

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

DRAFT

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 #18

other names/site number _____

2. Location

street & number 199 Chautauqua Boulevard

city or town Los Angeles

state California code CA county Los Angeles code 037 zip code 90077

☐

not for publication

☐

vicinity

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 #18
Name of Property

Los Angeles, California
County and State

5. Classification

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

☒	private
☐	public - Local
☐	public - State
☐	public - Federal

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

☒	building(s)
☐	district
☐	site
☐	structure
☐	object

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

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

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

The Case Study House Program: 1945-1966

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions (Enter categories from instructions.)

Domestic: Single dwelling

Current Functions (Enter categories from instructions.)

Domestic: Single dwelling

7. Description

Architectural Classification (Enter categories from instructions.)

Modern

Materials (Enter categories from instructions.)

foundation: Concrete slab

walls: Plywood, Floor-to-ceiling glass, Pebbled
glass, Corrugated wire glass

roof: Composition, Flat

other: Steel frame, Floor-to-ceiling glass

Case Study House #18
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

This house is located in what soon became a Chautauqua colony of Case Study houses. Walker oriented the public areas to take full advantage of tremendous ocean views by employing floor to ceiling glass panels. Comparable in construction and finish to his own home (CSH #16), Case Study House #18 is built with wood framing set at three-foot intervals, which also assisted in economy and efficiency in the building process. Notable in the living room is the strong presence of the large copper-sheathed brick fireplace and the raised roof with clerestory windows. The property exhibits a high level of physical integrity.

Narrative Description

This one-story, flat-roofed residence was built on a high one-half acre meadow with an ocean view and within walking distance to the Pacific Ocean. The site was originally chosen for six Case Study houses, in what is now called Pacific Palisades. At 1600 square feet with living-dining room, garden room, kitchen, two bedrooms, and two baths, it was sited adjacent to parcels of land that would soon become the sites for the Case Studies #8, #9, and #20. Preliminary plans for the house first appeared in *Arts & Architecture* in late 1947, with the completed house published in the February 1948 issue of the magazine.

Walker employed a construction system similar to that of his own house, Case Study House #16, by positioning wood framing at three-foot intervals. "The module system was employed because of the strength inherent in such a structure, the absence of waste, the speed with which it can be constructed and symmetry," he stated.ⁱ Continuing his experimentation with elevated heating systems, Walker placed a metal duct in the living room ceiling that spread hot air evenly from openings in each rafter bay; the heated ceiling would radiate warmth to the room below. A conventional forced air heating system was used in other rooms.

This site has unobstructed views on the south and east, with the principle view to the south to take advantage of light and warmth. The site lends itself to privacy, so large areas of glass were used. The house was placed as far back on the site as possible on the west and north property lines to avoid the noise of beach traffic on Pacific Coast Highway at the foot of the cliff. The west elevation features floor to ceiling glazing for unobstructed views of the ocean.

The residence was designed for a couple in their thirties with the wife being a clothing designer and gardener, and the husband an engineer who enjoyed drawing and machine shop work. They had two dogs so a dog run was designed adjacent to the service yard. Shop space was included for the garage and a partially enclosed garden room was created for the wife's gardening interests. The guest bedroom was designed as a possible sewing room.

ⁱ *Arts & Architecture*, February 1948.

Case Study House #18

Name of Property

Los Angeles, California

County and State

Because of the drama of the site and its ocean view, the major public rooms in the U-shaped plan of the house were all oriented to take full advantage of the vista via walls of glass. A key feature of the plan is the openness of the living and dining room with its access to the garden room.

A processional entry along a covered walkway marks the visitor's approach to the house. Beyond the front door, which faces east, an entry hall opens directly onto the combined living and dining room. Two bedrooms and baths are at the front (north side) of the house on either side of the covered walkway. To the west is a large service yard and dog run situated between the garage and a second entry leading to the kitchen and one of the bedrooms.

