accessible to all American families."[12] It sought to encourage quality building and efficient design, install modern, labor saving devices to reduce household drudgery, and provide economical furnishings, along with broader goals for improving family life. With much of its effort focused on educating the consumer, local chapters worked with builders and local department stores to sponsor show houses across the country.

Simultaneously with the activities of Better Homes in America, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) sought to encourage builders to use architect-designed plans for the construction of small houses, which were defined as having a maximum of six rooms. It

[11] "Builder Extols Arlington's Accessibility," *Washington Post*, 28 January 1940, R4.
[12] Reprinted by Arthur Evans Wood, *Community Problems* (New York, NY: The Century Company, 1927), 131.

sponsored the Architect's Small House Service Bureau to provide architect-designed plans and specifications to builders. Other organizations similarly sought to promote the use of architect-designed plans for small houses, thus improving the quality of new residential construction. Increasingly in the 1920s, popular publications like *Better Homes & Garden*, *House & Garden*, *McCall's*, and *Architectural Digest* addressed the interests and needs of owners of small houses.

Although both the Better Homes and small house movements focused on single-family housing in the 1920s, the qualities and values they promoted were applied to the design of garden apartments in the 1930s and 1940s. Garden apartments, like small houses, were viewed as an alternative to crowded city tenements on narrow lots with limited light, air, and privacy. Garden apartments provided an economical way to produce rental housing in suburban areas with many of the features of the small houses popularized in the press. The single-family houses and the multi-family garden apartments insured under FHA programs had much in common. In approving applications, the FHA looked for efficient floor plans with a minimum of wasted space. In garden apartments this included the elimination of apartment corridors; more natural light and cross ventilation; installation of modern appliances; use of durable, easy-to-maintain materials; and low lot coverage to provide an attractive, open setting.

THE FHA'S INFLUENCE ON APARTMENT DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION IN ARLINGTON

From the outset, the FHA encouraged the construction of low-rise apartment buildings and advocated building them in suburban areas rather than cities because cheaper land enabled developers to provide housing at a lower cost with the benefits of lower density. As described by the FHA's deputy administrator, Miles L. Colean, "[w]ith the vast areas which are brought, through rapid transit or automobile highways, within the reach of urban dwellers, land loses that quality of scarcity which perhaps at one time justified crowding. Today, land crowding is an economic folly. With the present availability of land for spacious developments, it is safe to say that multi-storied buildings built to high coverages of their separate narrow lots are obsolete before they are started."[13]

The FHA established ceilings on rental costs and purchase prices for the single- and multi-family projects it insured. It perceived the unmet rental housing need as being for housing renting at $50 or less per month for units with three to six rooms. Colean told the housing industry in 1938 that, "above this figure the market dwindles away," adding that, "we must drop our concentration

[13] National Association of Real Estate Boards, Proceeding of the Realtors' Housing Conference Discussing the National Housing Act (as amended 3 February 1938), 17-19 March 1938 (Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938), 40.

upon the Cadillacs and Lincolns of the housing world...and turn our attention to the more familiar models."[14] In 1938, a rental of $50 a month, or $600 a year, represented one third of the $1,871 median annual salary of federal employees. The median salary for technical, scientific and professional positions in the federal government in 1938 was $3,137, while for clerical staff it was $1,572.[15] Because of its close proximity to the nation's capital where the majority of civil service employees work, the median salary for residents of Arlington County was that of the federal government. In 1940, the median national wage or salary income for workers was $885, and fewer than 900,000 of the United States' 31,727,000 workers earned $3,000 or more.[16]

Because the FHA's mortgage insurance programs facilitated financing, they made the construction of moderately priced rental housing a more attractive option for developers, particularly after the 1938 amendments to the National Housing Act were enacted. Thus, FHA-insured projects came to dominate construction of moderately priced rental housing and the standards the FHA set determined many of the features of the apartment buildings constructed for this market. In addition to the FHA's general guidelines on the economic soundness of projects, and the quality and durability of construction, it also set many explicit standards on what it would insure, specifying, for example, minimum room sizes and acceptable materials.

Room sizes in the small houses and apartment projects insured by the FHA were comparable. For example, the FHA's 1936 publication, *Principles of Planning Small Houses,* provided five illustrative houses, ranging from a minimum one-story, two bedroom house of about 500 square feet for a family of three, to a two-story, three bedroom house with just under 900 square feet.[17] In Colonial Village, one-bedroom apartments ranged from 515 to 594 square feet and two-bedroom apartments were 777 square feet. At Westover, an FHA-insured project constructed shortly after the enactment of the 1938 housing act amendments, apartments were on two levels and were more spacious than most of FHA's illustrative small houses, with one-bedroom apartments of 720 square feet and two-bedroom apartments of 984 square feet. The two-bedroom apartments, with exposures on three sides, included a separate full dining room unlike most FHA-insured small houses that incorporated a dining area in either the kitchen or living room.

The FHA laid out its guidelines for the construction of rental properties in a 1939 publication, *Architectural Planning and Procedure for Rental Housing,* which was revised periodically but

[14] Ibid, 40.
[15] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1942* (Sixty–third edition) (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1942), Table No. 189, 189.
[16] Ibid, Table No. 382, 361.
[17] U.S. Federal Housing Administration; *Principles of Planning Small Houses,* Technical Bulletin No. 4 (Washington, D.C. U.S Government Printing Office, 1936), 24-33.

adhered to the same general principles. The focus of FHA's rental program was the provision of long-term rental housing for families. It interpreted the "word 'Housing' to mean dwelling quarters for families, quarters which offer complete facilities for family life, as a result of desirable planning and environment."[18] To protect the long-term value of a project, it advocated a conservative approach to location, favoring "a distinctly residential area, which promises to remain of good character," and avoiding a tenant population that would be dependent on the continued success of a single industry in the community.[19]

Tenant appeal was based on offering the greatest amount of space, comfort, and service, with attractive surroundings offered at the lowest possible rent consistent with a reasonable profit. The low operating and maintenance costs were to be achieved by avoiding the probability of tenant abuse, and designing and building to minimize the need for repairs and replacement. Typically, multi-family buildings included one or more units set aside to house a janitor or other staff, who would provide routine upkeep and ensure the day-to-day maintenance of buildings and grounds. The maintenance provided by developers of the early large rental projects such as Colonial Village and Buckingham was described in 1937 by Deputy Administrator Miles L. Colean and reported in the *Washington Post*: "The buildings are serviced by mechanics, carpenters, painters, firemen, and janitors, and the grounds are cared for by gardeners. The property is under the management of an experienced real estate operator, who maintains offices on the property."[20]

The FHA advocated simplicity and economy in construction and investment in design and materials that would ensure low maintenance costs. It said the "lowest permissible standards of quality in materials and construction must in all cases insure durability with low maintenance cost" and defined that as "*essential* quality" as opposed to "elements of elaboration of decorative effect, special equipment, etc.," which constituted "*luxury* quality." It said that "essential quality must be present in all projects" to the exclusion, if necessary, of elements of luxury.[21]

Although the FHA made clear that it did not set standards for architectural styles, its predilection for conservative and traditional design was evident. It advised that "simple, direct designs which rely for their effect upon mass, scale, and proportion are more attractive, and the resultant structures are sounder investments than those which strive for picturesque or unusual effects

[18] U.S. Federal Housing Administration; *Architectural Planning and Procedure for Rental Housing* (Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office, 1939), 7.
[19] Ibid, 7.
[20] "FHA Housing Requirements are Explained, *Washington Post*, 24 October 1937, R2.
[21] U.S. Federal Housing Administration; *Architectural Planning and Procedure for Rental Housing* (Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office, 1939), 8.

through elaboration of motif and ornament or a startling use of materials" and that a "property should be able to retain permanent acceptance and not be so faddish that it is soon outmoded."[22]

In Virginia, the Colonial Revival style, harking back to the Commonwealth's early history, was enduringly popular and the public's enthusiasm for it was heightened by the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg, which began in 1927. The FHA's first apartment project, Colonial Village, capitalized on this popularity both in choice of name and of architectural style. Many of the subsequent FHA projects followed suit by using elements of this traditional style, although sometimes only minimally. The Colonial Revival and its classical elements remained deeply embedded in the hearts and minds of Arlingtonians. Therefore, the vast majority of apartment buildings expressed the Colonial Revival style. Pure interpretations of the style, albeit suburban examples of the mid-twentieth century, include the Irving (1936) at 605 North Irving Street, Boulevard Courts (1940) at 2300 Washington Boulevard, and Magnolia Gardens (1948) at 5201-5205 8th Road South, 830-856 South Frederick Street, and 831-857 South Frederick Street. Large complexes such as Colonial Village (1936), Buckingham (1937-1953), Arlington Village (1939), Barcroft Apartments (1942-1947), Fillmore Gardens (1942-1943/1948), Queen Anne (1944), and Fairlington (1943-1945) are typical suburban illustrations of the style, with entry porches supported by Tuscan columns, broken or arched pediments, fanlight and sidelight windows, and slate-covered gabled and hipped roofs.

Over time, however, some FHA-insured apartment buildings exhibited elements of what the FHA described as "Modern" design. In 1941, they issued a technical bulletin addressing modern design and how it should be evaluated by the FHA staff in their ratings of mortgage applications. Although this bulletin principally addressed the rating of single-family housing, it reveals the agency's thinking on modern design generally. The bulletin described the basic characteristics of modern design as attempting:

> (1) to create a plan which will provide a functional relation between rooms arranged to suit present day modes of living, to facilitate efficient housekeeping, and to permit an economical use of materials;
> (2) to permit the exterior treatment to be dictated primarily by the plan and to be an expression thereof, with little or no regard to traditional concepts; and
> (3) to use materials efficiently, economically and directly, boldly eliminating decorative features and relying upon texture and color of materials together with skillful arrangement of masses and openings to produce a good esthetic effect.[23]

[22] Ibid, 8.

The FHA advised its staff to evaluate projects designed in modern styles on their success in achieving these goals, saying that it was important to distinguish between "stylistic labels which are purely surface treatment, and those which proceed from developments in plan or structure." The FHA recognized the long-term implications of the style, saying that, "in spite of many faddish features displayed by [modern design,] the movement is one of more than a transitory nature, and…the basic elements which characterize it will in all likelihood sooner or later become characteristic of a large body of our stock of housing."[24] The styles of the Modern Movement era rejected the decorative features of traditional architectural styles that evoked historical periods. Instead, with an aesthetic that relied heavily on massing, form, and materials, it celebrated new materials, new technologies, and a concern for creating simplified, functional, and efficient living spaces. Moreover, Modern Movement styles, like the European-inspired Art Deco and Streamline Moderne, embodied the "hypnotizing promise of more and more things tomorrow, advanced by America's machine technologies and rising standard of living."[25] Modernism emphasized the utilitarian, deliberately seeking to reduce costs and encourage simpler living by providing a less expensive design that was technologically advanced. The architecture of the Modern Movement espoused a better tomorrow for the middle class that was difficult to ignore after the dark years of the Great Depression and World War II.

