

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service



National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form*. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. **Place additional certification comments, entries, and narrative items on continuation sheets if needed (NPS Form 10-900a).**

1. Name of Property

historic name Case Study House #9
 other names/site number The Entenza House

2. Location

street & number 205 Chautauqua Boulevard not for publication
 city or town Los Angeles vicinity
 state California code CA county Los Angeles code 037 zip code 90272

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
 I hereby certify that this ___ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.
 In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:
 ___ national ___ statewide ___ local

Signature of certifying official/Title _____ Date _____
 State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government _____

In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.
 Signature of commenting official _____ Date _____
 Title _____ State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government _____

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:
 ___ entered in the National Register ___ determined eligible for the National Register
 ___ determined not eligible for the National Register ___ removed from the National Register
 ___ other (explain:) _____
 Signature of the Keeper _____ Date of Action _____

Case Study House #9
Name of Property

Los Angeles, California
County and State

5. Classification

Ownership of Property
(Check as many boxes as apply.)

Category of Property
(Check only **one** box.)

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	private
<input type="checkbox"/>	public - Local
<input type="checkbox"/>	public - State
<input type="checkbox"/>	public - Federal

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	building(s)
<input type="checkbox"/>	district
<input type="checkbox"/>	site
<input type="checkbox"/>	structure
<input type="checkbox"/>	object

Contributing	Noncontributing	
1	1	buildings
0	0	district
0	0	site
0	0	structure
0	0	object
1	1	Total

Name of related multiple property listing
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

The Case Study House Program: 1945-1966

0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Domestic: Single dwelling

Domestic: Single dwelling

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Materials
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Modern

foundation: Concrete slab

walls: Concrete block, Plywood panels,
Aluminum frame glass

roof: Asphalt, Flat

Steel-framed, Floor-to-ceiling glass

exterior walls, Free-standing fireplace,

other: Built-in cabinetry

Case Study House #9
Name of Property

Los Angeles, California
County and State

Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current physical appearance of the property. Explain contributing and noncontributing resources if necessary. Begin with a **summary paragraph** that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, setting, size, and significant features.)

Summary Paragraph

Constructed adjacent to the Eames House, the Entenza House, designed for *Arts & Architecture* publisher/editor John Entenza, was built according to the original plans published in 1945. Entenza frequently entertained, so the house consists of mostly public and very little private space. A large, sunken living room with a built-in seating area facilitates conversation. The steel-framed house is infilled with plastered and wood-paneled surfaces in a modular plan. As relates to design, a large contemporary dwelling on the portion of the parcel facing the ocean has been constructed. It connects to the Entenza House via a covered hallway. Nonetheless, Case Study House (CSH) #9 continues to “maintain enough physical integrity to be readily identifiable as a contributor to the program.”

Narrative Description

The Entenza house is approximately 1600 square feet in size with the largest portion of the interior devoted to an oversized bi-level living area originally overlooking the meadow-like grounds and the Pacific Ocean. When completed in 1949, the house contained two bedrooms, a study, two bathrooms, kitchen, large open living/dining area, utility room and garage. Two broad, deep, carpeted sitting steps created the bi-level of living space. The dwelling was once painted a medium gray color, the original color chosen by Eames and Entenza. The house is primarily sheathed in Truscon Ferroboard with the ocean-facing elevation glazed by Libby-Owens-Ford glass with Truscon steel window framing. The east elevation consists of lightweight concrete block by Rocklite. This design exemplified the classic Case Study House concept of merging interior and exterior spaces through glass expanses and seamless materials.

The property is situated on a primarily flat parcel on a bluff overlooking the Pacific Ocean. The site slopes downwards on the southwest toward Chautauqua Boulevard. A privacy wall was built to protect the front entry of the house as well as provide a privacy screen near guest parking areas.

It is important to note that this house is built as part of a compound of five (5) significant modern structures off of Chautauqua Boulevard, four of which are Case Study Houses. These houses are on contiguous lots, and all five form a tightly knit grouping. Four of the five homes share a common narrow driveway.

In the 1990s, the Entenza House was modified to accommodate a much larger residence on the ocean side of the property. The original design featured a sliding wall between the master bedroom and the living area, allowing an ocean view from the sleeping area. This wall has been covered with sheetrock; however, it is believed that the sliding wall and mechanism are still intact beneath the newer materials.

Case Study House #9
Name of Property

Los Angeles, California
County and State

The original plan also featured a 2-car garage located within the footprint of the dwelling. The entry to the garage was on the front of the house, and access from the garage led either into the utility room/kitchen area or into the main entry hall. This garage has been enclosed and now appears to be the servants' quarters for the newer residence. Details of the original garage, such as the full-height wall of corrugated glass separating the garage from the entry hall, remain. Direct connection between CSH #9 and the new residence exists by virtue of an enclosed hallway which is attached to the former bedroom space adjacent to the living room.

Although retaining integrity of location, the placement of the large non-original dwelling unfortunately blocks some of the sweeping ocean views once afforded to the Entenza House, negatively affecting its historic setting. Yet the ocean-side profile of the house, used many times in photographs as an exemplary design in steel-frame modern architecture, remains unchanged. The living area, dining area, and entry hall have also survived without the impact of alterations. In terms of integrity of design, materials, workmanship and setting, the attachment of the new adjacent residence via a covered hallway to the Entenza House, the loss of ocean views, and the noted interior changes do not rise to the level of significance to warrant disqualification as a contributing property. The property continues to retain its association with Entenza and, despite the identified modifications, it appears that the original feeling of Case Study House #9 has not been seriously diminished. Case Study House (CSH) #9 meets the criteria established in the Registration Requirements outlined in the MPS cover document. In sum, Case Study House #9 continues to "maintain enough physical integrity to be readily identifiable as a contributor to the program."