The most unique interior feature of the dwelling is a large floor-to-ceiling brick fireplace faced with copper that dominates the living room and around which the roof is raised to 11 feet to accommodate clerestory windows. The fireplace is double sided with one side facing the living room and the other facing the garden room. A number of the glass walls are sliding panels opening to outdoor terraces.

The service yard between the garage and the house has been enclosed for a bedroom and bathroom. This addition appears to have been done without changing the exterior perimeter of the home. The exterior door to the service yard is the now the entry door to the new bedroom. It was constructed with the intention that it could be reversed or removed if desired.

Due to earthquake damage the fireplace was rebuilt and is now gas burning as opposed to the original wood burning. The fireplace is cosmetically preserved with its original materials and configuration. There appear to have been no other modifications to the primary residence, which is remarkably intact. The broad lawn facing south still affords sweeping unobstructed views. The house appears to be well maintained and in excellent condition. As a result, the house exhibits a high level of integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. The residence is in its original location and its setting has been retained. Integrity of association is high because of its continued use as a single-family residence. Because of these factors, integrity of feeling remains strong.

Case Study House #18

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

1948

Significant Dates

1948

Significant Person

(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

Cultural Affiliation

N/A

Architect/Builder

Rodney A. Walker

Period of Significance (justification)

1948 Date of construction.

Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)

N/A

Case Study House #18
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.)

Case Study House (CSH) #18 meets the criteria established in the Registration Requirements outlined in the MPS cover document. The house retains a high level of physical integrity. As relates to eligibility, 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 #18 was designed by master architect Rodney A. Walker. 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 #18 was designed by architect Rodney A. Walker and completed in 1948. It is one of the 25 dwellings constructed under the auspices of *Arts & Architecture* magazine's Case Study House program, which ran from 1945 until 1966. The importance of the house, its significance within the program, and the work of its primary architect are thoroughly discussed within the historic context argument presented in the Multiple Property Submission cover document. That historic context being: "Experimental Modern residential architecture of the Case Study House program in Southern California: 1945-1966." The house is a fine example of the property type: "Single family residences of the Case Study program," and the "wood-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 house is located in what soon became a Chautauqua colony of Case Study houses. Walker oriented the public areas to take full advantage of tremendous ocean views by employing floor to ceiling glass panels. Comparable in construction and finish to his own home (CSH #16), Case Study House #18 is built with wood framing set at three-foot intervals, which also assisted in economy and efficiency in the building process. Notable in the living room is the strong presence of the large copper-sheathed brick fireplace and the raised roof with clerestory windows. The property exhibits a high level of physical integrity.

CSH #18 is one of a cluster of dwellings erected in what became a Chautauqua colony of Case Study Houses in Pacific Palisades. Its design consists of key elements that became associated with the Case Study House program such as utilizing consistent intervals in the construction framing, in this case a three-foot pattern, that led to economy and efficiency in the building process. In addition, the property represents the work of master architect Rodney A. Walker. 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 a master architect.

Developmental history/additional historic context information (if appropriate)

Case Study House #18

Name of Property

Los Angeles, California

County and State

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.

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 34.03007

Longitude: W 118.51833

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.

Case Study House #18

Name of Property

Los Angeles, California

County and State

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Steven Kyle / Architect - Realtor

organization Los Angeles Conservancy Modern Committee

date Sep 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 _____

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 18
City	Los Angeles
County	Los Angeles
State	CA
Name of Photographer	Larry Underhill
Date of Photographs	March 30, 2011
Location of Original Digital Files	Los Angeles Conservancy, 523 W 6 th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90014

CA_Los Angeles_Case Study House 18_0001.tif
North facade (left), East facade (right), camera facing Southwest

CA_Los Angeles_Case Study House 18_0002.tif
South facade (left), East facade (right), camera facing Northwest

CA_Los Angeles_Case Study House 18_0003.tif
South facade, camera facing Northeast

CA_Los Angeles_Case Study House 18_0004.tif
Living Room-North facade, camera facing Northeast

Case Study House #18

Name of Property

Los Angeles, California

County and State

Property Owner:

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

name Frances K. Nathanson

street & number 199 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.