Although expressed modestly, modern design influences can be seen on a number of apartment buildings and complexes constructed in Arlington from the late 1930s through to the mid-1950s. One noted example is the individual low-rise apartment building known as McClaine Courts at 2500-2502 Lee Highway. Constructed in 1939, this two-story building has wide granite entry surrounds with a jack arch topped by an indented cornice. The flat roof with granite coping emphasizes horizontality, which was a hallmark of mid-century modern. The window openings are particularly wide, holding metal-frame casements rather than the wood-frame double-hung sash commonly favored by the Colonial Revival style. Another example of modern design is The McClaine at 1515-1519 North Barton Street and 2416-2424 16th Street North. Exhibiting elements of the Streamline Moderne, the two 1939 low-rise apartment buildings have single entry openings topped by flat cantilevered hoods of polished steel with rounded corners. The expansive window openings, which now hold replacement double-hung sash, are set to the outermost bays to read as corner windows. Projecting brick string courses unite the openings as

[23] U.S. Federal Housing Administration, *Modern Design*, Technical Bulletin No. 2, March 1, 1941 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1941), 2.
[24] Ibid, 4.
[25] American Experience, "People & Events: Chicago Century of Progress Exposition (World's Fair), 1933-1934," Public Broadcasting Service, http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/streamliners/peopleevents/e_fair.html (accessed 4 November 2009).

they wrap the corners. McClaine Gardens at 1600-1606 North Rhodes Street, completed in 1941, is one of the larger individual low-rise buildings exhibiting modern design. The building's strong horizontality is created by symmetrically placed landscape windows holding metal-frame casements. The flush metal entry doors, marked by a single circular light, are topped by flat cantilevered hoods with squared edges. Spanning the two upper stories above the first-story entries are two paired casement windows divided by a metal spandrel. A granite string course, also acting as a continuous sill, runs under the third-story openings, while projecting brick string courses unite the window openings. Key Boulevard Apartments (1942) at 1537-1545 North Key Boulevard and Westmoreland Terrace (1947) at 1320-1322 Fort Myer Drive and 1301-1313 North Ode Street show many of these same streamlined elements. Fort Strong (1954) at 2000-2012 North Daniel Street is minimally executed at the slightly projecting entry bays, which are veneered in coursed narrow stones and pierced by vertical window openings separated by metal spandrels and commercial-style metal-framed glass doors with narrow two-light sidelights and transoms.

A seamless blending of traditional American architecture with modern European designs was successfully produced by Mihran Mesrobian, a Turkish-born Armenian who immigrated to the United States in 1921. By following the standards of the FHA, Mesrobian presented the conventional elements of the Colonial Revival style, such as hipped and gabled roofs, projecting square and round bays topped by pediments, cupolas and lanterns, and molded cornices. Mesrobian was able to accentuate the American style, though, by subtly introducing design elements and materials of the Art Deco and Streamline Moderne, such as glass block, indented brick spandrels and cornices, abstract geometric motifs set in granite panels, cantilevered flat roofs, and metal-framed casement windows that wrapped around corners. The work of this prolific architect in Arlington County in the 1940s and early 1950s proved overwhelmingly acceptable to the developers, property owners, renters, and lending financial institutions. His work includes 1233 North Courthouse Road (1940), Lee Gardens South (now Sheffield Court, 1942), Wakefield Manor (1943), Lee Gardens North (now Woodbury Park, 1949), and Calvert Manor (1950). Notably, Mesrobian's first apartment building, located at 1233 North Courthouse Road, did not present any elements of the Colonial Revival style and was ultimately incorporated into the neighboring garden-apartment complex of Wakefield Manor, which reflects both the Colonial Revival and Streamline Moderne, to ensure its acceptance and financial success.

Less stylized examples of the Colonial Revival style were constructed after World War II, when modern design became more synonymous with minimal design and mass-produced materials. This reduction of ornamentation, initially a direct result of the significant inflation for building materials and labor, forced developers and property owners to seek ways to reduce construction costs and provide lower rental rates, thus ensuring their financial ventures would be successful.

Initially, this resulted in just the application of modest Colonial Revival-style entry surrounds with broken or arched pediments often surmounted by glass blocks that stretched upward to the cornice to provide natural lighting for the interior stairs. The more elaborate gable roofs with molded entablatures were replaced by flat roofs with corbeled bricks only suggesting cornices. Single and paired double-hung sash windows with molded surrounds, sills, and lintels were supplanted by metal-frame casements and picture windows that brought a false sense of spaciousness by uniting the interiors with the planned exterior landscape. Less ornate examples include Nalbert Apartments (1947) at 1315-1319 Fort Myer Drive, Briarcliff Manor (1946-1947) at 1301-1309 and 1318-1320 North Pierce Street, and Virginia Gardens (1949) at 1700-1715 South Taylor Street.

By the late 1940s and into the 1950s, most developers attempted—albeit unsuccessfully—to completely cast off the popular Colonial Revival style, snubbing the tradition of applied ornamentation as an unnecessary expense. This resulted in austere garden-apartment buildings and complexes that employed a simplistic design consisting merely of a rectangular form covered by a low-pitched gable or a flat roof finished with a narrow cornice (applied more for functional than cosmetic reasons). The modest garden apartment used its setting, location, form and massing, fenestration, and materials to easily qualify for FHA financing and approval. Accordingly, builders and developers—without the added financial burden of a trained architect—could more quickly, more efficiently, and more cost effectively provide housing for the middle-income rental population. Such complexes, like Buchanan Gardens with its unadorned buildings arranged on a cul-de-sac with connecting concrete walks, evoked this austerity of design. Moreover, because they could be quickly erected, the apartment units were quickly occupied, leaving real estate companies to deal with long waiting lists of prospective renters.

In such austere garden apartment buildings, the single and paired double-hung or wider casement windows, symmetrically placed on each elevation, were modestly finished with rowlock brick sills and jack-arched openings, lacking molded surrounds. The main entry openings were covered by cantilevered flat hoods, hipped roofs of standing seam metal, or shed roofs supported by wooden knee brackets. Such examples include Buchanan Gardens (1949) at 914-934 South Buchanan Street, the complex at 2000-2011 4th Street South (1952-1953), the complex at 2030-2036 North Woodrow Street (1952/1954), Vermont Terrace (1952-1953) at 2026-2030 North Vermont Street, and Ingleside (1954) at 2125-2133 19th Street North. A few complexes, such as Tyroll Hills (1950) at 741-751 and 801-821 South Florida Street and the Admiralty (1953) at 2000-2020 North Calvert Street employed only broken or arched entry surrounds that scarcely recalled the Colonial Revival style.

Although the austere garden apartment—stripped of any true stylistic vocabulary—was ultimately cheaper to construct and, thus, financially available to more renters, it was not widely embraced. The number of austere buildings and complexes constructed in Arlington County was noticeably limited, especially when compared to the great numbers built in neighboring localities like the District of Columbia, Fairfax County and the city of Alexandria in Virginia, and Montgomery and Prince George's counties in Maryland. Many of these residents commuted everyday to the nation's capital, where the monumental architecture in which they worked recalled historical precedents, promising prosperity and longevity. The memories evoked by the traditional Colonial Revival style proved too strong for Arlingtonians to abandon completely.

Recognizing residents' disinterest in the austere garden apartment, builders and developers quickly returned to the Colonial Revival style, all the while attempting to introduce the Modern Movement. Most architects, builders, and developers were not fluent in the vocabulary of the modern styles, which included "suntrap-style" (curved) windows, a circular "porthole" window, and abstract geometric patterns, or the innovative materials such as glass block and polished steel that were embraced by modern design. Yet, they employed modernistic elements, albeit minimally so as to familiarize Arlingtonians with the style and its materials. Ultimately, the post-war garden apartment united elements of both the Colonial Revival style and the Modern Movement, even if solely expressed by a simple pediment crowing a single-leaf entry alongside an expansive picture window with casement sash. This transitional unity of traditional and modern elements proved most effective in the years following World War II.

APARTMENT CONSTRUCTION IN ARLINGTON

Although a modest number of apartment buildings had been constructed in Arlington County before Colonial Village in 1936, this premier garden-apartment complex, with over 1,000 apartments on 40 acres along the highly traveled Wilson Boulevard, represented an entirely new scale of rental development and community planning for the Washington metropolitan area. It was soon followed by others, including Buckingham, Arlington Village, Lyon Village, and Fairlington. Garden apartments became the dominant form of apartment construction in Arlington County for the next fifteen years. In the same era, large-scale complexes were constructed in other jurisdictions in the Washington metropolitan area, especially in the city of Alexandria and Fairfax County, Virginia, and Montgomery County, Maryland. Development of garden-apartment complexes in nearby Prince George's County, Maryland, commenced predominately after World War II and continued well into the 1950s. Yet, for the period between 1934 and 1954, no other county in the Washington area matched Arlington County in the construction of garden-apartment buildings and complexes.

The expansion of the federal government in the decade from 1930 to 1940 is reflected in the population growth of the entire metropolitan Washington area. In terms of absolute numbers, the greatest increase in that decade was in the city itself, which grew by 176,222 persons, compared to increases ranging from 29,000 to 35,000 for Arlington County and Prince George's and Montgomery counties. However, in percentage terms, Arlington County's population increased by 114 percent, while the District of Columbia's only increased by 36 percent. In the next decade, from 1940 to 1950, suburban growth outstripped that of the city. In absolute numbers, Arlington County's increase of 78,400 was less than the much larger and more populous Maryland counties of Montgomery and Prince George's, which grew by 80,500 and 104,700 respectively. Nevertheless, Arlington County's growth rate was the fastest, an increase of 137 percent compared to 95 percent for Montgomery County and 116 percent for Prince George's County. The District of Columbia's growth of 139,000 represented only a 21 percent increase.[26]

Arlington's growth in the 1940s was spurred by the federal government's decision to "overflow into Arlington County," as one newspaper reporter described it, and relocate much of the military's administrative work force from the District of Columbia to Arlington.[27] In 1941, 5,000 Navy Department office workers moved into a new office building in Arlington. On September 11, 1941, three months before Pearl Harbor, construction began on the Pentagon, designed to provide space for over 20,000 employees, and the building opened a year later. Although the World War II military buildup accelerated Arlington's development, its growth is best understood by looking back several decades. It had become evident that Arlington County was ripe for suburban development as Washington, D.C. grew, and rapid transit and the automobile provided new access to the county's formerly rural farmlands. The county's business and real estate communities began to press for planning and infrastructure to facilitate orderly growth. The local government began work on a county-wide water system in 1927 and sewer system in the following decade which, together, opened the predominately undeveloped county up to much more intensive development.