Case Study House #9
Name of Property

Los Angeles, California
County and State

8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria

(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations

(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

- A Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- B removed from its original location.
- C a birthplace or grave.
- D a cemetery.
- E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- F a commemorative property.
- G less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance

(Enter categories from instructions.)

Architecture

Social History

Period of Significance

1949

Significant Dates

1949

Significant Person

(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

Cultural Affiliation

N/A

Architect/Builder

Charles Eames

Eero Saarinen

Period of Significance (justification)

1949. Date of construction.

Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)

N/A

Case Study House #9
Name of Property

Los Angeles, California
County and State

Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance and applicable criteria.)

The property meets Criterion A for its association with experimental modern housing in the postwar years under the auspices of John Entenza's *Arts & Architecture* magazine. The property is also significant under Criterion C because it embodies the distinctive characteristics of residential architecture associated with the Case Study House program. In addition, CSH #9 was designed by master architects Charles Eames and Eero Saarinen. Therefore, the property qualifies for listing under Criteria A and C at the local level of significance.

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

Case Study House (CSH) #9 was collaboratively designed by Charles Eames and Eero Saarinen and erected in 1949. It is one of the dwellings constructed under the auspices of *Arts & Architecture* magazine's Case Study House Program, which ran from 1945 until 1966. It is a key example of the property type: "Single family residences of the Case Study House Program," and the "steel-frame dwellings" subtype. The property meets National Register Criterion A for its association with experimental modern housing in the postwar years under the auspices of John Entenza's *Arts & Architecture* magazine.

This one-story house was built for John Entenza, the publisher and editor of *Arts & Architecture* magazine. The Entenza house was the first steel framed project to be built in the Case Study Program soon followed by Case Study House #8, the Eames house, which is sited on the adjacent lot. The residence epitomizes the Case Study House philosophy. It is characterized by floor to ceiling glass walls, a flat roof, open floor plan with a minimum of hallways, flexible multi-purpose rooms, immediate access to gardens from all major rooms and use of standardized materials such as concrete block, plywood panels and industrial glass. Planar walls shield the house from the street while orienting the public living rooms to rear gardens for privacy. The plans, materials, and siting of the house encourage a relaxed lifestyle based on indoor-outdoor living. In validating the property's significance, Case Study House #9 was listed as a City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument in 1991 (excluding non-historic, non-original additions). As a result, the property meets National Register Criterion C because it embodies the distinctive characteristics of residential architecture associated with the Case Study House program and is the work of master architects Eero Saarinen and Charles Eames.

Developmental history/additional historic context information (if appropriate)

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form.)

As indicated in The Case Study House Program: 1945-1966 Multiple Property Documentation Form.

Case Study House #9
Name of Property

Los Angeles, California
County and State

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67 has been requested)
- previously listed in the National Register
- previously determined eligible by the National Register
- designated a National Historic Landmark
- recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey # _____
- recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # _____
- recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey # _____

Primary location of additional data:

- State Historic Preservation Office
 - Other State agency
 - Federal agency
 - Local government
 - University
 - Other
- Name of repository: _____

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned): _____

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property Less than one acre
(Do not include previously listed resource acreage.)

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates

(Follow similar guidelines for entering the lat/long coordinates as describe on page 55, *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form* for entering UTM references. For properties less than 10 acres, enter the lat/long coordinates for a point corresponding to the center of the property. For properties of 10 or more acres, enter three or more points that correspond to the vertices of a polygon drawn on the map. The polygon should approximately encompass the area to be registered. Add additional points below, if necessary.)

Datum if other than WGS84: _____

(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

1. Latitude: N 34.031 Longitude: W 118.5187

Google Map

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

NOTE: These three items were part of the original submission, and did not make the transfer to updated forms.

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Steven Kyle / Architect - Realtor
organization Los Angeles Conservancy Modern Committee date June 1, 2009; Revised February 2013
street & number 523 West Sixth Street, Suite 826 telephone 213-623-2489
city or town Los Angeles state CA zip code 90014
e-mail _____

Case Study House #9
Name of Property

Los Angeles, California
County and State

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A **USGS map** (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

A **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.
- **Continuation Sheets**
- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items.)

Photographs:

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map.

Name of Property: Case Study House 9
City: Los Angeles
County: Los Angeles
State: CA
Name of Photographer: Andy Hurvitz
Date of Photographs: February 26, 2011
Location of Original Digital Files: Los Angeles Conservancy, 523 W 6th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90014

CA_Los Angeles_Case Study House 9_0001.tif
Southeast façade (left), Southeast façade (right), camera facing Northwest

CA_Los Angeles_Case Study House 9_0002.tif
Southeast façade (right), camera facing Southwest

CA_Los Angeles_Case Study House 9_0003.tif
Interior – Living Room, camera facing Northeast

CA_Los Angeles_Case Study House 9_0004.tif
Interior – Living Room, camera facing Northeast

CA_Los Angeles_Case Study House 9_0005.tif
Interior – Living Room, camera facing Northwest

Property Owner:

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

name Winfield Holdings, LLC
street & number 205 Chautauqua Boulevard telephone _____
city or town Los Angeles state CA zip code 90272

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.