Arlington County adopted its first comprehensive zoning plan in 1930 although it had instituted some subdivision controls prior to that time. This plan had limited categories of land use and only two residential categories, "A" and "B," the latter being apartments. At the time, the county's population was just over 26,000 and the plan did not anticipate the influx of garden-

[26] Richard L Forstall, comp., "Population of Counties by Decennial Census: 1900 to 1990," http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/cencounts/files/va190090.txt, (Accessed 17 November 2009); Campbell Gibson, "Population of the 100 Largest Cities and Other Urban Places in the United States: 1790 TO 1990," http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/twps0027.html, (Accessed 3 December 2009).
[27] "Quadrupled DC Urged by Delano," *Washington Post*, 9 January 1941, 17.

apartment construction stimulated by the creation of the FHA in 1934 with provisions for insuring mortgages for moderate-income rental housing projects. By the mid-1930s, Arlington County recognized its need for comprehensive planning.

Arlington County, the smallest county in the state, was the first county in the Commonwealth of Virginia to create a planning commission. This occurred in June 1937, after the Virginia General Assembly authorized the counties to take on a planning function.[28] To address Arlington's pressing need for highways to ease rapidly increasing traffic, the county first worked on a preliminary thoroughfare plan for areas where development was imminent. Next, it revised subdivision regulations and required developers to install utilities and street improvements in new subdivisions according to county specifications. Planning activities intensified in Arlington County as it became clear, in the immediate pre-World War II build-up of defense activities, that the population would continue to grow rapidly and that the demands for housing, transportation, schools, roads, parks, and other infrastructure would need to be met in an orderly manner. In 1941, the Planning Commission adopted a revised thoroughfare plan, which created much of the present highway system and provided more control over land subdivision.[29] This also anticipated higher density development along arterial roads.

In 1942, the county adopted a Comprehensive Zoning Plan that established minimum land area requirements for each type of residential land use and created three categories of apartment building zoning. Off-street parking was required for all apartments and housing projects. Community opposition to the construction of rowhouses resulted in the prohibition of their construction, thus confirming that residential construction in Arlington would not resemble that of urban Washington, D.C. and the city of Baltimore. The 1942 zoning plan was heavily weighted toward residential construction, designating a few areas for industrial use and relatively few for commercial use.[30]

Within five years of adopting the 1942 plan, Arlington County's government felt the need to revise its zoning plan, in part because of the large number of rezoning applications it was receiving as developers responded to the demand for more housing. In 1948, the County Board proposed a new master zoning plan that greatly expanded the areas in which apartment houses, semi-detached (twins) and two-family houses could be built. It also reduced the minimum lot sizes for some single-family housing. Civic groups protested the increased zoning for apartments

[28] Frank L., Dieter, "Early Planning Progress in Arlington County, Virginia to 1945," *Arlington Historical Magazine* 3 no. 3 (October 1967), 30.
[29] Dieter, "Early Planning Progress in Arlington County, Virginia to 1945," 34.
[30] Merlo Pusey, "Wartime Washington," *Washington Post,* 3 March 1942, 9.

and when the new master plan and zoning ordinance were finally approved in 1950, it provided for increasing the total land acreage zoned for apartments by only one percent.[31] However, by the time this ordinance was adopted, post-war apartment construction had reached its peak.

The need for housing, its proximity to the federal government in Washington, D.C., and the allowances made by the County Board and its plans made Arlington County a proving ground for FHA's rental housing program with the construction of the first two sections of Colonial Village. However, only a handful of low-rise apartment buildings were constructed in the county until FHA mortgage insurance was opened to for-profit developers by the 1938 housing act amendments. As a result, apartment construction accelerated rapidly. Thirty-eight low-rise apartments and garden-apartment complexes were built between 1938 and 1940. Most were moderately priced apartments built under FHA programs, although it is not possible to determine the exact number because the FHA has not retained individual project records from that period.

WORLD WAR II-ERA CONSTRUCTION

World War II created new challenges for the building industry and further defined what could be built. Affordable housing for workers involved in the defense effort received top priority as building materials became scarce and the federal government instituted a system for allocating them.

Long before the United States entered World War II following the Pearl Harbor attack in December 1941, it was preparing for war. As defense industries geared up production, the FHA began to explore its role in stimulating construction of housing for workers who were migrating to defense areas. In March 1940, the FHA's recently retired Deputy Director, Miles L. Colean, published a report, *Housing for Defense: A Review of the Role of Housing in Relation to America's Defense and a Program for Action* under the auspices of the Twentieth Century Fund. It called for giving priority to the construction of housing for rent or sale to defense workers with modest incomes.

A year later, in March 1941, Congress amended the National Housing Act by adding Title VI, Defense Housing Insurance. It authorized the FHA to insure private market construction of housing in designated defense areas for defense workers. Over the course of four years, Congress authorized a total of $1.8 billion for wartime-housing insurance. Designated defense areas included areas with manufacturing plants, military bases, or other facilities that attracted an influx of workers involved in the defense effort. The FHA lowered its requirements for economic

[31] "Board Adopts Zoning Plan in Arlington," *Washington Post*, 16 July 1950, M17.

soundness for privately funded defense housing construction in order to "cover the stripped-down house meeting WPB [War Production Board] standards and the location requirements of war housing in proximity to industrial plants," as described by FHA's Administrator.[32] War-era housing legislation and FHA rules implementing it incorporated proposals from Colean's report. In the war years, FHA mortgage insurance was effectively limited to moderately priced housing projects in designated defense areas. The Washington metropolitan area was designated a defense area on April 10, 1941.

Scarce materials, including construction materials, were allocated among potential users by a federal War Production Board. Builders seeking priority for construction materials had to conform to the FHA requirements. In addition to the cost limitations, the FHA also checked plans to ensure that builders made the minimum possible use of scarce materials. This is reflected in the design of the apartment buildings, which were minimally ornamented and employed natural materials such as concrete block, brick veneers, asphalt shingles, wood entry surrounds, and metal-framed casement windows—which were steel prior to the war and aluminum after.

Although building construction came to a halt in many parts of the country during World War II, construction of garden-apartment complexes and low-rise apartment buildings as well as inexpensive single-family houses continued in Arlington County. Whether or not these projects were FHA-insured, they would have had to comply with rental guidelines established by the FHA in order to receive an allocation of building materials from the War Production Board. Thus, they would have been designed for the relatively modest incomes of federal employees and other defense workers. Moderately priced housing for war workers was in such short supply in the Washington area that the federal government constructed a number of apartment complexes for defense workers. The largest of these was Fairlington, a defense housing community composed of 579 garden apartments (3439 units) set on 322 acres located close to the Pentagon. Rents for the units ranged from $58.50 for a one-bedroom apartment up to $89.50 for a three-bedroom apartment.[33]

POST-WORLD WAR II CONSTRUCTION

At the end of World War II, after five years of deferred construction in all but the designated defense areas, there was a severe national housing shortage. Further, it was anticipated that

[32] Abner H. Ferguson, "Housing Progress of FHA," *Housing Progress*, vol. 1, no. 2 (Summer 1945), 18.
[33] Catherine D. Fellows, "Fairlington at 50: May 1943-May 1993," 60th Anniversary Printing (Arlington, VA: Fairlington Historical Society, 2003), 21.

demand would surge as service men and women were discharged and began marrying and starting families. The National Housing Agency predicted in 1944 that there would be a need for an additional 12,600,000 housing units in the postwar decade.[34] Six million service personnel were released in 1945 and an additional 4 million in 1946. In the immediate post-war period, it was estimated that, nationally, 2.5 million "reunited families and recently married couples had to double up with relatives."[35] In the Washington area, there were 25,000 homeless veterans.[36]

Most of the post-war demand was for low or moderately priced housing. Nationally, about "75 percent of the 5 million families seeking homes could afford no more than $60 a month in rent, and they could pay no more than $6,000 for a house."[37] Even in Arlington County where, as a designated defense area, public and private building projects had greatly expanded the stock of moderately priced housing during the war, supply was still inadequate to meet the need. Although many of Arlington County's residents had moved to the area to fill defense-related jobs, they tended not to leave after the war and the population continued to grow.

In 1946, Congress enacted the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, which modified provisions of the National Housing Act originally designed to facilitate wartime housing construction. To encourage the construction of rental housing for veterans, minimum property and financial requirements for multi-family housing under Section 608 of the Defense Housing Insurance program were eased. For the first time, the construction of elevator buildings for federally insured, moderately priced housing was permitted. However, in Arlington, the only elevator building constructed in this period was the higher-priced Virginian. Rental housing financed under the revised provisions "showed a spectacular increase" in 1947, according to the FHA.[38] These provisions remained in effect until 1950. Also, housing legislation enacted in 1948 created more favorable terms for FHA-insured mortgages on low cost rental and cooperative projects constructed with financing under Section 207 of the National Housing Act.

In the immediate post-war period, residential construction was hampered by shortages of building materials. In the fall of 1945, the Truman Administration briefly attempted to stimulate housing construction by removing wartime controls on building materials. The resulting building

[34] Richard O. Davies, *Housing Reform During the Truman Administration* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1966), 25.
[35] Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America* (New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1981; Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1983), 242.
[36] Davies, *Housing Reform During the Truman Administration*, 41.
[37] Davies, *Housing Reform During the Truman Administration*, 40.
[38] U.S. Federal Housing Administration, *The FHA Story in Summary, 1934-1959*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing office, 1959).

boom produced commercial and recreational construction but very little housing suitable for veterans or others in the lower income brackets. In December 1945, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion re-imposed price controls, including rent control, and reinstituted an allocation of building materials, with 50 percent of all construction materials to be channeled into housing, particularly veterans' housing. Nevertheless the building industry continued to be hampered by supply shortages that were exacerbated by strikes and other labor problems.[39]

The price controls remained in effect until November 1946, by which time production of building supplies was catching up with demand. The controls had become increasingly unpopular and, furthermore, they had proved relatively ineffective in stimulating the construction of housing suitable for veterans.[40] Only rent control was retained.[41] Nationally, new construction increased dramatically in 1947, achieving a fourfold increase over the 1945 level and signaling the beginning of a building boom that peaked in 1949-1950.[42] In Arlington County, fourteen apartment buildings and complexes were constructed in 1947; the only multi-family complex constructed in 1945 was the George Mason.

Although supply problems eased, significant inflation in the costs of both building materials and labor in the post-World War II era created pressure to economize in both design and materials to keep rentals within reach of veterans and others needing moderately priced housing. But post-war inflation led to higher rental prices for newly constructed apartment units, thus reducing the number of people who could afford them. With the inflation of the post-World War II years, the FHA raised the ceiling for rental prices of the apartment projects it insured. By 1948, it was insuring apartment projects in the Washington metropolitan area with rentals of $70 to $100 a month.[43] By this time, the median national wage or salary income in the United States was $2,959.[44]

ACCELERATION OF APARTMENT CONSTRUCTION

In the years from 1947 to 1949, there was a marked shift from single-family construction to apartment construction nationally and the press noted this shift in the metropolitan Washington

[39] Davies, *Housing Reform During the Truman Administration*, 42-51.
[40] Davies, *Housing Reform During the Truman Administration*, 54-56.
[41] Rent controls were periodically extended in modified form by Congress and were not eliminated until June 1951.
[42] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1955* (Seventy–sixth edition) (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955), Table No. 958, 769.
[43] Conrad P. Harness, "Wide Choice in $70-100 Bracket," *Washington Post*, 10 July 1949, R1.
[44] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1952* (Seventy–third edition) (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952), Table No. 319, 265.

area. In 1947, the construction of 849,000 new dwelling units was started nationally, of which 740,200 were single-family units while 33,900 were in two-family structures and 74,900 were in multi-family dwellings. In 1949, the numbers of building starts for single-family and two-family dwelling units were just over 7 percent higher than the 1947 levels, while multi-family units had increased by 159 percent in the three-year period.

This shift to the predominance of apartment construction was evident in the Washington metropolitan area as a whole. The *Washington Post* reported that in 1946, single-family housing accounted for 77 percent of all housing units constructed, and that the percentage fell to 57 percent in 1947 and 45 percent in 1948. In that time period, the construction of rental units increased fourfold in the metropolitan area, rising from 2,500 units in 1946, to 10,600 in 1948.[45] While the District of Columbia retained rent control, the removal of rent control for new construction in Maryland and Virginia provided further stimulus for construction in the suburbs. Most of that was apartment construction, which consisted of one- and two-bedroom garden apartments with four to twelve units in two- or three-story buildings with not more than 25 units per acre.[46]

In the Washington, D.C., area, apartment building reached its peak in 1949 and dropped sharply in 1950. According to the *Washington Post*, approximately 23,000 apartment units were started in 1949, almost all of which were FHA-insured projects, but that number dropped to an estimated 5,500 in 1950 because, in the latter part of 1949, "FHA took the position that sufficient units in the $70-$100 rental range had been committed to answer the need."[47] In 1949, one-bedroom garden apartments generally rented for $70 to $85 and two-bedroom apartments were $85 to $100. Already, in December 1948, the FHA had announced that in the future it would give preference to projects renting for under $70 because it considered the local rental market saturated in the over $70 a month class. In January 1951, the *Washington Post* reported that "FHA officials say" that by the spring of 1951 "the postwar apartment construction program here [in metropolitan Washington, D.C.] will be pretty well worked out. When that time comes, some 43,000 individual apartments will have been built since mid-1946 with FHA mortgage insurance."[48] The *Washington Post* noted a precipitous drop in the aggregated value reflected in building permits for new apartment construction projects in the first 11 months of 1950 compared to the first 11 months of 1949 in the District and the Virginia and Maryland suburbs while, in the same time period, the value of single-family housing permits increased in each

[45] "Area Builders Start 800 New Units in Dec.," *Washington Post*, 29 January 1949, B2.
[46] William S. Banks, "20,000 Rental Units Underway, Ready Soon," *Washington Post*, 21 March 1948, R1.
[47] Robert P. Jordan, "Area Accent Shifts from Apartments to 1-Family Homes," *Washington Post*, 2 January 1951, C4.
[48] Ibid, C4.

jurisdiction. In Arlington County, the value of apartment building permits dropped from $7,786,355 in 1949 to $1,370,600 in 1950.[49]

TURNING POINT

In 1949, Arlington County issued a building permit for the construction of its first high-rise apartment, the 10-story, 264-unit Virginian. Perched above Arlington Boulevard near Fort Myer, with a view of the Potomac River, it was designed to serve a more affluent market than the vast number of low- and mid-rise buildings and garden-apartment complexes that had been constructed in the previous fifteen years. The Virginian was a harbinger of the future course of apartment development in Arlington County.

The year 1950 was a pivotal one in the history of apartment construction in Arlington County. Since the beginning of planning for Colonial Village in 1934, FHA programs and guidelines had dominated apartment construction in the county. Its mortgage insurance programs made the construction of moderately priced rental housing, as well as the construction of modest single-family housing, a financially attractive option for developers in the lean years of the Great Depression. In the World War II era, builders constructing housing for war workers following FHA guidelines were given priority in the allocation of scarce building materials and, thus, virtually all housing built in Arlington County in this period conformed to FHA guidelines. After the war, Defense Housing amendments enacted by Congress authorized the FHA to insure mortgages for veterans housing, and particularly rental housing for veterans, on liberalized terms that attracted developers to that segment of the market. Throughout these years, the FHA had encouraged the construction of low- and mid-rise buildings and garden-apartment complexes near major arteries, where zoning permitted, in many parts of the county. Elevator projects, perceived as unnecessarily expensive, were not even eligible for FHA mortgage insurance until 1946.

Then, in 1950, national and local events and policies converged to change the direction of apartment construction. The FHA, always sensitive to the economic soundness of projects it insured, had already announced that the market demand for apartments in all but the very least expensive rental levels had been satisfied in Arlington County and, therefore, it was not likely to approve mortgage insurance for new projects in the relatively modest rental range of $70 to $100 a month. In 1950, the Defense Housing mortgage insurance provisions expired and the FHA closed applications for the program on March 1; buildings already in the pipeline were constructed.

[49] Ibid, C4.

Housing reform legislation, enacted by Congress in 1950 after several years of debate, changed the course of government-assisted housing programs. Its most controversial provisions created urban renewal programs and provided for a major increase in public housing construction. However, it also shifted the focus of the FHA's programs to encourage more production of middle-income housing, most notably large-scale tract developments of single-family housing. Consequently, the undeveloped land in northwest Arlington County, some of which was already subdivided into building lots, became very attractive to merchant builders, who established neighborhoods composed of freestanding, mass-produced single-family dwellings.

In June 1950, the outbreak of the Korean War suddenly created a need to divert materials to a new war effort. The Truman Administration took a number of measures to slow the post-World War II building boom, which was still being fueled by the pent-up demand for veteran and other housing. On July 18, 1950, President Truman ordered both the FHA and the Veterans Administration to tighten credit by increasing down payment requirements. He also cut the aggregate outstanding amount of insured mortgages that FHA could carry by $600 million.[50] As a result of these and other government-imposed constraints on construction, housing construction in 1951 fell nationally by more than 20 percent from its 1950 peak. The constraints were clearly evident in Arlington County, where only two apartment buildings—Myerwood and Arlco—were constructed in 1951, compared with nineteen apartments constructed in 1949-1950.

A new zoning plan adopted by Arlington County in 1950 encouraged the construction of higher density multi-unit buildings in areas already zoned for apartments. The zoning revision did not significantly expand the areas zoned for apartment construction, largely in response to community opposition to revisions proposed in 1948 that would have substantially enlarged the proportion of the county zoned for apartments.

When apartment building resumed in Arlington County, as Korean War restrictions eased, most of the multi-family housing built was distinctively different from the earlier construction. The post-1954 construction, consisting principally of mid- and high-rise apartment buildings, was concentrated in Rosslyn, Fort Myer Heights, and Courthouse, where public transportation provided ready access to nearby Washington, D.C. The target market was generally a higher income level than that served by the pre-1950 apartment construction. Garden-apartment construction declined sharply as land became more valuable and high-rise apartments became a more common multi-family building type. A study conducted by the Arlington County Office of Planning in 1961 documented the construction of 74 multi-family apartment buildings and

[50] "Text of Truman Letters to Agency Heads on Housing," *New York Times*, 19 July 1950, 23.

complexes between 1955 and 1961, most of which were mid- or high-rise buildings. Prior to 1955, only three high-rise apartment buildings had been constructed in Arlington County.

CONCLUSION

Almost one third of the multi-family buildings and garden-apartment complexes constructed between 1934 and 1954 have been demolished in the half century since their construction. Of the 174 which were built in that period, only 109 remained standing in 2011, heightening the significance of the surviving examples of apartment construction designed to provide persons of moderate means with well designed, attractive, and efficient, yet affordable housing in landscaped, suburban settings. These apartment buildings, situated along Arlington County's major roadways, are a notable feature of Arlington's landscape and attest to the role that such apartments played in providing housing in decades of austerity, war, and acute housing shortages.

F. ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES: Additional Documentation

This section has been expanded to better identify the resources and the necessary elements for integrity.

Historic properties associated with the context "Garden Apartments, Apartment Houses and Apartment Complexes in Arlington County, Virginia, 1934-1954" take the following six types:

1. Garden-Apartment Complex
2. Individual Low-Rise Apartment Building
3. Individual Mid-Rise Apartment Building
4. Mid-Rise Apartment Complex
5. Individual High-Rise Apartment Building
6. High-Rise Apartment Complex

PROPERTY TYPE DESCRIPTION

The definitions of the six property types follow:

Garden-Apartment Complex

Garden-Apartment Complexes are composed of at least three or more multi-family buildings, each containing at least four self-sufficient dwelling units. Each building is at least two stories high and no more than three stories high. Entry is gained either through main public entrances or separate entrances that lead to individual units. The buildings do not have an elevator and access to upper stories is gained by stairs. The buildings are intentionally designed and sited to relate to the surrounding landscape, with interior courtyards, walkways, and private parking. Amenities often include a playground and shopping center with grocery, restaurants, beauty and barber shops, and dry cleaners.

Individual Low-Rise Apartment Building

The low-rise apartment building is composed of one or two buildings designed and constructed specifically to function as a multi-family building. These buildings were designed to contain at least three self-sufficient dwelling units. The low-rise apartment building is at least two stories high and no more than three stories high. Entry is gained through public entrances rather than separate entrances that lead to the individual units. The buildings do not have an elevator and access to upper stories is gained by public stairs. This type of apartment building is specifically designed to take advantage of site limitations, which garden-apartment complexes do not

encounter. Landscaping is limited as the building occupies the largest percentage of the lot. A walkway commonly leads from the public sidewalk to the main entrance; parking is typically not included. If the property contains two buildings, they are typically sited to create a landscaped courtyard between, sometimes with parking at the rear and a connecting walkway.

Individual Mid-Rise Apartment Building
The mid-rise apartment building is composed of one or two buildings designed and constructed specifically to function as a multi-family building. These buildings were designed to contain at least fifteen self-sufficient dwelling units. The mid-rise apartment building is at least four stories high and no more than six stories high. Entry is gained through public entrances rather than separate entrances that lead to the individual units. The buildings may contain an elevator, depending on the date of construction; access to upper stories is also gained by public stairs. This type of apartment building is specifically designed to take advantage of site limitations, which garden-apartment complexes do not encounter. Landscaping is limited as the building occupies the largest percentage of the lot. A walkway commonly leads from the public sidewalk to the main entrance; parking is typically not included. If the property contains two buildings, they are typically sited to create a landscaped courtyard between, sometimes with parking at the rear and a connecting walkway.

Mid-Rise Apartment Complex
The mid-rise apartment complex is composed of at least three or more multi-family buildings, each containing at least fifteen self-sufficient dwelling units. Each building is at least four stories high and no more than six stories high. Entry is gained either through main public entrances or separate entrances that lead to individual units. The buildings may contain an elevator, depending on the date of construction; access to upper stories is also gained by public stairs. The buildings are intentionally designed and sited to relate to the surrounding landscape, with interior courtyards, walkways, and private parking. Amenities often include a playground and shopping center with grocery, restaurants, beauty and barber shops, and dry cleaners.

Individual High-Rise Apartment Building
The individual high-rise apartment building is composed of a single building designed and constructed specifically to function as a multi-family building. These buildings were designed to contain at least twenty self-sufficient dwelling units. The high-rise apartment building is at least seven stories high with a single main public entrance with lobby. The building will contain an elevator and fire stairs. This type of apartment building is specifically designed to take advantage of site limitations and zoning allowances. Landscaping is limited as the building occupies the largest percentage of the lot. Walkways commonly lead from the public sidewalk and parking lot

to the main entrance. Amenities such as a pool are commonly provided, either on the roof or alongside the building.

High-Rise Apartment Complex
The high-rise apartment complex is composed of two or more buildings designed and constructed specifically to function as a multi-family building. These buildings were designed to contain at least twenty self-sufficient dwelling units. Each building of the high-rise apartment complex is at least seven stories high with a single main public entrance and lobby. The building will contain an elevator and fire stairs. This type of apartment building is specifically designed to take advantage of site limitations and zoning allowances. Landscaping is limited as the buildings occupy the largest percentage of the lot. Walkways commonly lead from the public sidewalk and parking lot to the main entrances. Amenities such as a pool are commonly provided on the roof or alongside the buildings, the landscaped courtyards typically have a playground, and a shopping center provides residents with a grocery store, restaurants, beauty and barber shops, and dry cleaners.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ASSOCIATIVE QUALITIES

Physical Characteristics

All of the eligible properties attached to this MPD Form must be designed, constructed, and used as multi-family housing in Arlington County, Virginia, for the period between 1934 and 1954. The following discussion describes the physical characteristics that define the property types, especially as their significance is tied to Criterion C and they are exemplary for Architecture and Community Planning and Development traits.

The following design elements are *key* aspects of Arlington County's multi-family apartment buildings from 1934 to 1954 for all six property types.

1. Siting and Landscaping:
    a. Set within residential neighborhoods, often at perimeter of planned subdivisions
    b. Located within close proximity to public transportation such as railway, streetcar, or primary transportation corridors for cars and buses
    c. Typically sited within walking distance to shopping centers, religious facilities, social activities, schools, and libraries
    d. Landscaped green space with courtyards created by the form and siting of the buildings within the complexes

e. Landscaped green space surrounding the individual buildings with plantings and shrubs
f. Connecting walkways (paved with concrete) to each building, to public sidewalk, and to parking lots

2. Number of Buildings:
   a. Individual low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise apartments consist of one to two buildings
   b. Complexes consist of three to over 540 buildings
3. Building Form:
   a. Rectangular
   b. Square
   c. I-shaped
   d. L-shaped
   e. U-shaped
4. Building Heights:
   a. Ranging from two to three stories in height for garden apartments and low-rise apartments
   b. Ranging from four to six stories in height for mid-rise apartments
   c. Ranging from seven to nine stories in height for high-rise apartments

The following design elements are *secondary* aspects of Arlington County's multi-family apartment buildings from 1934 to 1954 for all six property types.

1. Structure and Cladding:
   a. Concrete Block Structures
   b. Brick Veneer in American and Flemish Bonding
2. Roof Form and Covering:
   c. Gable, side and front
   d. Hipped
   e. Flat
   f. Mansard
   g. Slate Shingles
   h. Asphalt Shingles
3. Entry Surrounds and Porches:
   i. Colonial Revival surrounds with broken or arched wooden pediments
   j. Modern Designed granite surrounds with fluting and reeding
   k. Flat- or hip-roofed porches with Tuscan columns

l. Pedimented porches with Tuscan columns/posts or brick posts
m. Standing seam metal or asphalt-shingled hoods
n. Flat or sloped cantilevered hoods of steel or wood with curved or squared edges
o. Sloped roofs of wood

4. Windows:
    p. Double-hung sash: wood
        i. 8/8
        ii. 6/6
        iii. 4/4
        iv. 2/2
        v. 1/1
        vi. Single
        vii. Paired
    q. Casements: metal
    r. Sliding: metal
    s. Fixed: wood or metal
    t. Glass Blocks
    u. Picture Windows
        viii. Fixed or casement center light flanked by operable double-hung or casement sash
5. Architectural style:
    v. Influences of the traditional Colonial Revival
    w. Elements of the innovative modern designs (Art Deco and Streamline Moderne)
    x. Uniting elements of both the Colonial Revival and modern designs
    y. Lack of stylized ornamentation in favor of economical, simplistic design created merely by building forms and construction materials (austere)

Associative Characteristics

In order to qualify under Criterion A, all of the eligible properties should have an association with one or more of the following: 1) the demand for quality multi-family housing between 1934 and 1954 for civil servants and other moderate income families, 2) New Deal programs designed to stimulate the economy and reverse the precipitous decline of the construction industry in the Great Depression, 3) Growth of population with expansion of the federal government, first with the New Deal, then World War II and, after 1945, returning veterans, and 4) Urban planning and housing reform movements that sought to bring the benefits of quality housing design and construction and well-planned communities to people of moderate incomes. The properties

should represent new trends in suburban residential multi-family housing and the effects of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) between 1934 and 1954 in Arlington County.

Geographical Information

Almost all of the eligible properties will display a cultural landscape approach that makes the natural environment a key element. This is evident in the design and layout of internal streets, the siting of apartment buildings on the lots and the buildings' relationship to each other, the creation of courtyards or green space, the parking areas and walkways, and the relationship of the buildings and green space to the external streets and surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Boundaries

The boundaries of all of the eligible properties are typically the original lot lines as determined by individual surveys or subdivision plats. In cases where some buildings within a complex have been razed and new, non-historic housing has been constructed, resubdivision of the lots has typically occurred. If resubdivision has not occurred, the boundaries will have to be determined by what remains of the original multi-family complex and its garden-apartment appearance.

Variations Occurring within the Property Type

The most common variation occurring within the identified property types is the change in architectural style from the traditional Colonial Revival to modern designs, a uniting of elements from both, and, finally, to a lack of stylized ornamentation in favor of economical, simplistic design created merely by the buildings' form and construction materials. One notable element that changed with the attempted transition from Colonial Revival to modern design was the change in materials. Double-hung windows with a sash of wood were no longer commonplace as metal-frame casement windows dominated. Additionally, as the demand for housing intensified, the density of rental units increased from low-rise buildings standing two or three stories in the pre- and post-World War II years to four- to six-story mid-rise apartments in the mid-1940s and 1950s. Ultimately, by 1949, high-rise buildings rising over seven stories in height became the necessary norm for rental housing in Arlington County. Although they were still being constructed well into the mid-1950s, the garden-apartment complex with its landscaped open space and courtyards eventually gave way to individual buildings and complexes with less or no green space and more parking.

Locational Patterns of the Property Type

All of the properties exist within Arlington County, Virginia, beyond the confines of Washington, D.C., in what would be considered a suburban setting by the mid-1930s. The apartment buildings are generally, but not always, located in the southern and central portions of the county in such neighborhoods as Lyon Park, Fairlington-Shirlington, Claremont, Nauck, Colonial Village, Rosslyn, Fort Myer Heights, Courthouse, Clarendon, Ballston-Virginia Square, Ashton Heights, Buckingham, and Westover Village. Most significantly, the vast majority are located along primary transportation corridors such as Arlington Boulevard, Wilson Boulevard, Lee Highway, Clarendon Boulevard, Washington Boulevard, and Glebe Road, thus providing easy access to railroad, streetcar, and bus lines.

Condition of the Property Type

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

Most of the apartment buildings erected in Arlington County between 1934 and 1954 received Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insured mortgages or followed the standards of the FHA in order to be competitive with the rental market and receive allocation of the scarce construction materials. In approving applications, the FHA looked for efficient floor plans, with a minimum of wasted space, including, in garden apartments, the elimination of apartment corridors; the installation of modern appliances; the use of durable, easy-to-maintain materials; with more natural light and cross ventilation; and low lot coverage to provide an attractive, open setting. In addition to the FHA's general guidelines on the economic soundness of projects, and the quality and durability of construction, it also set many explicit standards on what it would insure, specifying, for example, minimum room sizes and acceptable materials. These elements have ensured the durability and stability of the garden apartments, apartment houses, and apartment complexes in Arlington County erected between 1934 and 1954.

The vast majority of the buildings have replacement windows; the replacement of the windows is a common, economical change that has ensured the preservation of the garden apartment buildings. Often, an operable double-hung sash of wood is replaced with an operable double-hung sash of aluminum or vinyl. The original divided lights of the sash, created by true muntins, have typically been lost in favor of 1/1 sash. More commonly, the double-paned, insulted glass has plastic muntins sandwiched between the two large double-hung panes, falsely simulating the true divided lights of the original sash. Fixed picture windows and operable casements have been

replaced with paired and tripled operable double-hung sash for economical reasons. Replacement material is typically vinyl rather than the original wood or metal frame; more historically sensitive materials have been used when the property has been renovated under the direction of the state and federal tax credit programs.

Within the last ten years, with the availability of state and federal tax credits, a few of the garden-apartment complexes and individual low-rise apartment buildings have been enlarged by modest additions. Because this work has followed the *Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation*, the additions have not compromised the integrity of design, feeling, or setting for the individual buildings or complexes. Additionally, this work has included the replacement of windows, both double-hung sash and metal casements, with wood sash and aluminum casements respectively. Replacement windows typically are in keeping with the original windows in type and materials.

Specific Period of Time and Location of Eligible Resources

The eligible resources were built between 1934 and 1954 and all exist in Arlington County, Virginia. This period begins with the creation of the FHA under the 1934 National Housing Act. Through the mechanism of providing mortgage insurance for both single- and multi-family moderately priced housing projects, the FHA created incentives for the construction of both owner-occupied and rental housing while setting standards for the first time for such construction. The 1954 date reflects the changes in apartment building design in the Washington metropolitan area and the FHA, always sensitive to the economic soundness of projects it insured, had announced in 1950 that the market demand for apartments in all but the very least expensive rental levels had been satisfied in Arlington County. Therefore, it was not likely to approve mortgage insurance for new projects in the relatively modest rental range, thus ending the dominance of apartment construction in Arlington County.

The period of significance for garden apartments, apartment houses, and apartment complexes should begin with their construction date. The ending date will either be the date of completion of the apartment, or if a complex, the construction of the final buildings within the complex. Alterations and demolitions to buildings within the complexes should not be the determining end dates.

PROPERTY TYPE SIGNIFICANCE

Arlington County's garden apartments, apartment houses, and apartment complexes are today common accepted forms of residential housing, recognized locally and nationally for their innovative planning and design elements. This specific type of residential housing dominates the landscape of Arlington County. However, while modest multi-family examples existed prior to 1934, the garden apartments of Arlington County represent the involvement, support, and encouragement of the federal government in housing reform. Under the direction and influence of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), these buildings incorporated the standards of forward-thinking planners and housing reformers and sought to bring the benefits of modern, efficient interior floor plans and attractively planned residential communities to people of moderate means. Notably, the garden apartments were designed specifically for workers and families of modest means, rather than the wealthy upper-class residents **(Context B)**. Cheaper suburban land permitted economical, lower density development of multi-family projects, thus making low-rise and garden apartments an attractive option. In the Washington metropolitan area, an additional spur to apartment construction was the area's rapidly increasing population, which seemed to be favoring Arlington County. The growth of the federal government under the New Deal was followed by a further expansion in preparation for and during World War II, which greatly swelled the ranks of modestly paid workers. The end of World War II brought a wave of returning veterans, who soon married and started families **(Context C)**. The era of apartment construction in Arlington County opened with the groundbreaking for the Colonial Village garden-apartment complex in 1936, the first project in the nation insured by the FHA under Section 207. Its well-designed and well-built, two-story buildings, covering only 18 percent of a landscaped site, attracted 10,000 applicants for the first 276 units—an indication of the demand for moderately priced quality rental housing in the Washington, D.C., area. Because of Colonial Village's immediate and widely publicized success, it became a model for garden-apartment construction throughout the nation, and was actively promoted by FHA as an example for other developers. Garden apartments like Buckingham, Arlington Village, Lyon Village, and Fairlington became the dominant form of apartment construction in Arlington County for the next fifteen years. In 1938, when the FHA's housing act amendment mortgage made allowances for for-profit developers, apartment construction in Arlington County accelerated rapidly. Between 1938 and 1950, when the FHA had determined the demand for apartments in Arlington County had been satisfied, 122 garden apartments, apartment houses, and apartment complexes had been constructed. The FHA's announcement was not exactly correct as another 45 apartments were constructed over the four-year period between 1950 and 1954 **(Context D and Additional Material in 2011 Amendment)**.

Garden apartments and apartment buildings in Arlington County dating from 1934 to 1954 are significant in the areas of Architecture, Community Planning and Development, and Social History. These multi-family buildings are significant indicators of several important patterns of events **(Criterion A)** and architectural ideals **(Criterion C)**.

Criterion A applies when:

A garden apartment or apartment building reflects the FHA standards adopted for the benefits of modern, efficient interior floor plans and attractively planned residential communities to people of moderate means.

A garden apartment or apartment building reflects the immediate need for multi-family moderately priced housing projects prompted by the growth of the federal government under the New Deal and expansions in preparation for, during, and after World War II.

Criterion C applies when:

A garden apartment or apartment building reflects the traditional Colonial Revival style, elements of modern design, the uniting of the two, or lacks stylistic ornamentation in favor of economical, simplistic design created merely by building form and construction materials.

A garden apartment or apartment building constructed in Arlington County between 1934 and 1954, although similar in design ideals and materials to single-family dwellings due to FHA standards, utilizes many of the popular and innovative building techniques and practices of the period, such as concrete block construction veneered in brick, shallow pitched gabled or hipped roofs, flat roofs, main entrances with public corridors or lobbies as well as individual doors to private units, and double-hung or casement windows that unite the interior spaces with the landscaped courtyards of the setting.

A garden apartment or apartment building includes an individual multi-family building or a complex, which could include up to 540 buildings, placed within a landscaped setting of internal streets, courtyards or green space, and parking areas and walkways.

PROPERTY TYPE REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

For National Register eligibility, a garden apartment or apartment building must possess sufficient historic integrity by visibly reflecting the overall physical appearance it gained during the period of historic significance. Generally speaking, historic integrity is composed of seven qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. (Note: See National Register Bulletin 15 for basic definitions of the seven aspects of integrity.)

Registration Requirements:

1. Garden-Apartment Complex
2. Individual Low-Rise Apartment Building
3. Individual Mid-Rise Apartment Building
4. Mid-Rise Apartment Complex
5. Individual High-Rise Apartment Building
6. High-Rise Apartment Complex

Garden apartments, by design, are defined their by massing, setting, landscape, and interior plan, which provide multi-family units. Cyril Harris, the editor of *Dictionary of Architecture & Construction*, states that a garden apartment is a "ground-floor apartment with access to a garden or other adjacent outdoor space" and as "two- or three-story apartment buildings with communal gardens, generally located in the suburbs."[51] The Rental Housing Division (RHD) of the FHA defined large-scale garden-apartment housing as "a grouping of residential units on a terrain of such size as to afford opportunities of coordinated group design, flexibility of planning, advantageous distribution of open space to afford pleasant outlook from the rooms, and as large a measure of protection against existing and possible future adverse use of adjacent property as the location and surrounding conditions will permit." At the same time the garden-apartment model was to meet the enormous demand for moderately priced rental housing.[52] As a product of their time, when social and economic factors coupled with the tremendous need for housing greatly affected the housing market, garden apartments have never been defined by their architectural style, ornamentation and detailing (applied or part of the structure), materials, types of doors and windows, fenestration patterns, building heights, or number of buildings. Although elements such as doors, windows, entry surrounds, lintels, arches, and cornices add to the overall design of

[51] Cyril M. Harris, editor, *Dictionary of Architecture & Construction* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006), 452.
[52] Laura Bobeczko and Richard Longstreth, "Housing Reform Meets the Marketplace," *Housing Washington: Two Centuries of Residential Development and Planning in the National Capital Area*, Richard Longstreth, editor (Chicago, IL: The Center for American Places at Columbia College Chicago, 2010), 164.

this particular building type, they are not essential to our understanding or the significance of garden apartments as they were developed and constructed in Arlington County between 1934 and 1954.

These resources all should be assessed for eligibility under Criterion C. Integrity of design and materials should be present, especially with regard to the form of the building(s), massing, and scale. Fenestration should reflect the building's use as multi-family housing. Further, the landscaping plan, especially for complexes, should be predominantly intact as it appeared when the last buildings were completed to ensure integrity of setting, location, and feeling are sufficiently maintained.

Window replacements are the norm for this particular housing type (97 of the 109 extant properties have replacement windows) and should not be viewed as a sole determining factor when assessing integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. Fenestration pattern, opening size, proportional divisions found in the original lights, lintel or arches, and sills may supersede the in-kind replacement of the original sash. Similarly, door replacements are typical for this housing type (84 of 109 extant properties presently have replacement doors) and should not be viewed as a ?sole factor when assessing integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. However, although a garden apartment is not defined by the types and materials of windows and doors, the replacement of these features should be cumulatively assessed, most particularly on austere apartment buildings that lack additional stylistic ornamentation. In some circumstances, the absence of fashionable embellishment elevates the importance of the retention of the original window sashes and entry doors as the defining characteristics.

For Criterion A, integrity should be present in the original boundaries and multi-family residential use.

Specifically, garden apartments or apartment buildings that are eligible for the National Register should have integrity of **location, design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling and association.** Resources should meet the following requirements:

1. A garden apartment or apartment building should not be moved from its original location. (**location**).

2. A garden apartment or apartment building should include low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise buildings and complexes that reflect the stylistic influences of the mid-1930s through the mid-1950s (**design and workmanship**).

a. Influences of the traditional Colonial Revival.
b. Elements of the innovative modern designs (Art Deco and Streamline Moderne).
c. Uniting elements of both the Colonial Revival and modern designs.
d. Lack of stylized ornamentation in favor of economical, simplistic design created merely by building forms (austere).

3. A garden apartment or apartment building should utilize popular and innovative building materials from the mid-1930s through the mid-1950s (**materials and workmanship**).

a. In form, the buildings are rectangular, square, I-shaped, L-shaped, and U-shaped.
b. The structures are concrete block veneered in brick with American or Flemish bonding.
c. The roofs are gable (side or front), hipped, flat, mansard, or a combination of all, covered in slate or asphalt shingles.
d. Entry surrounds and porches, if present, are wood frame, brick, or granite with Colonial Revival-style surrounds and pediments, modern designed surrounds, flat or hipped porches, pedimented porches with Tuscan columns, metal or wood sloped hoods either cantilevered or with brackets.
e. Double-hung sash, casement, or sliding windows of wood, steel, or replacement aluminum or vinyl.
f. Glass blocks and picture windows.

4. A garden apartment or apartment building should display evidence of original landscape or circulation features, courtyards or planned green space, paved walkways, and sometimes parking. It should relate to public transportation (historically and/or currently) such as railway, streetcar, or primary transportation corridors for cars and buses. It should be sited within walking distance to shopping centers, religious facilities, social activities, schools, and libraries (**setting**).

5. A garden apartment or apartment building should maintain the necessary physical features, which taken together, convey its historic character, specifically the period during which it was constructed (**feeling**). By retaining the original design, majority of the materials, workmanship, and setting, these multi-family housing units can express the aesthetic and historic sense of apartment building construction in Arlington County between 1934 and 1954.

6. A garden apartment or apartment building should maintain a link between its historic origin and the events that led up to its creation (**association**). The resources can reflect this association by remaining a multi-family residential housing unit and resembling mid-twentieth-century housing in their architectural expression.

A garden apartment or apartment building in Arlington County dating from between 1934 to 1954 will meet **registration requirements** if:

1. **Wall Materials:** Original wall materials are substantially intact. Replacing portions of damaged masonry with in-kind masonry to match or of comparable appearance will not cause the building to fail to meet eligibility requirements. Nor will covering over original exposed masonry with paint, as a number of the buildings were originally painted. Upper gable ends, typically clad in wood weatherboard or asbestos shingles, can be covered in replacement synthetic siding, provided the original material is intact underneath.

2. **Windows:** Replacement of the original sash or casement windows is typical for this particular housing type, which was commonly a rental property requiring regular maintenance. Although some properties retain the original windows, the majority have replacements that are in-kind to the original sash in type but generally not in materials and division of lights (true muntins). The fenestration pattern, sill, lintel or arch, and opening size must remain intact because they are significant to the historic context and, thus, are necessary to our understanding of garden apartments. If the sash or casement has not been restored but was replaced in-kind with regard to window type and number of dividing lights, the building continues to meet the eligibility requirements. Many of the apartments have undergone tax credit rehabilitation and inappropriate replacement windows have been removed, supplanted by a window more in keeping with the original sash in type but not always similar in material for maintenance purposes. The replacement of windows should be cumulatively assessed, most particularly on austere apartment buildings that lack additional stylistic ornamentation. In some circumstances, the absence of fashionable embellishment elevates the importance of the retention of the original window sashes. In these cases, the replacement of casement and/or picture windows with double-hung sash may render a building or complex ineligible, as these are character-defining features of a specific period and style. Similarly, the loss of the original division of lights created by muntins and the proportion of those lights (i.e.: 6/6 replaced by 1/1) may affect the eligibility of a property

3. **Doors:** Replacement of the original doors is common for this particular housing type. Although some properties retain all or a few original doors, most have been replaced for maintenance and security purposes. If the primary entry door was replaced in-kind with regard to type, glazing pattern, and material, the building continues to meet the eligibility requirements. The fenestration pattern/location, lintel or arch, glazing patterns, and

opening size for primary entries must remain intact because they reflect the period when the building or complex was constructed and, thus, are necessary to understanding the context of garden apartments. The replacement of secondary entry doors with doors that are not in-kind to the original in material, size, and glazing will not render a property ineligible as these entries are typically located on the rear or below grade with access to the basement and used for maintenance purposes. The replacement of doors, especially the primary entries, should be cumulatively assessed, most particularly on austere apartment buildings that lack additional stylistic ornamentation. In some circumstances, the absence of fashionable embellishment elevates the importance of the retention of the original entry doors as the defining characteristics.

4. **Roof:** Roof form must remain unchanged. Cladding material can be replaced, preferably in-kind, for maintenance purposes.

5. **Additions:** Modest additions are not common but have occurred. Additions that are compatible in design and materials but reflect that they are in fact additions and do not alter the landscape setting (i.e.: the garden aspect of the site), particularly for complexes, will not compromise the integrity of design or setting.

6. **Garages:** Original secondary elements such as garages are not common but do exist. These resources must remain in their original locations and display substantially original form.

7. **Landscape:** Original or early landscape features, such as retaining walls, walkways, plantings, and parking should be in their original location and have retained, to a substantial degree, their original character. The construction of new buildings must not alter the open landscape plan and garden aspect of the property.

8. **Interiors**: The floor plans of garden apartments or apartment buildings are substantially unaltered, although upgrades relating to HVAC, mechanical equipment, bathrooms, and kitchens have occurred. When modernizations have occurred, interior floor plans have remained largely intact as constructed. However, interior walls may have been moved to allow for the installation of mechanical equipment.

G. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Resources listed by construction date.
The inventory has been updated with new documentation regarding address, construction dates, and building status.

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
1.	Frank Lyon Apartments	1007-1011 North Highland Street 1009 North Hudson Street`	1935	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
2.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	2807 North Pershing Drive	1935	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
3.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	2647-2649 North Pershing Drive	1935	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
4.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	2753-2757 Washington Boulevard	1935	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
5.	Colonial Village	Wilson Boulevard and North Taft Street	1936-1955	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
6.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	702-710 22nd Street South	1936	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
7.	Irving Apartments	605 North Irving Street	1936	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
8.	Buckingham	North Pershing Drive and North Glebe Road	1937-1953	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
9.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	4750-4753 21st Road North 4751-4753 21st Road North	1938	Individual Low-Rise Apartments	Extant
10.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1601 North Randolph Street	1938	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
11.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	3016-3020 Wilson Boulevard	1938	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
12.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	North Scott and Rolfe Streets at 14th and 16th Street North	1938/1944/ 1952-1953/ 1958	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
13.	Lyon Village	3111 20th Street North & 3000 Lee Highway	1939	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
14.	Arlington Village	South Barton Street and 13th Road South	1939	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
15.	Westover Apartments	Washington Boulevard & Patrick Henry Drive	1939-1941	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
16.	McClaine Apartments	1515-1519 North Barton Street 2416-2424 16th Street North	1939	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
17.	McClaine Courts	2500-2502 Lee Highway	1939	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
18.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1021 Vermont Street	1939	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
19.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1545 17th Road North	1939	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
20.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1449 17th Street North	1939	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
21.	Lee Terrace Apartments	2608 Lee Highway	1939	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
22.	Cherokee	1512-1532 17th Street North	1939-1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
23.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	700-724 North Monroe Street	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
24.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	3710-3718 7th Street North	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
25.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	617-619 North Monroe Street 624-626 North Monroe Street 632-634 North Monroe Street	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
26.	Fort Craig Gardens	2201-2209 2nd Street South 100-120 South Courthouse Road	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
27.	Kenmore Apartments (Erdo Community)	740 North Monroe Street 726-738 North Nelson Street 737 North Nelson Street 727-739 North Oakland Street 730 North Oakland Street 3606-3610 Wilson Boulevard	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
28.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	2634 Lee Highway	1940	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
29.	Le-Mar Apartments	1720-1726 North Quinn Street	1940	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
30.	Boulevard Courts	2300 Washington Boulevard	1940	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
31.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	2116-2120 2nd Street South	1940	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
32.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	200-204 North Veitch Street	1940	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
33.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	319-323 South Wayne Street	1940	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
34.	Fort Henry Gardens	2409-2488 South Lowell Street 2424-2440 South Lincoln Street	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
35.	Redferne Gardens	5611 Washington Boulevard 1401-1407 North Kenilworth Street	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
36.	Westover Courts	Washington Boulevard and North Lancaster Street	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
37.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1609-1617 North Queen Street	1940	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
38.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	1512-1520 Clarendon Boulevard	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
39.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1016 North Vermont Street	1940	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
40.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1233 North Courthouse Road	1940	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
41.	Oakridge	13th and 14th Street North at North Taft and Troy Streets	1940	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
42.	Clarendon Courts	3814 and 3822 6th Street North 3829 7th Street North	1940-1941	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
43.	Rahill Apartments	16th Street North, North Quinn Street, and North Queen Street	1940-1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
44.	North Quinn Apartments	1210-1250 North Quinn Street 1230 North Queen Street	1940-1946	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
45.	E.R. Keene Apartments (Westover)	Washington Boulevard and North Kenilworth Street	1941	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
46.	Queens Court Apartments	1801-1805 North Quinn Street	1941	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
47.	Arna Valley	South Glebe Road off Shirley Highway	1941	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
48.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	4305-4340 Fairfax Drive	1941	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
49.	Arlington Courts	1310-1314 North Courthouse Road	1941	Individual Mid-Rise Apartment	Demolished
50.	McClaine Gardens	1600-1606 North Rhodes Street	1941	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
51.	Oak Springs	2000-2024 5th Street South 2013-2025 5th Street South	1941-1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
52.	Barcroft	Columbia Pike and George Mason Drive	1942-1947	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
53.	Carydale Apartments	1200-1218 North Rolfe Street	1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
54.	Key Boulevard Apartments	1537-1545 North Key Boulevard	1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
55.	Highland Hall Apartments	20-30 Old Glebe Road South	1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
56.	Lee Gardens South (Sheffield Court)	9th and 10th Streets North & North Wayne Street	1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
57.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	401 South Courthouse Road	1942	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
58.	Windsor (Whitefield Commons)	100-110 North Thomas Street 200-204 North Thomas Street	1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
59.	Swansen Apartment	1601 North Rhodes Street 1600 North Quinn Street 1607-1613 North Quinn Street (Demolished)	1942	Garden-Apartment Complex (two of three original buildings remain)	Partially Demolished
60.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1811-1813 North Veitch Street	1942	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
61.	Unnamed Mid-Rise Apartment Building	1600 North Quinn Street	1942	Individual Mid-Rise Apartment	Demolished
62.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	1301 North Courthouse Road 1314 and 1322 North Troy Street	1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
63.	Paul Dunbar Apartments	3501-3541 South Four Mile Run 3400 South Kemper Road	1942	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
64.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	2100-2106 5th Street South 2101-2107 5th Street South	1942-1943	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
65.	Bedford Garden Apartments	35-39 North Bedford Street 45-49 North Bedford Street 55-59 North Bedford Street 65-67 North Bedford Street	1942-1943	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
66.	Westover Park Apartments	Washington Boulevard, Fairfax Drive, North Kennebec Street, and North Kensington Street	1942-1943 1947-1948	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
67.	Pierce Queen Apartments	1600-1610 16th Street North 1520 North Pierce Street 1515 North Queen Street 1521 North Queen Street	1942/1947	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
68.	Quinn Apartments	1410 North Quinn Street	1942/1952	Garden-Apartment Complex	Partially Demolished
69.	Sylvester	1516 North Rhodes Street (1800 16th Street North) 1500 North Rhodes Street (Demolished) 1410 North Rhodes Street (Demolished) 1411 North Rhodes Street (Demolished)	1942-1943	Garden-Apartment Complex (originally – one building remains)	Partially Demolished
70.	Briarcliff Manor (Marlaine)	1300-1304 North Pierce Street 1318-1320 North Pierce Street 1301-1309 North Peirce Street	1942 1946-1947	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
71.	Fillmore Gardens	8th Street South and South Fillmore Street	1942-1943/ 1948	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
72.	Lee High	2401-2813 Arlington Boulevard	1943	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
73.	Stratford Courts	1336 North Ode Street	1943	Individual Mid-Rise Apartment	Extant
74.	Mason Apartments	4030 Washington Boulevard	1943	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
75.	Wakefield Manor	1201-1203 North Courthouse Road and 1215-1223 North Courthouse Road (also known as 1216-1220 North Troy Street)	1943	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
76.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1628-1636 North Oak Street	1943	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
77.	Bedford Street Apartments	North Brookside Drive and North Bedford Street	1943	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
78.	Parkland Gardens	North Glebe Road and 20th Road North	1943	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
79.	Fairlington	South Buchanan Street & 29th Street South 34th Street South & South Wakefield Street	1943-1945	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
80.	Queen Anne Apartments	518-832 North Thomas Street	1944	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
81.	Chateau Arms	1727 North Fairfax Drive	1944	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
82.	Glenayr Apartments	4400-4429 4th Road North 421-437 North Park Drive	1944	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
83.	Fairfax Drive Apartments	Fairfax Drive and Wilson Boulevard at 9th Street North	1944	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
84.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1527 17th Street North	1944	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
85.	George Washington Carver Homes	1707-1717 13th Road South 1725-1735 13th Road South 1300-1334 South Rolfe Street 1344-1362 South Rolfe Street 1324-1330 South Queen Street	1945	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
86.	George Mason Apartments	4315-4319 4th Street North 4304-4320 North Henderson Road	1945	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
87.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	1235 North Quinn Street 1220-1230 North Queen Street	1946	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
88.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1631 North Ode Street 1524-1532 Clarendon Boulevard	1946	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
89.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1219 North Taft Street	1946	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
90.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1209 North Taft Street	1946	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
91.	Fletcher Gardens	1020-4022 9th Street North	1946	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
92.	Westmoreland Terrace	1320-1322 Fort Myer Drive 1301-1313 North Ode Street	1947	Mid-Rise Apartment Complex	Extant
93.	Glebe Apartments	210-212 North Glebe Road	1947	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
94.	Park Glen Apartments	700-708 South Arlington Mill Road 800-822 South Arlington Mill Road	1947	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
95.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	2040 North Vermont Street	1947	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
96.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	2060 North Vermont Street	1947	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
97.	Palisade Gardens	North Scott Street and 21st Street North	1947	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
98.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1556-1558 16th Street North	1947	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
99.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1112A North Stafford Street	1947	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
100.	Frederick Courts	Columbia Pike, Frederick Street, and South Columbus Street	1947-1948	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
101.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	1509-1511 and 1521-1523 16th Road North	1947-1952	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
102.	Magnolia Gardens	5201-5205 8th Road South 830-856 South Frederick Street 831-857 South Frederick Street	1948	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
103.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	515-517 North Piedmont Street	1948	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
104.	Washington and Lee Apartments	Arlington Boulevard and 2nd Street North	1948	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
105.	Arlington Courts	2800-2912 16th Road South 2801-2913 16th Road South	1948	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
106.	Walter Reed (Commons of Arlington)	1301-1305 South Walter Reed Drive 1315-1319 South Walter Reed Drive 2900-2914 13th Road South	1948	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
107.	North Thomas Street Apartments	470-480 North Thomas Street	1948	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
108.	Randolph Court	1011-1017 North Randolph Street	1948	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
109.	Quincy Gardens	1002-1008 North Quincy Street	1948	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
110.	Glenelg	2300-2306 Lee Highway	1948	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
111.	Fort Myer Heights	1506 North Scott Street	1948	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
112.	Pollard Gardens	North Pollard Street and Fairfax Drive North Scott and Taft Street	1948-1949	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
113.	Lee Gardens North (Woodbury Park)	10th Street North and Arlington Boulevard	1949	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
114.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	461-469 North Thomas Street	1949	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
115.	Buchanan Gardens	914-934 South Buchanan Street	1949	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
116.	Virginia Gardens	1700-1714 South Taylor Street	1949	Garden-Apartment Complex	Partially Demolished
117.	Greenbrier Apartments	841-871 South Greenbrier Street	1949	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
118.	The Virginian	1500 Arlington Boulevard	1949	Individual High-Rise Apartment	Extant
119.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1233 North Scott Street	1949	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
120.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	1215 North Scott Street 1800-1802 13th Street North 1314-1316 North Rolfe Street	1949/1952	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
121.	Hillside Gardens	13th and 15th Streets North at North Scott and Taft Streets	1949/1953-1954	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
122.	Calvert Manor	1925-1927 North Calvert Street	1950	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
123.	Columbia Heights Apartments	8th Road South and South Greenbrier Street	1950	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
124.	Tyroll Hills Apartments	741-751 South Florida Street 801-821 South Florida Street 5100-5104 7th Road South 5108-5112 7th Road South	1950	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
125.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1215-1217 North Quinn Street	1950	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
126.	Columbia Heights (Section I)	5316-5320 8th Road South 5224-5228 8th Road South 5214-5216 8th Road South 830-836 South Buchanan Drive	1950	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
127.	Nalbert Apartments	1301-1319 Fort Myer Drive	1950	Individual Mid-Rise Apartment	Extant
128.	Nield Apartments	1510 18th Street North	1950	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
129.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1635-1637 North Oak Street	1950	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
130.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1600 North Pierce Street	1950	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
131.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1601 16th Street North	1950	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
132.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1721 17th Street North	1950	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
133.	Myerwood Apartments	416 South Veitch Street	1951-1952	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
134.	Arlco Apartments	1423-1427 North Nash Street	1951-1952	Individual Mid-Rise Apartment	Extant
135.	Taylor Apartments	1660-1670 21st Road North	1952	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
136.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1500-1502 16th Road North	1952	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
137.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1029 North Stuart Street	1952	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
138.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1127-1129 North Stuart Street	1952	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
139.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1405 North Scott Street	1952	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
140.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1516 16th Road North	1952	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
141.	Christine Apartments	2912 17th Street South	1952	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
142.	Arlington Boulevard Apartments	1534 16th Road North	1952-1953	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
143.	Vermont Terrace Apartments	2026-2030 North Vermont Street 2051-2055 North Woodstock Street	1952-1953	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
144.	Dominion Terrace Apartments	2030-2036 North Woodrow Street 4635-4641 20th Road North 4701-4705 20th Road North	1952-1954	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
145.	Manor Court	14th and 16th Streets North at North Quinn and Queen Streets	1952-1954	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
146.	Unnamed Apartment Complex	2000-2011 4th Street South	1952/1955	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
147.	Marlow Apartments (Rosslyn Heights)	1220-1224 North Meade Street 1300-1304 North Meade Street	1953	Mid-Rise Apartment Complex	Extant
148.	Pomar Apartments	1123-1125 North Randolph street	1953	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
149.	Admiralty (Calvert Apartments)	2000-2020 North Calvert Street	1953	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
150.	Quebec Apartments	1000-1020 South Quebec Street 1005-1023 South Quebec Street 4010-4012 Columbia Pike	1953	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
151.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1712 21st Road North	1953	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
152.	Radnor Apartments	1400-1402 12th Street North	1953	Individual Mid-Rise Apartment	Extant
153.	The Thomas Apartments	540 North Thomas Street	1953	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
154.	Twin Oak	1511 18th Street North 1800-1806 North Oak Street	1953	Garden-Apartment Complex	Demolished
155.	Rhodes Manor	1325 North Rhodes Street	1953	Individual Mid-Rise Apartment	Demolished
156.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1545 16th Road North	1953	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
157.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1602 Fort Myer Drive	1953-1954	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
158.	Larchmont Gardens	10th Street South and South Frederick Street	1953-1954	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
159.	Aurora Hills Apartments	2701-2705 South Fern Street	1953-1954	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
160.	Taft Manor Apartments	2005 Fairfax Drive	1953-1954	Individual Mid-Rise Apartment	Extant
161.	Fort Bennett (Fort Georgetown)	21st Street North and North Peirce Street	1953-1954	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant

	Name	Address	Construction Date	Building Subtype	Current Status
162.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	1804-1808 North Quinn Street	1954	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
163.	Fort Myer Manor	2001 15th Street North	1954	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Demolished
164.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	4940-4946 19th Street North	1954	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
165.	Unnamed Low-Rise Apartment Building	500 South Courthouse Road	1954	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
166.	Fort Strong Apartments	2000-2012 North Daniel Street	1954	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
167.	Ingleside Apartments	2125-2133 19th Street North	1954	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant
168.	John E. Delashmutt Apartments	1931 North Cameron Street 1941 North Cameron Street	1954	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
169.	Parkview Manor Apartments	1310 North Meade Street	1954	Individual Mid-Rise Apartment	Extant
170.	Rosslyn Ridge Apartments	1501-1531 North Pierce Street	1954	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
171.	Washington Vista (Carydale in Towne)	1545-1549 Colonial Terrace Key Boulevard and North Nash Street	1954-1955	Individual Low-Rise Apartment	Extant
172.	Arlington Towers (River Place)	1011,1021, 1111, 1121 Arlington Boulevard	1954-1955	High-Rise Apartment Complex	Extant
173.	Dominion Arms	333 South Glebe Road	1954-1955	Individual High-Rise Apartment	Extant
174.	Oakland	3804-3814 Columbia Pike	1954-1956	Garden-Apartment Complex	Extant

H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

The goal of the 2011 amendment was to: 1) expand on the thematic context and 2) update the current status of the properties identified as a number of the resources have been razed since 2002. With regard to the expanded thematic context, focus was paid to the forces that shaped development of this particular property type in Arlington County, especially:

- New Deal programs designed to stimulate the economy and reverse the precipitous decline of the construction industry in the Great Depression
- Growth of population with expansion of the federal government, first with the New Deal, then World War II and, after 1945, returning veterans
- Pent-up demand for quality housing that civil servants and other moderate income families could afford
- Urban planning and housing reform movements that sought to bring the benefits of quality housing design and construction and well-planned communities to people of moderate incomes.

The 2002 survey identified a total of 176 individual apartment buildings and complexes. At that time, 42 had been demolished, 3 had lost integrity, and 131 survived intact with good integrity. The 2010 survey, the result of a county-wide examination of this property type, correctly identified one hundred seventy-four (174) individual apartment buildings and complexes. The discrepancy was related, presumably, to the repetition of two apartment complexes because of erroneous addresses. Of the 174 identified, 109 are extant in whole or part, with 65 properties fully demolished (three complexes have been partially razed).

To achieve the desired products, a senior architectural historian of EHT Traceries, Inc., and the historic preservation coordinator for Arlington County visited each of the apartment buildings and complexes in 2007-2008 and in 2009-2011. The on-site windshield survey recorded the number of resources associated with the property and the existing status of the property and its resources based on historic documentation (including a 1961 county survey of multi-family units and Sanborn Fire Insurance maps). The resources were examined for original and replacement windows and doors, additions and alterations, entry and window surrounds, roof type and cladding, and exterior cladding materials. The neighborhood context and siting of each property

and resource was evaluated to determine if integrity of setting, location, and feeling were present.

Research was conducted at the Arlington County Historical Society, the Virginia Room of Arlington County Library, the Library of Congress, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development Library (before it was fully dismantled in the winter of 2009). The Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing and Development and the Federal Housing Administration reference specialist at the National Archives, College Park, were consulted. *The Washington Post* (Historical) was searched online through Proquest.

I. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arlington County, Virginia. *County of Arlington Zoning Plan*, [Map]. May 1942. Archived at Arlington County Public Library, Virginia Room.

Arlington County, Virginia. *Zoning Ordinance.* Adopted May 16, 1942.

Davies, Richard O. *Housing Reform During the Truman Administration.* Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1966.

Dieter, Frank L. "Early Planning Progress in Arlington County, Virginia to 1945." *Arlington Historical Magazine* 3 no. 3 (October 1967).

Doan, Mason C. *American Housing Production, 1880-2000: A Concise History.* Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1997.

Fellows, Catherine D. "Fairlington at 50: May 1943-May 1993," 60th Anniversary Printing. Arlington, VA: Fairlington Historical Society, 2003.

Ferguson, Abner H. "Housing Progress of FHA." *Housing Progress* 1, no. 2 (Summer 1945).

Goode, James M. *Best Addresses.* Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 1988.

National Association of Real Estate Boards. *Proceeding of the Realtors' Housing Conference Discussing the National Housing Act (as amended February 3, 1938).* March 17, 18, 19, 1938. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970.* Bicentennial Edition, Parts 1, 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Census of Housing, Housing Characteristics by Type of Structure.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1945.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1942*. 63rd ed. Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office, 1942.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1952*. 73rd ed. Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office, 1952.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1955*. 76th ed. Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office,1955.

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

U.S. Federal Housing Administration. *Modern Design*. Technical Bulletin No. 2, March 1, 1941. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1941.

U.S. Federal Housing Administration. *Planning Rental Housing Projects.* Rev. September 1947. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

U.S. Federal Housing Administration. *Principles of Planning Small Houses,* Technical Bulletin No. 4. Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office, 1936.

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

Washington Post

Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981; Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1983.

Online Resources

Public Broadcasting Service, American Experience. “People & Events: Chicago Century of Progress Exposition (World’s Fair), 1933-1934,”

http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/streamliners/peopleevents/e_fair.html (accessed November 4, 2009).

Richard L Forstall, comp., "Population of Counties by Decennial Census: 1900 to 1990," http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/cencounts/files/va190090.txt (accessed November 17, 2009)

Richard L Forstall, comp. "Population of Counties by Decennial Census: 1900 to 1990." http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/cencounts/files/md190090.txt (accessed December 3, 2009).

*Gibson, Campbell. "*Population of the 100 Largest Cities and Other Urban Places in the United States: 1790 TO 1990," Population Division Working Paper No. 27, June 1998. http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/twps0027.html (accessed December 3, 2009).

U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Census of Housing Tables, Units in Structure.* http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/census/historic/units.html (accessed November 30, 2009).